

Adult Development & Aging News

Volume 28, Number 3
Spring 2001

20 DIVISION

Inside:

President's Message

1

Teaching Tips: Grad. Classes

3

M. Powell Lawton

4

Grandparents & Grandchildren

5

Candidates: President Elect

6

Candidates: Members-at-

Large

7-9

Award Nominations

9

Remembering Powell

12

President's Message

Roger A. Dixon

As a field, the psychology of adult development and aging is growing in size, expanding in complexity and range, and racking up advances and accomplishments at startling rates. As the number of psychologists interested in aging issues is increasing, so is the number of scholars from a widening range of neighboring disciplines. Fittingly, because aging is understood as inherently complex and multiply-determined, an increasing number of research projects are designed to chart a broad range of aging-related processes.

Large-Scale Studies:

Large-scale studies of aging have been around for decades—the venerable Baltimore and Duke studies leap to mind. Recent years have witnessed the emergence of more such studies. What purposes do they serve? In a recent *Psychology and Aging* article, Division 20 colleagues, Paul Baltes and Jacqui Smith, wrote that large-scale studies uniquely embody the principle that psychological aging is “inherently a process involving many dimensions: physical, psychological, social, and institutional.” It is not unusual to see these studies including measures of physiological and sensory func-



Roger A. Dixon, Division 20 President

tioning, health and medications, personality and affect, economic and life history information, social and familial contexts, awareness and self regulation, blood-based indicators and genetic markers, and cognition and memory. Such studies may also feature large and diverse samples, longitudinal designs, collaborators from a variety of disciplines, and even multiple research sites.

Web Sites: Interestingly, many large-scale studies now maintain web sites that provide information about the mission, projects, and products of the research. Here are some of the informative sites originating in several continents: (a) The Australian Longitudinal Study of Ageing (www.cas.flinders.edu.au/sanra/research/proj0020.html), (b) The Berlin Aging Study (www.base-berlin.mpg.de), (c) The Betula Project (www.psy.umu.se/personal/Betula.html), and (d) The Victoria Longitudinal Study (www.uvic.ca/psyc/VLS). Check out the links to other research projects and initiatives. Moreover, the list of web sites representing aging research projects is growing. For example, Division 20 colleague, Warner Schaie, has indicated that the prodigious Seattle Longitudinal Study plans to produce a web site in the near future.

www.psy.umu.se/personal/Betula.html), and (d) The Victoria Longitudinal Study (www.uvic.ca/psyc/VLS). Check out the links to other research projects and initiatives. Moreover, the list of web sites representing aging research projects is growing. For example, Division 20 colleague, Warner Schaie, has indicated that the prodigious Seattle Longitudinal Study plans to produce a web site in the near future.

Margret M. Baltes

Award: Division 20 has completed arrangements with the Margret M. Baltes Foundation to offer a new award for young investigators in the psychology of aging. The annual prize is \$1000. The deadline for application for the 2001 Margret Baltes Award will be June 1. Further information will be distributed soon on the Division 20 web site and list serve, and will be available directly from me (radixon@uvic.ca).

Apportionment: In the annual apportionment election, the division came tantalizingly close to obtaining enough votes to capture a second seat on APA Council. Thanks to everyone who cast some (if not all!) of their 10 votes to Division 20. Please help us again next fall, as we try once more to surpass the threshold.

Adult Development and Aging News is published three times a year by Division 20, Adult Development and Aging, of the American Psychological Association.

Adult Development and Aging News is edited by Harvey L. Sterns and co-edited by Martin D. Murphy both at the Department of Psychology and Institute for Life-Span Development and Gerontology, The University of Akron.

Deadlines for submissions are:

November 1
February 15
June 1

Please direct mail queries to Adult Development and Aging News, Department of Psychology, The University of Akron, Akron, OH 44325-4301.

Please submit materials via e-mail or on disk to:

Harvey L. Sterns
Tel: (330) 972-7243
FAX: (330) 972-5174
Internet:
hsterns@uakron.edu

or

Martin D. Murphy
Tel: (330) 972-8374
FAX: (330) 972-5174
Internet:
mmurphy@uakron.edu

Teaching Tips from page 3

may gather a false sense of the contrasts and similarities in development across different stages of the lifespan based on these disparities in research attention. For example, social relationships have developmental implications throughout life, not just in infancy (attachment), adolescence (peer relationships and sexuality), and old age where they have received the most research attention. Instructors can hammer home these lessons, but the state of the literature does not provide easy integration for most topics.

Further, the phenomena under discussion vary in ways that make lifespan integration challenging. We cannot measure the same behavior to assess the same construct across the lifespan. Is early temperament truly a precursor to later personality? Are the reasoning tasks in school children's tests equivalent to everyday problems older adults solve? The course can be strengthened by introducing such questions.

There are also differences in the rates of change across the lifespan. Changes tend to be dramatic in the first two years of life. Students can readily note physical changes from the newborn who cannot coordinate binocular vision to the two-year-old dashing across the playground. Likewise, change at the end of life can be rapid when disease hits and debilitates. Students may garner a false sense that the big contrasts involve infancy vs. childhood or adolescence vs. late life. More subtle, psychological changes of young and middle-adulthood are lost as a result. It is important for instructors to highlight how we conceive of change and how less obvious patterns may be indicative of changes at different stages of life.

Further the shape of development varies at different points in the lifespan. Behavior in infancy tends to unfold in a regular, sequential pattern. In adulthood, development is less proscribed and unfolds at different rates in different individuals. (As an aside, I recently became a mother and, as a geron-

tologist, I was convinced I had the most unique and charming baby ever born. Much to my chagrin, when my son started daycare, I noticed that other babies his age engaged in the exact same adorable behaviors!) These differences in the shape of development may leave students who study children unsatisfied with research on adult development and aging. These issues do however, provide fodder for course discussion.

In summary, if we wish to integrate aging into the mainstream of developmental psychology, we must train future generations of scholars in material across the lifespan. The challenges of designing courses that accomplish this task are multifold and include discrepancies in the state of research on different age groups and in developmental phenomena themselves. With careful attention to these issues, instructors can engage graduate students in lively discussion (if not ready answers) pertaining to how development unfolds across the lifespan.

Note from the Editor and Co-Editor

We thank everyone who contributed to this issue of the Newsletter. We encourage division members to send us announcements of general interest for the Newsletter. If you have an idea for a feature article, please contact one of us.

Address changes need to be made through the APA office at (800) 374-2721 (e-mail membership@apa.org). Your Newsletter editors must use the addresses that APA provides.

The deadline for the Summer issue is June 1, 2001. Please send stuff.

Teaching Tips: Lifespan Development at the Graduate Level

Karen Fingerman

Human Dev. & Family Studies
Pennsylvania State University

Although the oft-stated cliché indicates that “life is short,” it may not feel that way to instructors who are charged with teaching its entire contents in a single academic term! Lifespan psychology is growing in importance as universities recognize that development occurs after the age of 18 and that the population is growing older. Instructors with expertise in adult development are often asked to teach these courses. Recently, when my department revised its graduate curriculum, they asked me to help design an introductory proseminar that covered human development across the entire lifespan. This article deals with the challenges of teaching adult development in advanced undergraduate or graduate level courses that also cover child development.

Mechanics of Designing a Lifespan Course

The first challenge instructors face in designing any course involves the organization of the material. Instructors of introductory lifespan psychology courses often rely on the implied organization of the material and simply teach sequentially, from birth to death. This approach makes the organization of the course transparent to introductory level students, but is not satisfactory for more advanced students. Graduate students experience material as disjointed when emotional development is covered one week in infancy and weeks later in early adulthood. Instead, a topical approach to organization works best when covering lifespan material at advanced levels.

Indeed, a successful organization to

lifespan courses at any level involves introducing large themes at the start of the course and then using subsequent units to illustrate these themes. Specifically, our proseminar introduces themes of development such as: continuity and discontinuity, genetic and social contextual influences on development, and inter-individual and intra-individual variation in development in the first two weeks. The remainder of the course focuses on more specific topics such as: temperament and personality, cognitive functioning, identity formation, emotion regulation, and biological changes.

This approach to instruction is not problem-free. In my experience and the experience of other instructors who have taught our proseminar, the big themes of human development are complex and daunting and, for some students, intimidating. Over time, however, as instructors point out examples of these themes in each unit, students come to see how human development can be understood and studied from birth to old age. It is particularly useful to introduce a more clearly defined topic in the second or third week of the course to avoid losing student interest. For example, students tend to find material related to temperament and personality easy to grasp with regard to bigger issues such as the influence of genetics and the environment, continuities and discontinuities and individual differences.

Instructors also should be aware of the dilemma they will confront about decisions over material to cover and to skip. It is impossible to cover the entire “lifespan” in every unit. There are few “lifespan” articles on most topics. Rather, instructors must rely on articles that cover different periods of life in each unit. If an instructor assigns one paper each on cognitive shifts in infancy, childhood, and adolescence, that leaves at most one reading assignment for all of adult-

hood. A single chapter might be used to cover material from infancy through adolescence, but students need to read at least some empirical studies in the early years of graduate school. Longitudinal studies such as the Berkeley Growth Study, The Normative Study of Aging, and the Seattle Longitudinal Study can help, as they deal with more than one stage of life, but other important studies cover much smaller age ranges. Decisions about what material to cover and what not to cover will be difficult until there are more studies of the entire lifespan. In the mean time, instructors should be aware of this problem. As will be discussed, the material itself will help instructors make some decisions about which periods of life to include and exclude in each unit.

Intellectual Issues in Teaching a Lifespan Development Course

In addition to the issues of basic mechanics when teaching a lifespan psychology course, instructors also face intellectual barriers that can divert students’ attention from a true understanding of the human lifespan. The field of child development is nearly 100 years older than gerontology. Because it is a more established field, studies of children may seem more detailed and sophisticated with regard to many topics. By contrast, articles on adult development often cover bigger ideas. It is difficult to help students derive a comparable sense of the lifespan as a result of these intellectual differences in the fields.

Further, research attention is scattered by stage of life and topic. Whereas there is a great deal of research attention to cognitive development in early childhood and late life, social relationships take center stage in research on adolescence. Students

Teaching Tips continues on page 2

M. Powell Lawton, Ph.D., 1923-2001

On January 29, 2001, adult development and aging lost a giant with the passing of Mortimer Powell Lawton, Ph.D. Powell died of a malignant brain tumor after being ill for several months. He was 77. Powell stayed active doing the work he loved from his hospital bed until he was physically unable to work any longer.

Powell was born on May 31, 1923 in Atlanta, but was raised and educated in the Philadelphia area. He then obtained his bachelor's degree in psychology from Haverford College in 1947. He obtained his doctorate degree in clinical psychology from Columbia University in 1952. Upon graduation, he became chief psychologist at the Veterans Administration Hospital in Providence, Rhode Island and remained there for five years. From 1957 to 1963, he was assistant chief psychologist at Norristown State Hospital and from 1964 to 1987, research scientist. Powell was the first director of research at the Polisher Research Institute at the Philadelphia Geriatric Center and held the position for 30 years, from 1963 to 1993. He then became director emeritus and senior research scientist until his death.

He held a number of academic appointments, including Adjunct Professor at Pennsylvania State University, from 1972 until his death; Professor of Psychiatry at Temple University from 1985 until his death; and Professor, Department of Psychiatry Medical College of Pennsylvania from 1985 to 1996.

Powell was a long-time member of APA, joining as an associate member in 1953, becoming a full member in 1958, and being elected APA Fellow in 1971. He was a Fellow of Division 34 as well as Division 20. He was Division 20 president in 1970-1971. He was co-chairman of the APA Task Force on Aging, 1970-1972; and Chairman, APA Committee on Aging Issues, 1996-1997.

Powell was equally active in the Gerontological Society of America. He was a Fellow of GSA. He served GSA as secretary (1969-1972), vice-president (1977-1978), and president (1986).

In addition to being elected a Fellow of APA and GSA, Powell was selected for a number of prestigious awards. In 1981 he was given GSA's most prestigious award, the Kleemeier Award; he was awarded the Novartis Prize from the International Association of Gerontology in 1997; the Distinguished Contribution Award, Division 20 APA in 1981; the Developmental Health Psychology Award from APA Division 38; the Distinguished Service Award from the American Association of Homes and Services in 1996; the Career Award from the Environmental Research Association in 1987; and the Ollie Randall Award from the

Northeastern Gerontological Association in 1986. He was selected as an APA Master Lecturer in 1979.

Powell served in many editorial capacities, including Editor for Social Gerontology for the *Journals of Gerontology*, 1970-1976 and member of the editorial board, 1983-1986; Associate Editor, *Environment and Behavior*, 1980-1990; Founding Editor, *Psychology and Aging*, 1984-1991; and Editor-in-Chief, *Annual Review of Gerontology and Geriatrics*, 1989 until his death.

He served on four different National Institutes of Health peer review committees, chaired one of them, was a member of the REACH cooperative study advisory board, and a member of two National Academy of Sciences committees on aging. He was a member of the National Technical Committee on Housing at the 1971 White House Conference on Aging.

Powell, was the Principal Investigator on a large number of grants from the National Institutes of Health, and at one time in the last six years, simultaneously held a MERIT award and two R01 awards. He was also well funded from private foundations.

He was a prolific writer, authoring about 220 peer-reviewed journal articles and 100 book chapters; he authored or edited 22 books. Three things were most remarkable about his research: first, the topics he tackled were diverse: functional assessment of older adults, depression, affect, personality, psychometrics, housing and the environment, caregiving, Alzheimer's disease, quality of life, and valuation of life; second, he was consistently on the cutting edge; and third, his research had practical applications that improved the everyday lives of older adults.

A Festschrift, "The Many Dimensions of Aging," was published last year in Powell's honor.

His first research was on the psychological aspects of smoking. In the early 60s, he led one of the first meetings on Alzheimer's Disease. He was one of the first to recognize the human factors aspects of living environments for older adults. He pioneered the scientific assessment of functional status with his publication in 1969: Lawton, M.P., Brody, E., Assessment of older people: Self maintaining and instrumental activities of daily living, *The Gerontologist*, 9, 179-186. This article is still cited. The scales were developed for use by nursing home staff to assess patient performance, but were quickly adopted by researchers as

M. Powell Lawton continues on page 11

Grandparents Raising Grandchildren: New Challenges for Geropsychologists

Bert Hayslip, Jr., Ph.D.

Department of Psychology
University of North Texas

In American society, 96% of all persons age 20 or younger have a living grandparent; by age 30, 75% do so (Uhlenberg & Kirby, 1998). Recent work (Somary & Stricker, 1998) even suggests that persons anticipate their roles as grandparents while their grandchildren are still in utero.

Over the last 25 years, the number of children being raised by someone other than a parent has increased dramatically, with the vast majority of these children being raised by their grandparents. Some 3.7 million grandparents are currently helping to raise 3.9 million children in the United States. Between 1990 and 1998, the number of these families increased by 53 percent; over 1.3 million children are now being raised solely by their grandparents, with nearly a million children being raised by other relatives (perhaps with grandparents as secondary caregivers) with no parent present in the household (Casper & Bryson, 1998). Growing numbers of caregivers are unexpectedly assuming the responsibility of raising children without the benefit of the nine-month planning period that biological parents have (Beltran, 2000). As a reflection of the interest in the unique parenting situation faced by such persons, several edited volumes of work have appeared recently (Cox, 2000; Hayslip & Goldberg-Glen, 2000; Joslin, 2001).

Grandparents, particularly grandmothers, often accept surrogate parent roles when there has been a family crisis prompted by such factors as divorce, drug abuse, alcoholism, teenage pregnancy, parental abuse, and either separation from or abandonment of the children by their natural parents (Burton, 1992; Minkler, Roe, & Price, 1992; Pruchno, 1999; Shore & Hayslip, 1994). Middle aged and older persons who become surrogate parents usually do so because there is no one else to help, and feel a special sense of commitment to the grandchildren they are caring for. Recent research (see Baird, John, & Hayslip, 2000; Hayslip, Shore, Henderson, & Lambert, 1998; Hirshorn, 1998) suggests that grandparents derive many positive benefits (e.g., satisfaction in being able to care for a vulnerable child, being able to make up for past parental mistakes) from their surrogate parent roles. Importantly however, only a minority receive any sort of reliable family support in carrying out their parental role responsibilities (Burton, 1992; Minkler & Roe, 1993). It is this context that the resumption of the parental role has the potential to

undermine the older person's well-being via increased role demands and the problems that grandchildren bring to the relationship, or that are produced by it (Emick & Hayslip, 1999; Hayslip et al., 1998). Consequently, as intergenerational relationships and caregiving are reciprocal, full-time parenting for the grandparent influences not only the middle-aged or older person, but also that child for whom he or she is now responsible.

Custodial grandparents report being distressed about their resentment of, and ambivalence toward, their grandchildren's parents, as well as the consequences for their grandchildren should they become incapacitated or die (Shore & Hayslip, 1994). They also frequently report concern over the legal custody of their grandchildren. As natural parents may not pay child support, custodial grandparents are often responsible for providing for their grandchildren financially, often undermining their ability to effectively parent. They may also be attending concurrently to the needs of their aging parents, children, and grandchildren. Many such grandparents report constraints on their social roles as well as isolation from their friends due to their parenting responsibilities. They also report not seeing grandchildren for whom they are not caring as often as they would like; indeed, they may feel guilty due to not affording their noncustodial grandchildren consideration equal to that of the grandchildren in their care (Shore & Hayslip, 1994). In addition, grandparents in a position of authority often tend to have more formal relationships with their grandchildren, and therefore may be robbed of the opportunity to develop close emotional relationships with grandchildren in their care.

Positive effects of custodial grandparenting have been noted particularly among African American families, where grandmothers are seen as buffers against the detrimental effects of an insensitive mother, and grandfathers can serve as role models for boys who do not often see their fathers (Wilson, 1986). In addition, younger children and adolescents are more likely to achieve in school, to get off welfare, demonstrate more autonomy in decision making, and engage in fewer deviant activities when residing with grandmothers (Wilson, Tolson, Hinton, & Kiernan, 1990).

While many children raised by grandparents exhibit behavioral and emotional symptoms and are treated in mental health settings, data on this issue is virtually nonexistent. It is possible that grandparents may react to a child's emotional, behavioral, or neurological disturbance simi-

Grandparents continues on page 14

Candidates: President Elect

Thomas M. Hess

Biosketch

Thomas M. Hess is a Professor of Psychology and Coordinator of the graduate program in Developmental Psychology at North Carolina State University. He received his B.S. in Psychology from The Pennsylvania State University and his M.A. and Ph.D. in Developmental Psychology from Southern Illinois University at Carbondale. He received additional training in aging as a Postdoctoral Fellow in the Center for the Study of Aging and Human Development at Duke University Medical Center.

Dr. Hess is a Fellow in the American Psychological Association (Division 20), American Psychological Society, and Gerontological Society of America. He is also a Member of the Psychonomic Society. Division 20 activities include: Executive Committee member (1990-1992; 1995-); Division liaison to the APA's Centennial Celebration committee; Convention program committee (1991-1992); Co-Chair, Student Awards Committee (1995-1998); Chair for Division 20's 50th Anniversary Celebration (1996); Member-at-large (1996-2000); Chair, Membership Committee (1998-2000); and Program Chair for the 2001 Convention.

Other professional service includes membership on several editorial boards (*Psychology and Aging* [1991-1993, 2000-present], *Aging, Neuropsychology, and Cognition* [1993-present], and *Journal of Gerontology: Psychological Sciences* [1996-present]) and on the NIA-S Grant Review Committee (1997-present). Dr. Hess's primary research focus is on aging-related changes in cognition, with an emphasis on social cognitive processes and social context influences on cognitive functioning. He is also interested in issues relating to aging and work. He has received support for his research from NIA since 1983. He is the editor/co-editor of three books and author/coauthor of over 50 journal articles and book chapters.

Statement

Our past presidents have done a wonderful job of broadening our membership base, building alliances with other organizations, and promoting the study of aging as an important and necessary component in all fields of psychology. We need to build upon this foundation by continuing our efforts to increase the visibility of aging within APA. With respect to such efforts, two specific areas are

Hess continues on page 10

Harvey L. Sterns

Biosketch

My educational background includes an A.B. from Bard College (1965) with a double major in biology and psychology, an M.A. in Experimental Psychology from the State University of New York at Buffalo (1968) and a Ph.D. in Life-Span Developmental Psychology (1971) from West Virginia University. Additional training in Gerontology was received at the University of Southern California and The Pennsylvania State University.

My current appointments at The University of Akron include Professor of Psychology and Chair of the M.A./Ph.D. specialization in Industrial Gerontological Psychology and faculty member in the M.A./Ph.D. program in Applied Cognitive Aging. In addition to serving as Director of the Institute for Life-Span Development and Gerontology, my other assignments include Research Professor of Gerontology and Co-Director of Western Reserve Geriatric Education Center at the Northeastern Ohio Universities College of Medicine. I am a licensed Psychologist in Ohio and hold fellowship in the American Psychological Association (Division 20), American Psychological Society, Gerontological Society of America (BSS), Association for Gerontology in High Education and the Ohio Academy of Science.

For close to thirty years, I have been privileged to serve Division 20 in many capacities including two terms as a member-at-large (1983-1987, 1988-1991), Nominating Committee (1973-1974), Chair, Education Committee (1977-1978), Member (1975-1977, 1986-1987), Task Force on Training in Aging (1977-1978), Program Committee (1977-1978, 1986-1987), Chair, Continuing Education (1980-1981), Chair, Fellowship Committee (1985-1986), and Editor of *Adult Development and Aging News* (1997-present).

Awards received include the 1994 Clark Tibbits Award from the Association for Gerontology in Higher Education, the 1991 Outstanding Researcher in Ohio Award from the Ohio Research Council on Aging, the 1996 Arnold L. Heller Award from the Menorah Park Center for Aging, and the 1996 Distinguished Service in Education, Research and Communication Award, from the Association of Ohio Philanthropic Homes and Housing for the Aging.

Additionally, I served as President of the Association for Gerontology in Higher Education, Sigma Phi Omega-the National Academic Honor and Professional Society in

Sterns continues on page 10

Candidates: Members-at-Large

Leslie D. Frazier

Biosketch

I am an Assistant Professor in the Department of Psychology at Florida International University, soon to be promoted to Associate. In this capacity I serve on the Basic and Applied Life Span Developmental Graduate Program Committee and the Mental Health Counseling Program Committee. My research interests focus on the intersections among sense of self, personality, and mental and physical health outcomes in later life. My most recent work explores theoretical models of developmental processes that influence sense of self across adulthood, and the allocation of coping resources to physical, cognitive, and psychosocial stressors in older adults suffering from chronic illness or mental health problems.

My educational background includes a B. A. in Psychology, and M. A., and Ph.D. from the Life Span Developmental Psychology Program at Syracuse University. My graduate training addressed cognitive processes and personality in later life. I also completed a two-year National Institute on Aging Post-Doctoral Fellowship in the Sociocultural Gerontology Program at the University of California San Francisco.

I have been active in Division 20 since 1987, and was awarded the Division's Dissertation Research Award in 1993. I was active as a student member and have continued my involvement by serving on the Education committee and the Awards committee. For the past three years, I have worked closely with the Chair of the Awards committee in administering Student Awards Program. I have been a consistent presenter at the annual conventions since graduate school. I served as a reviewer for the Division's program and awards committees from 1993, as well. In terms of other national professional service, I am a member of Division 38 and the Gerontological Society of America. I also serve as an ad hoc reviewer for *Psychology and Aging*; the *Journal of Gerontology: Psychological Sciences*; *Research on Aging* among others.

Statement

As a Member-at-Large, my first goal will be to promote and publicize interdisciplinary activities both within and outside the Division. Our division membership is growing and our strength and visibility within APA increasing, as noted by Roger Dixon in his President's Message (Fall 2000). With these accomplishments comes a need to continue to build bridges with other divisions through interdis-

ciplinary initiatives. My second goal as a Member-at-Large would be to facilitate support of our special interest groups, especially those emphasizing multicultural and cross-generational issues and those that enhance applied gerontology. This is especially important for our commitment to broaden awareness of special issues of aging in the domains of education, research, and practice. It is important to continue to position our division as a major resource for the APA Directorate and I will be active in facilitating that goal. Finally, I have enjoyed working on the education and awards committees and will continue to serve and advance those programs.

Jacqui Smith

Biosketch

I am a Senior Research Scientist at the Max Planck Institute for Human Development in Berlin and currently also Chair of the Research Group on Psychological Gerontology in the Medical School (Psychiatry) of the Free University of Berlin. This university position is linked to an interdisciplinary Doctoral Program on the "Psychiatry and Psychology of Aging" funded by the German Research Council. Since 1989, my primary research affiliation has been with the Berlin Aging Study (BASE), a multidisciplinary longitudinal study of men and women aged 70–100+ years. As well as being on the Steering Committee of this project, I am Co-Director of the Psychology Unit (together with Paul. B. Baltes).

After obtaining my B. A. (with Honours) at the University of Sydney, I held faculty positions as a Tutor and Senior Tutor and completed my Ph. D. on music cognition and expertise at Macquarie University. In 1984, I moved to the Max Planck Institute in Berlin as a Postdoctoral Fellow with the intention to specialize in lifespan psychology, learn about research on aging, and return after two years leave-of-absence to Macquarie University. However, when the opportunity arose to take up a research scientist position in Berlin in 1987, I decided to stay in Germany. In 1999, I obtained the Habilitation degree at the Free University of Berlin. My publications have dealt with aspects of cognitive aging (memory, wisdom, workplace skills, expertise), self-regulation (life planning, self description, personal wellbeing), differential aging, and psychological predictors of longevity. In the context of BASE, I am currently investigating age trajectories in personality and self-related functioning and the transition from the Third to the Fourth Age.

Candidates continue on p. 8

Members-at-Large (Continued)

Candidates continued from page 7

Although I have been an international member of APA for many years, I only finally succeeded in officially becoming a member of Division 20 for the last two. I have, however, been active as a reviewer and contributor to Psychology and Aging and have regularly presented in the Div. 20 section of APA conferences since 1985. Our research at the Max Planck Institute and in association with BASE has also allowed many opportunities for collaboration and exchange with colleagues in Div. 20 over the years.

Statement

For me, Division 20 represents an important forum for psychologists interested in the potential and limits of individuals to change during adulthood and old age to come together to formulate research questions, develop appropriate methods, and advance theory. On the one hand, Div. 20 is attractive because it brings together specialists from different areas: cognition, social, personality, health, clinical and experimental. On the other hand, it is attractive because members of Div. 20 have a common mission as advocates of the human capital initiatives to guide science, public policy, and education in issues related to productive aging, lifelong learning, intergenerational relations, psychological wellbeing, and dignity in late life. I am interested in working together with the Executive Committee to foster these features of the Division. Furthermore, I would represent the international concerns of Div. 20 members.

Avron (Ron) Spiro III

Biosketch

Avron (Ron) Spiro III is Research Scientist, US Department of Veterans Affairs (since 1986), and Assistant Professor, Department of Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Boston University School of Public Health (since 1988). At the VA, he works with the Normative Aging Study (since 1986); the Center for Health Quality, Outcomes, and Economic Research (since 1994); and the Massachusetts Veterans Epidemiology Research and Information Center (since 1998). At BU, he collaborates with colleagues in the Department of Neurology, BU School of Medicine on studies of language and aphasia (since 1996); and in the Department of Health Policy and Health Services Research, BU School of Dental Medicine on oral health and quality of life (since 1998).

Before joining the VA, Dr. Spiro was Senior Data Analyst, Department of Environmental Science and Physiology, Harvard School of Public Health (1981-86), and Senior Research Associate, Education Development Center (1986-89). Dr. Spiro received his BA in Psychology from Emory University; and his MS and PhD from The Pennsylvania State University in Human Development and Family Studies. His research interests are in aging and developmental methodology, including the influence of health on cognition, and the effects of personality on health, mental health, oral health, and quality of life.

Dr. Spiro has been a member of APA and Division 20 since 1977; he currently serves as co-chair of the awards committee. He is also a member of the Gerontological Society, Psychometric Society, American Statistical Association, American Public Health Association, and International Society for the Study of Traumatic Stress. He was recently elected to membership in the Academy of Behavioral Medicine Research. Other professional activities include membership on editorial boards (*Journal of Traumatic Stress*; *Psychology and Health*), journal reviews (*Health Psychology*, *Journal of Gerontology: Psychological Sciences*, *Psychology and Aging*, *Psychological Methods*); and ad hoc reviews for the VA and the Department of Defense research programs.

Statement

My career has largely been in what are, for a psychologist, nontraditional settings such as schools of public health and the US Government. This provides me with a somewhat unique perspective among most Division 20 members, and has led to my interest in applied aspects of aging research, such as the relations between psychological characteristics and health. A good deal of my time is spent promoting interaction between researchers and medical, mental health, and public health practitioners. With the aging of society, psychology, especially Division 20, has much to contribute to these and other fields. In addition to the substantive base to which our members have contributed, many in our Division recognize the importance of applying appropriate methodology to the study of human development and aging.

I would like to use my position as Member-at-Large to continue working with our awards program, and expanding it to recognize other forms of excellence outside of university settings. I'd also work bring our substantive and methodological knowledge base to those in other divisions of

Candidates continue on p. 9

Members-at-Large (Continued)

Candidates continued from page 8

APA (e.g., Divisions 5, 8, 18, 38, 40) and to other fields as well, including medicine and public health. The breadth of interests among our membership, encompassing science, practice, education and policy, makes us an exemplary division, and we should continue to present our message that "Aging is Vital" to the broader audience in APA and beyond.

Judith A. Sugar

Biosketch

Judith A. Sugar is an Associate Professor in the interdisciplinary Health Ecology Department at the University of Nevada, Reno. She has served as Director of the Sanford Center for Aging, Associate Dean of the Graduate School at UNR, and Associate Director of the Borun Center for Gerontological Research at UCLA. She received her Ph.D. in life-span developmental psychology from York University in Toronto, was awarded a Postdoctoral Fellowship from the Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council of Canada, and, prior to assuming her current position, was an Assistant and Associate Professor of Psychology at Colorado State University, and Research Fellow and Visiting Faculty at the Division of Geriatric Medicine and Gerontology at UCLA School of Medicine.

Dr. Sugar has been an active member of Division 20 since she joined APA more than 15 years ago. She has been privileged to serve the Division in many capacities, including Elections Committee Chair, member of the Program Committee, Research Awards Committee, and Education Committee, and as a reviewer for annual conference submissions. Dr. Sugar is also a Fellow in the Association for Gerontology in Higher Education, and a member of the Behavioral and Social Sciences Section of the Gerontological Society of America. Her primary research focus is on the assessment and enhancement of quality of life. She is also interested in memory, memory strategies, and diversity issues in aging. Dr. Sugar's work has resulted in more than 90 authored and co-authored journal articles, book chapters, books, invited colloquia, and presentations at national and international conferences.

Statement

A leader within APA in many ways, Division 20 has always championed the relationships between science and

praxis. Our central involvement in the Vitality for Life Committee, and resulting hallmark publication, "Human Capital Initiative: Psychological Research for Productive Aging," which was immediately used to advocate for research funding in the psychological sciences, is a superb case in point. The current Zeitgeist of accountability, both inside and outside of psychology, puts our Division in the exciting position of being able to capitalize on our previous successes to pioneer new means of demonstrating how our scholarship can solve real-world problems in our aging society. Such endeavors contribute immeasurably to a better understanding and appreciation for our scholarship. If elected as a Member-at-Large, my primary goal would be to collaborate with members of the division to formulate new frontiers in which to demonstrate the practical value of our scholarship. To build on our Division's achievements, I also believe that we can develop fresh ways to address the professional needs of our current and future members.

Award Nominations Due

Division 20 offers awards for research, teaching, and mentoring. Nomination deadlines for these awards are in the Spring:

- 3/1 Retirement Research Foundation Mentor and Master Mentor Award Nominations (materials due 5/4)
- 3/15 University Teaching Award Nominations
- 5/30 Student Research Awards Nominations
- 6/1 Distinguish Research Career Award Nominations
- 6/1 Springer Early Career Award Nominations.

We strongly encourage people to nominate their teachers, students, colleagues or themselves for these awards. Individuals who were nominated for the mentor awards within the past two years may re-activate their files.

Information on these awards can be found on the Division 20 web site, <http://aging.ufl.edu/apadiv20/apadiv20.htm>. For more information, contact Dr. Carolyn Aldwin, Dept. of Human and Community Development, University of California at Davis, Davis, CA 95616; (530) 752-2415; cmaldwin@ucdavis.edu.

Hess continued from page 6

of immediate concern due to recent developments: membership and convention program.

With respect to the former, APA's membership is beginning to decline. In the face of such changes, our Division must work to strengthen its membership base by encouraging students and current APA members to join and by fostering relationships with existing Division 20 members. Efforts toward this end should focus on the "big tent" aspect of our Division, in which research, application, and education associated with aging are seen as essential parts of all areas of psychology and thus relevant to all psychologists, regardless of primary affiliation. We must also do a better job at getting students involved in the Division, especially at convention time, in order to promote their professional development as well as strengthen their identification with aging and the Division. Hopefully, this will translate into continued membership and involvement once they are professionals. Increasing membership should also boost the probability of obtaining an additional representative on APA Council, which would further increase our Division's voice.

The second area of concern—and of potential opportunity—deals with proposed changes in the structure of the annual convention, which are intended to promote integration and communication across divisions. This may provide our Division with an excellent chance to promote the study of aging and to build bridges with other divisions through collaborative programming efforts. We should take advantage of it.

Sterns continued from page 6

Gerontology and the Ohio Network of Educational Consultants in the Field of Aging of the Ohio Department of Aging. I also Co-Chaired of the Education Committee and Chair Business Awards in Aging for the American Society on Aging. I have served as Member-at-Large (BSS), Fellowship Chair, and member Research, Education and Practice Committee of the Gerontological Society of America.

Other experience includes, Delegate to White House Conference on Aging and its Research Committee (1981), a four-year term as a member of the Aging and Human Development Study Section HUD 2 of the National Institutes of Health, service on special committees for the National Academy of Science, Institute of Medicine and National Research Council. I currently serve on the Transportation

Research Board Committee on Safe Mobility of Older Persons and Human Factors Workshop Committee. Service on editorial boards includes Psychology and Aging, Research on Aging, The Gerontologist, Journal of Women and Aging, and Experimental Aging Research.

My research has focused on improving older adult learning and problem solving; improving skills related to older adult driving; family and friends intervention with older drivers; maintaining professional competence; training and career development; personality and housing choices by older adults; and life planning research and curriculum development for adults and older adults with MR/DD as part of the Rehabilitation Research and Training Center on Aging and Mental Retardation.

Funding has been received from the Andrus Foundation, Administration on Aging, National Institute on Aging, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration and National Institute of Developmental Disabilities Research. My publications include one co-authored text, three edited/co-edited books, over eighty articles and book chapters, and more than two hundred professional presentations.

Statement

I believe that Division 20 has played and will continue to play major roles in advocacy for aging research, educational program development, intervention and practice approaches, applied areas (such as aging and work issues, product design and human factors, housing design), broad efforts to support successful aging, and sensitive approaches to long-term care.

Since my first involvement in helping to set the stage for "Older Boulder Conference" Training Psychologists to Work in the Field of Aging, I have been committed to introducing aging into undergraduate and graduate training in all aspects of psychology.

The need continues for well-trained psychologists in all areas of aging, and the need for advocacy supporting research funding remains pivotal. I join with many others in believing that Division 20 represents a wide variety of aging-related careers committed to continuous growth in knowledge and practice. Division 20 must continue to reach out to other divisions, directorates and committees advocating for aging issues within APA, and effective linkage with other aging organizations. Each of us in Division 20 must take an active role by voting, organizing votes to regain our second Council Representative, recruiting other members, serving on committees, submitting contributions to the convention, and actively supporting innovative conference approaches by attendance. The last 53 years of Division 20 have been significant. The next 50 years will bring the ultimate challenge.

M. Powell Lawton continued from page 4

a self-report measure, and were also adopted for use in sample surveys, such as the National Health Interview Survey, conducted by the National Center for Health Statistics.

His most recent work included research on the valuation of life, how valuation is influenced by quality of life, background factors, physical and mental health, and how valuation of life relates to end-of-life attitudes and behaviors. He published a wonderful article on valuation of life in the summer of 1999 that breaks new ground in this area. He began this new line of research at age 70! Another recent innovation was his development of a scale that allows for the interpretation of emotions and nonverbal communication of dementia patients. Because he was on the cutting edge, he had to develop his own scales at many points in his research career.

Powell's work was influential all over the globe. He enjoyed keeping copies of his scales in other languages, and these scales continue to be used as far away as Hong Kong. Moreover, he was often asked to participate in world wide activities. Before his illness, he was scheduled to go to Korea last November. A year ago he went to Israel to present the first Shimon Bergman Memorial Lecture for the Israel Gerontological Society (for which he had a packed house even though the lecture was in English with no translation).

Yet all of the above accomplishments, as remarkable as they are, don't give you the full essence of the person. Powell was far more than a brilliant scientist. He was a devoted husband to Fay Gardner Lawton, his wife of 52 years. When learning of his final illness, his thoughts were not of himself, but concern for Fay. He was a devoted father to their three children; all three have careers in the arts. Tom Lawton is a jazz pianist in the Philadelphia area, Jenny Lawton Grassl is an artist and poet in Cambridge, MA, and Pamela Lawton is a painter in New York City. He is also survived by two grandchildren. He was a dear friend to many, and was always supportive when encouragement was needed. He was a very kind and compassionate person.

Powell's hobby was listening to music. At one time, he played the oboe, clarinet, and the saxophone, and in his youth, even considered a career as a musician. He also enjoyed chopping wood.

All who worked with Powell will remember him as a mentor. He was never too busy to mentor. For example, for the past three summers, Powell and Fay traveled to Duluth, Minnesota to be on the faculty of Chandra Mehrotra's summer institute on the psychology of aging. The purpose of

the program is to encourage younger faculty members at four-year colleges to conduct aging research. In addition to teaching at the summer institute, Powell gave his time throughout the year in individual mentoring to the trainees. I sat in on his class one afternoon and learned a lot myself. From comments I heard, the trainees held him in great esteem and were extremely appreciative of his generosity with his time.

Another story of Powell's mentoring skill and his kindness comes from his colleague, Allen Glicksman. On two occasions, Powell was asked to participate on panels to review proposals from novice researchers not trained in research design. In both cases, he was asked to critique the proposals in front of a group and in both cases he readily managed to identify every design flaw, explain how to correct them, and, at the same time, to come across with the same respect he would have shown the most experienced and senior scientist. Nobody felt stupid or embarrassed. He even agreed to serve on dissertation committees in other countries, another measure of his commitment as a mentor!

M. Powell Lawton was one of the greatest gerontologists ever. But, he was an even better human being. I will miss him very much.

A memorial service will be held at 2 pm on March 10 at the Radnor Friends Meeting. Cards may be sent to Fay at The Quadrangle, Pine Building #7306, 3300 Darby Road, Haverford, PA 19041. A memorial session is being planned for the GSA annual convention next November. The family has requested that donations in Powell's memory be made to the Gerontological Society of America. Please indicate that the check is in memory of Powell Lawton and send it to:

The Gerontological Society of America
1030 15th Street NW Suite 250
Washington DC 20005

Jared B. Jobe

Newsletter online

Interested in Teaching Tips from Sue Whitbourne et al. or information on Clinical Assessment from Peter Lichtenberg? Want to reread Don Kausler's Aging Research Hits of the 20th Century from Fall 1999? Need to contact an Executive Board member or find the deadlines for the next issue of the Division 20 Newsletter? Now, all of the issues from Fall 1997 are archived on the Division 20 web site: <http://aging.ufl.edu/apadiv20/newslet.htm>, with their original formatting as pdf files. Come visit!

Remembering Powell

Compiled by Liz Stein-Morrow

Powell was a discussant at my most recent APA talk (ironically, a memorial symposium for Margret Baltes). Just scant weeks before his diagnosis, he proceeded to offer a theoretical reconceptualization of everyday competence so major that I knew I was hearing something critical. Simultaneously, I watched as Sherry Willis and I dashed for our pads to record every precious word. After the symposium, we dashed to Powell to ask if this was published or would be. Subsequently, Powell joined Warner Schaie, Paul Baltes, Sherry Willis, Boris Baltes and others in a tribute glass in Margret Baltes' honor. It was amazing to see him reminisce about watershed moments in his own career, and his great pride that one of his mentees (Rick Shultz) had just won the Kleemeier Award. The afternoon had all the hallmarks of "classic" Powell Lawton: fully engaged, based in history, theoretically profound, and concerned with mentorship.

—Michael Marsiske

I remember a GSA meeting in New Orleans. There was a threatened airline strike. The Chair of a paper session scheduled for Tuesday morning of GSA (the last session of the conference) called to ask if I would read the chair's paper — and that of some other presenters. As a N.O. resident, I said sure. At the time of the presentation there were 4 or so people in the room — myself, another person presenting a paper for the session, the AV person sent by the hotel, and Powell Lawton. He had agreed to be discussant for the session because he was interested in the topic, and no airline strike threat was going to keep him away. Powell was like that — 110% committed to anything he ever agreed to do.

—Cameron J. Camp

When I was a doctoral student presenting at GSA for the first time, Powell Lawton surprised and amazed me afterwards by offering support and encouragement for continued success in my research on older adults' personal relationships and well-being. I still remember the warm feeling that his kind words created in me, and I've tried to do something similar for other new scholars over the years. He sent me copies of articles



M. Powell Lawton -- 1923-2001

and requested my reprints, which meant so much to me. Powell never failed to greet me by name in all the ensuing years of GSA conferences, even though I never had a formal working relationship with him.

When I had joined the faculty here and our fledgling Center for Gerontology was trying to negotiate a research arrangement with a fledgling retirement community in our town, Powell agreed to serve as our consultant. With grace and conviction about the merits of cooperation between academics and community facilities, Powell calmed the management's suspicions about what we researchers might want to be up to with their residents. His visit laid the foundation for what was to become a formal memorandum of agreement between the retirement community, two universities, and a community college. All parties have benefited greatly from numerous joint projects and exchanges, thanks to Powell's effort.

Rest in peace, Powell!

—Rosemary Blieszner

Two things come immediately to mind:

1) I cannot imagine a topic that would not have been intriguing to Powell. He worked so broadly, yet he had a keen sense of where to delve productively in research. His breadth as a clinical psychologist/researcher was astonishing. I particularly appreciated his willingness to tackle very practical problems experienced by older people, bringing basic

science, theory, and new methodologies to research that produced practical benefits.

2) I was a first year graduate student (21 years old) when I spent a summer at PGC in the clinical psychology program where I learned basic clinical skills of geropsychology. I had a very limited linkage with the research unit there, but was often included in lunch conversations with the "greats" who inspired my awe. Certainly, Powell Lawton was prime among those because I had used his environments book as an undergraduate. At first I was flabbergasted that I was encouraged, let alone allowed, to sit at the same table with someone of his stature. I thoroughly enjoyed and deeply admired his ability to move between personal reflection and research methodologies as ways to know about whatever topic was at hand. My interactions with the research group were a special highlight of my time at PGC. As an aspiring geropsychologist who was very low on the totem pole, I was deeply impressed when he went out of his way to greet me (by name!) at the next GSA meeting. I do not think a professional meeting has passed in the last 20 years when I was not greeted warmly and affectionately by Powell. Despite the fact that he had no official reason to track my career, he consistently asked about my work, my whereabouts, and/or my family. When students ask me about professional organizations, I have often told them of the importance of Powell's interactions with me as the prototypical reason for getting involved in small professional organizations that encourage mixing between junior and senior professionals. He personally gave me a sense of belonging to this field. I will never have the professional stature Powell had, but his willingness to respect my development and contribution, limited though it be, is a model of professionalism I deeply admire and seek to emulate. I hold it as a challenge and a high standard to track the progress of colleagues' students as they arrive into the field and move into their own professional roles, primarily because of the influence of Powell Lawton.

—Sara Honn Qualls

Though I was never real close to Powell, I knew him over many years, heard him talk, and read most of what he wrote. His decision about living better but shorter seems characteristic. He was always pleasant and profound and I was

truly upset at his death. He was a great man.

—Lillian Troll

The very first person I ever met in the field of aging was Powell Lawton. Division 20 was a small division and desperate for members when I joined 20 years ago or so. I knew no one and was totally clueless on all fronts. As a new member, I was invited to the social hour and Powell was assigned to introduce me to people and buy me a drink. I was very nervous about the whole thing but Powell immediately found me and pumped me up with his enormous charm, joie de vivre, and well, alcohol. I was astounded at how nice the people in the Division were, and Powell immediately made me feel so welcome. It seemed I found an intellectual home at that social hour, and in addition, that many people were there that day that became my life-long friends. It is great to have that treasured memory of Powell. I also had occasion to see Powell be extremely tough-minded and plain-spoken when he had little to gain, a lot to lose, but happened to be right. His ethics, his brilliance, and his kindness should be remembered as long and as well as his outstanding scientific contributions.

—Denise Park

In 1988, when I was a post-doctoral fellow at the University of Waterloo, Canada, I sent Dr. Lawton, who I had never met in person before, a paper dealing with environmental adaptation by persons in their later life. Powell not only provided me with helpful comments, but shared with me three unpublished papers that significantly shaped the paper, which was subsequently published in *Research on Aging*. However, it was his encouraging letter to a Canadian post-doc, whom he had never met, that had the greatest impact on my understanding of collegiality. It was an honour to consider Powell a friend.

—Andrew Wister

As with so many others, I was privileged to be mentored by Powell. What struck me most about him was his ability to stay deeply centered, intellectually and spiritually. On the other hand, that ability to sustain focus never kept Powell from making himself available to all of us - I never once, in 25 years, saw his door closed, or his phone ignored. We miss him terribly.

—Deborah W. Frazer

Powell had the gift of making every person feel special. I simply feel honored to have known him and appreciate his generosity of spirit, the interest he took in me and my work although I was never his student and worked in different areas. I will miss his elegance and gentleness as well as his scholarship at the GSA meetings.

—Victoria Hilkevitch Bedford

One of the things that I will remember Powell Lawton for is his generosity and openness toward junior gerontologists. In 1994, I organized a symposium at GSA on the topic of Everyday Problem Solving in Later Life and I asked Powell to serve as discussant. He did so with great enthusiasm, impeccable thoughtfulness, and with a sense of support and encouragement that I have not experienced again. What was most intriguing was that Powell drew on a wealth of experience that made him truly unique, that he was gentle yet firm in his critique, and that he made wonderful and unexpected suggestions to all of the contributors of the symposium (i.e., Margret Baltes, Sherry Willis, Hans-Werner Wahl, myself).

Ever since, I have gone to GSA and have looked forward to the moment when I would bump into him walking around a corner or see him waving at me when we pass each other on an escalator. It is hard to imagine for me that this won't happen again at the next GSA conference.

—Manfred Diehl

I think of Powell as the Clark Kent of gerontology—not the psychology of aging, as Powell was incapable of thinking within disciplinary bounds. He never could grasp status distinctions or see any difference between the field and the real world. From the beginning students he hired as full colleagues, to the community groups he routinely spoke to (never for pay), to the editorial assistant at Springer who once commented to me, “That’s a really sweet man!”, EVERYONE passing through the Lawton life space was nurtured, respected, and given infinite time.

What was it like to arrive in 1976 at PGC at your first job after grad school? The best way to describe the department was that it was exactly like Powell—a ramshackle house in a deteriorating Philadelphia neighborhood crammed with mountains of data and multidisciplinary characters, with a boss (I use that term

loosely) who offhandedly spewed out pathbreaking ideas and then attributed them to everyone else. During my year at PGC, Powell was developing his theory of person-environment congruence. With Elaine Brody he was pioneering caregiving (“I decided to help Elaine with some of her research”). I realized years later that I was hired because Powell thought it was “time psychologists started to do clinical work in nursing homes.”

Because of his laid back personality and wide-ranging interests, I never thought our field grasped the magnitude of Powell’s contributions: jump starting clinical geropsychology, research in Alzheimer’s disease, long-term care, and caregiving; devising the standard scales of morale and the whole idea of IADLs.... And then much later in his seventies turning around to nurture the emerging study of emotions and age... and who even knows what else?... That’s in addition to founding and editing those journals, reviews and books, the new committees he developed, and all of the offices he held.

Powell was not superhuman. He often felt hurt and depressed. It bothered him that he had trouble getting his research into *Psychology and Aging*. (I think a main reason was that he was never afraid to go out on an intellectual limb.) But his real concern was larger and it never related to himself: “I’m worried that our field is not nurturing young scholars”; “I think important new ideas may be getting lost”. Powell’s life was generativity and, OK guys, I really think he was more than Clark Kent. To me he came pretty close to being someone else.

—Janet Belsky

There are so many remarkable things to write about Powell but I will leave comments on his intellectual contributions to others. What I remember most fondly about Powell is that he always remembered me. I met him (I was literally in awe) while I was in graduate school. The next year when I saw him at GSA (and I was still a graduate student), he knew my name and recalled things from our conversation the previous year. He continued this remarkable talent of remembering students whom he had only met once as I brought my own graduate students to GSA and APA. Each year, he met a new student of mine, and the next

Remembering continued on page 15

Grandparents continued from page 5

larly to the way grandparents react to a grandchild's physical disability (Seligman, 1991); they may express bewilderment, guilt, and fear at having to interact with their grandchildren. Two recent studies (Emick & Hayslip, 1999; Hayslip et al., 1998) have found that grandparents raising problem grandchildren experience more personal distress, more role disruption, less role satisfaction, and more life disruption than grandparents raising grandchildren with few emotional or behavioral problems, who in turn differ in these ways from traditional grandparents not raising grandchildren. Thus, two distinct groups of custodial grandparents have emerged: 1) those whose difficulties primarily lie in dealing with the new demands of the parenting role and 2) those whose difficulties relate to having to raise a problem grandchild. Each group of surrogate parents faces unique difficulties that may undermine their personal, marital, social, and role adjustment.

In spite of the availability of large datasets that comprehensively describe sociodemographic characteristics of both traditional and custodial grandparents (Casper & Bryson, 1998; Szinovacz, 1998), little data has been gathered regarding the extent to which grandparents themselves experience problems amenable to some form of mental health care, or whether the grandchildren they are raising experience difficulties that warrant some form of professional mental health intervention for either the grandparent or the grandchild. In this light however, Fuller-Thomson et al. (1997) found grandparents raising grandchildren to be twice as likely to report suffering from depression as their traditional, noncustodial counterparts, and Pruchno (1999) has described the extent to which White and Black grandmothers experienced feelings of burden in raising grandchildren who exhibited a wide variety of behavior problems.

Little attention has been paid to grandparents' use of mental health services despite clear findings that 1) raising grandchildren can have a negative impact on grandparents and 2) older persons are notoriously reluctant to seek out mental health providers for emotional difficulties that they may be experiencing (Currin, Hayslip, Schneider, & Kooken, 1998; Yang & Jackson, 1998). Importantly, grandparents' relationship to the mental health system has been virtually ignored in recent treatments of contemporary grandparenting (e.g., Hirshorn, 1998; Kornhaber, 1996; Szinovacz & Roberts, 1998), though the topic is discussed in popular sources written for grandparents themselves (deToledo & Brown, 1995; Strom & Strom, 1991; Takas, 1999), and will be discussed further in a Special Issue of the *Journal of Mental Health and Aging*. Indeed, in a community-based sample, 40% of custodial grandparents had obtained therapeutic services for their grandchildren, with an additional 25% planning to seek mental health services

in the immediate future (Shore & Hayslip, 1994). However, custodial grandparents may also minimize the need for intervention, hoping that the behavior problems will cease on their own (Emick & Hayslip, 1996). Significantly, data show that grandparent-headed families are more likely to be African-American, to be non-employed, and to be less highly educated than one- and two-parent families (Solomon & Marx, 1995), the consequences of which can be a deterioration in the quality of life as well as in the physical and mental health of the grandparents.

Grandparents raising children of illicit drug users report additional stressors, e.g. unsafe neighborhoods due to drug-related activities, caring for drug dependent relatives, caring for drug-addicted grandchildren or grandchildren with physical and neurological problems due to maternal drug use during pregnancy (Minkler et al., 1992). Psychological consequences of these stressors include depression and anxiety, increased tobacco use, and alcoholism, and such grandparents are at greater risk for various metabolic, degenerative, and cardiovascular disorders (Burton, 1992).

What often complicates custodial grandparenting is that grandparents have typically previously endorsed the norm of noninterference, wherein mothers, especially those separated or divorced, emphasize the utility of grandparents' practical and moral support in childrearing, while concurrently expecting grandparents to avoid interfering in the upbringing of their grandchildren (Thomas, 1990). As a result, grandparents are often reluctant to interfere, only doing so when a crisis develops.

More needs to be understood about the emotional and physical toll that surrogate parenting by grandparents can take. Few investigations have focused on the behavioral and emotional problems found in grandchildren living with custodial grandparents. Baker (2000), Silverthorn and Durrant (2000), and Hayslip, Silverthorn, Shore and Henderson (2000) each discuss the definition and treatment of problem behaviors in grandchildren. Grandparenting self-help books (e.g., de Toledo & Brown, 1995; Takas, 1999) discuss what to do if grandchildren exhibit emotional or behavioral problems. But, data are limited as to how many grandchildren are actually in need of services.

Additionally, little attention has been paid to the development of theory that might properly frame both research and applied work. Several processes might operate to either enhance or undermine the adjustment of grandparents who are raising their grandchildren. For example, one might predict on the basis of Role Theory (see Burnette, 1999) that roles that are unanticipated and/or ambiguous, i.e., custodial grandparent caregiver, might require more

Grandparents continues on page 15

Grandparents continued from page 14

social resources so that individuals might cope with their demands. In this light, custodial grandparents, who may be especially prone to role conflict have indeed reported social isolation and lessened social support from family and age peers (Burton, 1992; Hayslip et al., 1998; Jendrek, 1994; Shore & Hayslip, 1994). As reliable social support has been demonstrated to provide many health-related and psychosocial benefits to older adults (Unger, McAvay, Bruce, Berman, & Seeman, 1999), workable social convoys of support (Antonucci, 1989) may permit some grandparents to adapt to their surrogate parental roles. Also crucial to this process might be the identification of critical significant others under stressful circumstances via a process of socioemotional selectivity (Carstensen, 1995), as well as an accurate assessment of both role demands and the grandparents' own resources to deal with the requirements of grandparental caregiving (see Pearlin, Mullan, Semple, & Skaff, 1990). Attachment theory (see e.g. Ainsworth, 1989) might also prove a fruitful avenue by which to frame variations in adjustment to this newly defined family system, viewed from both the grandparent's and the grandchild's perspective. Likewise, theoretical developments in the psychology of grief and loss (Stroebe, Hansson, Stroebe, & Schut, 2001) might also hold keys to understanding grandparents' ambivalence, guilt, or hostility directed to the adult parent whose child is being raised by the grandparent, and to the grandchild's relationship to the parent who has abandoned him or her.

Likewise, there is little properly designed intervention research to document the effects of both formal and informal community-based programs on grandparent caregivers and their grandchildren. What is available often fails to include control groups, fails to utilize random assignment to groups, is often based on small samples of convenience which are not generalizable to the underlying population of grandparent caregivers, and does not incorporate even short term, to say nothing of long term, follow-up efforts to document efficacy. Such work might be best understood as involving levels of intervention (see e.g., Danish, 1981), wherein efforts to effect the adjustment and well being of custodial grandparents could be targeted to the culture at large, the community, and to the interpersonal system which incorporates the grandparent, his or her spouse, and the grandchildren that are and are not being cared for by the grandparent. Of course, the impact of such interventions might vary with individual differences in both grandparent and grandchild characteristics, such as health status, age, gender, race, and ethnicity.

In this context, it is significant that many states are enacting responsive and supportive public policies for these families (Beltran, 2000). Yet, the challenge remains to edu-

cate more states about the need for such policies, as well as to inform policy makers of the informal caregivers in their jurisdiction and the particular obstacles such caregivers face (Beltran, 2000).

Longitudinal research, especially of a prospective nature, may also yield important understandings regarding the antecedents of parental styles and coping mechanisms employed by custodial grandparents. To date, only two such studies exist (Hayslip, Emick & Hendersson, In Press; Strawbridge, Wallhagen, Shema & Kaplan, 1997). Additionally, we know virtually nothing about the consequences in adulthood of having been raised by one's grandparents. Such persons may hold more positive attitudes toward aging or may be more effective parents. Moreover, we know little about cultural variations in custodial grandparenting.

Much work remains to be done! To the extent that grandparent caregivers can continue to play viable and influential roles in their grandchildren's lives and have meaningful contact with them, both generations' emotional and physical well being can be enhanced.

References are available from Dr. Hayslip via e-mail at hayslipb@unt.edu.

Remembering continued from page 13

year, he remembered them. I truly believe that this behavior reflects Powell's sincere desire to make newcomers to Gerontology feel welcome and included, and his incredible humility about his own stature. I will greatly miss his warm greetings and I am very sorry that my future students will never have the opportunity to receive them.

—Mary Ann Parris Stephens

Powell Lawton worked with us here at the College of St. Scholastica in Duluth, MN for more than 17 years. During this period he made at least twelve visits to the College to teach courses, to offer seminars, to conduct workshops, and to provide research consultation. For the past three years he was serving as a visiting professor in an NIA-supported research training program in aging that we offer for psychology faculty from 4-year colleges. As a mentor to the participants in this program he reviewed their rough drafts, suggested assessment methods, and helped them address reviewers' comments on their initial submission. Thus, he touched hundreds of faculty members, college students, service providers, and community members. We believe that the widespread impact of his work will continue for a very long time. This summer I will miss him, his expertise, his wisdom, and his humor at the institute he helped us design.

—Chandra M. Mehrotra

I met Dr. M. Powell Lawton first in June of 1988, when spending a couple of months at the PGC. From this time on, we had regular interchanges, in person normally on GSA meet-

Remembering continued on page 16

Remembering continued on page 15

ings. We also had the pleasure that Powell and Fay visited the German Centre for Research on Ageing at the University of Heidelberg in January 1999 and all of us still remember vividly his very impressive talk on measuring the quality of life of impaired nursing home residents. Actually, we expected Powell for another presentation on a conference to be held in April of this year here in Heidelberg. We will miss him very much.
—Hans-Werner Wahl

I have no big things to report in my memories of Powell but there are so many small things that I treasure. He was consistently gracious and kind to me when I was a graduate student at Texas A&M University and chair of the student organization of GSA in the mid '80s. One time after a GSA board meeting we rode on the train together from Washington, DC to Philadelphia and he was genuinely interested in hearing about my studies and research. He volunteered guidance on my clinical work and my dissertation with pearls of wisdom that I continue to use and teach to my own students. Later when I was on faculty at Ball State University he came to speak at a conference I organized. He showed the same interest and kindness to another speaker who was an 85-year-old retired minister living in a local retirement village. He had such a beautiful way of making both students and elders feel as though we were interesting, worthwhile people and that he, the master, could learn from us as well as be our teacher.
—Royda Crose

I was a postdoc at PGC from 1997-2000 and worked with Powell until last summer. He was, as everyone knows, a consummate scientist and rare human being. Although now I sometimes cringe at the number of meetings I have to attend, I recall looking forward to every meeting at PGC at which I knew Powell would be present. At each one you knew you would learn something, that Powell would have an idea or perspective that would shift everything that came before and everything that came after. He was intelligent in that way. But his comments weren't just smart. They demonstrated at another level his deep and genuine concern for improving the lives of older adults. When you passed by Powell's office you would often find him hunched over a yellow legal pad, crafting his manuscripts by hand, and he was always ready to turn from his work to listen to your ideas, to comment and to encourage. He was a man of great spirit, humble to a fault, generous to all.

—Brian Carpenter

I had a chance to read all of the wonderful statements collected by Liz. Each of them rings so true. For close to thirty years Powell was a mentor and friend. He came to Akron 3 times, the last to Keynote the 15th Anniversary of our Institute. Last summer Powell agreed to serve as a consultant for a major grant proposal that we were doing here. Like so many have said, he was supportive and kind to colleagues. Peace to you Dr. Lawton.

—Harvey Sterns

Adult Development and Aging News

Division 20, American Psychological Association
Harvey L. Sterns, Editor
Martin D. Murphy, Co-Editor
Department of Psychology and
Institute for Life-Span Development & Gerontology
The University of Akron
Akron, OH 44325-4301

NON-PROFIT ORGANIZATION U.S. POSTAGE PAID AKRON, OH PERMIT# 222
--