*A BRIEF, SELECTIVE HISTORY OF THE DEPARTMENT OF
HUMAN DEVELOPMENT AND FAMILY LIFE AT THE
UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS: THE EARLY YEARS*

DONALD M. BAER

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS

The University of Kansas' Department of Human Development and Family Life (HDFL) was created in the very early 1960s, in a confluence of academic, societal, and personal behaviors. Some of the academic responses had begun many years earlier, when the Kansas legislature created a Bureau of Child Research at its flagship university in Lawrence, and charged it with learning, discovering, and disseminating useful facts about child development. The state supplied only the necessary words, and funds for a half-time secretary. It was assumed that an already employed professor could be found who, in addition to the usual full-time academic duties, would know or find out what new facts ought to be disseminated; that professor could then write news releases for the secretary to type and send to all Kansas newspapers, which might occasionally print some of them, thereby enlightening interested Kansas readers.

In the late 1940s, the directorship of the Bureau was assigned to a professor of speech pathology, Richard L. Schiefelbusch, who immediately saw his new duty quite differently from his predecessor. A variety of governmental agencies had begun funding biomedical research at levels of generosity that may well seem science fiction to modern researchers, and had also recognized behavioral science as a small but key component of biomedical science. Schiefelbusch noted that the state charge to the Bureau of Child Research included not only the gleaning of existing knowledge but also the production of new knowledge; he and his subsequent colleagues used their half-time secretary mainly to type research-grant applications. They applied often

and with great success to those agencies, and in the mid-1960s the Bureau had more than \$2 million in grants largely aimed at the problems of retardation.

In the course of gaining, expending, and applying for more of these funds, Schiefelbusch very early recruited Joseph E. Spradlin for research programs at the State (retardation) Hospital and Training Center in Parsons, Kansas (about 130 miles south of Lawrence), and the two of them soon recruited a number of research associates, among them Frances Degen Horowitz. Horowitz had been trained in the environment of Psychology and the Child Welfare Station of the University of Iowa; at that time, it intensely advocated behavioral, experimental, and Spence-Hullian reinforcement-based theoretical approaches to understanding behavior.

Horowitz (now president of the Graduate School of CUNY) was essentially an academic; she wanted an academic as well as a research appointment, as would many future research associates. Her obvious home was in psychology, but Kansas' Psychology Department at that time was wary of sudden expansion. A temporary but fateful recourse was to appoint Horowitz in the Department of Home Economics at Lawrence. At that time, the many areas of home economics were taught very well by a larger, flourishing, and well-equipped college at Kansas State University; by contrast, the University of Kansas department was small and ill equipped in most home economics areas, with the significant exception of child study: It had modest preschool and day-care facilities and staffs, a heritage of the efforts required by the Second World War, which had been handsomely met by the university's relevant professor of that era, Edna A. Hill.

But Hill and her three most important colleagues were all within a few years of retirement in the

Address correspondence and reprint requests to Donald M. Baer, Department of Human Development, University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas 66045.

early 1960s. The University of Kansas administration, considering how well home economics education was done at Kansas State, decided to dissolve its own department immediately after the imminent retirement of those four faculty. Horowitz quickly made four points to the administration: (a) The Bureau had more than \$2 million for child research and would surely gain much more, as the administration hoped, and would hire people like her who would ask for academic appointments; (b) the Psychology Department was reluctant to grow in that direction; (c) the Home Economics Department already had preschools and a strong tradition of child study, and could be an appropriate academic department for the anticipated new research associates; and (d) shortly after she joined the faculty of Home Economics (as a research appointment), that faculty had commissioned her to plead their cause to the administration: that Home Economics be not discontinued, but transformed into a strongly research-oriented Department of Human Development with her as chair. The administration agreed, and recognized in Horowitz an unusually gifted academic and extraordinarily talented leader; in 1963, she was commissioned to begin the transformation.

Since 1959, Horowitz had been conversing at conventions with Donald M. Baer; they recognized each other as especially interesting members of a small but ambitious disciplinary group dedicated to rigorous standards of proof, experimental technique, good measurement and the direct observation and thorough behavioral definition it required, and a theory consonant with those three values. In 1964, Horowitz asked Baer at the APA convention in Los Angeles if he would be "interested in a challenge." Fresh from losing a quite typical Psychology civil war at the University of Washington, the entire faculty of its Developmental Psychology Laboratory—Sidney W. Bijou, Baer, Jay S. Birnbrauer, and Bijou's research associate, Jack-Michael-trained Montrose M. Wolf—were indeed all in the process of seeking other universities. Baer was especially interested in recreating the intellectual climate of Bijou's Developmental Psychology Laboratory: a theory-driven commitment to the

experimental analysis of the child behaviors most important to children, their society, and developmental theory; and the use of graduate students more as colleagues than servants. The laboratory had already attracted Child Psychiatry's Iowa-trained Barbara C. Etzel to its weekly seminars, and it had trained or transformed students such as Ivar Lovaas, Robert Wahler, Ralph Wetzel, James Sherman, Todd Risley, Warren Steinman, Robert Peterson, Marilyn Erickson, Betty Hart, and (indirectly) Vance Hall into the behavioral researchers the subsequent literature illustrates.

Horowitz wanted exactly that kind of climate. She recognized the operant model Baer used as a powerful and legitimate one, relevant to (but not her favorite for) her own newly developing infant research, and to virtually every other theoretical and social problem as well. Horowitz and Baer discussed at length creating a department with that climate, pursuing as fully as possible only a very select few of the already few experimental behavioral and cognitive models (of the sort that Hayne Reese would later begin), and as soon as practical adding an experimental biobehavioral model (of the sort that Eli Michaelis would later begin, to the extent that a nonbiology department could afford suitable laboratories). Late in 1964, Baer agreed to come in the summer of 1965.

Horowitz immediately turned to her remarkable dean, George Waggoner, and to Schiefelbusch and his Bureau of Child Research for further appointments. Waggoner was a dean of great intellectual competence and enthusiasm; he doubted the intellectual validity of most current departmental boundaries, and was always quick to consider educational experiments in transforming them. He agreed that because Kansas already had a large Psychology Department, HDFL need not adopt the usual zoo model necessary to cover the entire field and its major theoretical approaches; HDFL was free to specialize.

Waggoner allowed Horowitz about 10 new appointments in HDFL's first few years, and about 15 more thereafter; he was greatly aided in that generosity by Schiefelbusch's funding many of those appointments with 25% to 50% research-associate

components in the Bureau. As the department grew, Waggoner occasionally commented with obvious amusement that in his opinion as a humanist, HDFL's behaviorists had quite the wrong concept of humanity, but that he was academically more impressed by our competence than our concept, and personally very interested in seeing where we had taken our approach and might take it next.

Horowitz and Baer collaborated in the next appointments after Baer. The first were Wolf, Risley, and Etzel. Wolf and Risley were offered mixed academic-research appointments; both considered them great gambles and agreed to come only after telephoning each other. Etzel, then at Western Washington State University, was offered a similar appointment, and also was asked to head the pre-school laboratories. But she had just been awarded a year's postdoctoral fellowship with Jacob L. Gewirtz at the National Institute of Mental Health to study infant behavior; she intensely wanted both opportunities. (The smallness of the behavioral world at that time is reflected in the fact that Gewirtz, trained at Iowa, had been Baer's doctoral advisor at Chicago.) Noting that Etzel, Horowitz, and Baer saw Etzel's two offers as a quandary, an amused Dean Waggoner promptly offered her an appointment that began with a year's leave; she accepted both.

Wolf and Risley, instantly involved in a program of school-community projects in a Kansas City ghetto area, asked for the recruitment of Vance Hall as their research associate. Everyone proposed that Captain James Sherman be recruited as an academic colleague as soon as he had satisfied his ROTC obligation at the Walter Reed Army Institute of Research.

Those early newcomers joined with already-there HDFL Kansans such as Marie Cross, a biochemist-dietician, and Alita Cooper, Lucille Paden, Carolyn Thomson, and Margaret Cooper, early educators, in a number of cooperative research and teaching ventures, and all participated in the recruitment of many new colleagues.

But first the department had to apply for permission to grant a new PhD degree in Developmental and Child Psychology. We already had doc-

toral students and no doctorate to offer them. The administration agreed, and immediately asked the American Council of Graduate Schools to send a suitable examiner. The Council chose Charles C. Spiker, who had been one of Horowitz's teachers at Iowa, and was known to be intensely devoted to Hullian theory and the most demanding standards of experimental proof. Horowitz, still in the awe that able students of exceptionally competent teachers find difficult to abandon, worried about what he might think of so operant a department. She jokingly said to him at the opening formal group lunch of his site visit that, of course, he would not be influenced by so trivial an event as the department paying for his lunch; he replied, completely serious, that indeed, he would not be influenced even by considerations of ordinary human decency. Two days later, having talked impassively to everyone, he let us know that he would approve fully of our application. But he also noted that we were very few and traveled often: A single airplane crash could cripple the new program. He would recommend additional appointments as soon as the university could manage them. On the drive back to the airport with Baer, he also remarked privately that "operant" versus "Hullian" was not the point; "experimental," "difficult to convince," and "theory driven" were, and we clearly were all of those. (We note his recent death with sadness and deep respect.)

Those earliest years would be difficult to establish in any way other than personal recollection and interpretation. The reader is reminded of all the frailties of mere verbal report about recollections and interpretations. Had Horowitz, Schiefelbusch, Waggoner, Wolf, Etzel, Risley, Hall, or Sherman been asked to write this account, each might well have produced a somewhat different chronicle. Which then is the truth?

All of what came next is clear enough in the literature, and need not be specified here in much detail. The University took Spiker's admonition to heart, and hired many more of us. As a result, there followed a hectic decade of personnel recruitment and conceptual expansion, and the evolution of three specialized Master's degree programs. We

soon attracted Don Bushell, Bill Hopkins, Hayne Reese, and Keith Miller. We expanded the early-education program with Wilma Holt, Nancy Mann Reese, and Eileen Allen. We began producing students we admired so much we kept them: Judith LeBlanc, Trudilee Rowbury, Elizabeth Goetz, Katherine Ramp, Steven Fawcett, Jan Sheldon, and Marion O'Brien. Jan Sheldon took a law degree as well, and added a powerful legal-implications dimension to our teaching and research. Don Green came for a few years, and left for Meharry Medical School. George Semb made the personalized system of instruction our introductory-course teaching technique and a decade-long research topic; and Eli Michaelis added biomedical science to our program for more than a decade (and then became chair of a Kansas biology department). Joseph Spradlin became a department appointment as well as a Bureau appointment. Hayne Reese left for a distinguished professorship at West Virginia; he had made so clear to the behavior analysts the value of a sophisticated cognitive-science advocate who understood behavior and application that we recruited,

as if in his image (and in the last flush of adequate state financing), Aletha Huston, John Wright, and John Colombo, and, for purely behavior-analytic reasons, Edward Morris and David Born. In our last wave of recruitment, we expanded the early-education program with Kathleen Zanolli; recovered a momentarily lapsed biological component with Steven Schroeder (who, upon the retirement of Schiefelbusch, had taken over a Bureau of Child Research newly transformed into a Life Span Institute); further acknowledged the importance of politics-driven community application with the appointment of Glen White; and began a cognitive-behavioral Child Clinical program collaboration with Psychology by a series of joint appointments: Michael Roberts, Kathleen Lemanek, and Eric Vernberg.

When Horowitz left our chair to begin her ascent in university administration, we turned to Sherman and LeBlanc as cochairpersons, and later to Sherman alone when LeBlanc turned solely to research and teaching.

There we stand today.