

## **HDF 652: Theories of Human Development**

Jonathan Tudge  
Spring 2006  
Stone 246, Wednesdays, 1.00-3.50

Office: 155 Stone  
Email: [jrtudge@uncg.edu](mailto:jrtudge@uncg.edu)  
Office hours: By appointment, or Monday 2-4

In this class we shall focus on some of the major developmental theories. The readings for this course will consist partly of a text [Goldhaber, D. E. (2000), *Theories of human development: Integrative perspectives*, Mountain View, CA: Mayfield] and original papers by the theorists under discussion. The Goldhaber text is organized around three major worldviews or metatheoretical perspectives (mechanism, organicism, and contextualism), and we will examine each theory in its metatheoretical context. The text is available at the bookstore and the papers are available on reserve in Blackboard (<http://blackboard.uncg.edu>). To get onto Blackboard, you should use Internet Explorer as your browser. (If you get onto the net from AOL or some other ISP, shrink its browser and open Explorer. Blackboard and other web-based teaching tools are sometimes unstable on other browsers.)

You will also need to buy, if you don't already have it, APA (2001), *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (5th ed.). Washington, DC: APA.

### **Course requirements**

The class meets once a week, on Wednesdays from 1.00 to 3.50. There are four basic requirements:

- 1. Read, think, and talk!** You are required to read the chapters listed for each week and you are expected to really know the material and be able to talk about it intelligently.
- 2. Short papers.** Seven times during the semester (**not** to coincide with the weeks in which you do a formal presentation) you are required to produce a short paper (two pages, double-spaced, should be sufficient, and the paper should be no longer than three pages, with a reasonable [i.e., Times New Roman 11] font) for discussion, in which you identify several of the major concepts of the relevant theory, explain them, and show the extent to which they fit into one or other of the major paradigms. You also need to explain why you think that the theory, as presented by the theorist him- (or occasionally her-) self is well or poorly captured by Goldhaber. One of the papers should be from the first two weeks of class (as these chapters are about the paradigms themselves you may write about connections, or lack of connections, between the ideas presented in the relevant chapters), and the remaining six papers should be evenly divided across the different paradigms (mechanism, organicism, and contextualism). Each discussion paper must be turned in by Tuesday at 2 pm at the latest. My mailbox is in the room next to 248 Stone, or you can send it as an attachment to [jrtudge@uncg.edu](mailto:jrtudge@uncg.edu) (no later than 2 pm). If it arrives later, I'll accept it, but it will receive a lower grade (how much lower will depend on how much later!). **The discussion papers will be worth 30% of your final grade.**

The papers should be written in APA style (for example, avoid contractions and colloquial expressions, provide appropriate citations and references), should be double-spaced and should not be right justified (leave the right margin ragged). Refer to the APA *Publication manual*, 5<sup>th</sup> edition (also a required reading for this class), for help on appropriate style if needed.

Be careful not to plagiarize, using someone else's words as your own. Note that slightly modifying the original words (changing a word here or there, leaving out a clause from a sentence, etc.) still constitutes plagiarism. Sometimes this happens by chance if you take fairly extensive notes on some text, and then simply use those words in your own paper—but it is still plagiarism. If you use an author's words you must put them in quotation marks and cite your source (author's name, date, and page number), and if you summarize you must also cite your source (author's name and date only). If you have any doubts at all, take this workshop:

<http://library.uncg.edu/depts/ref/tutorial/integrate/integrate.html> **Plagiarism is a serious issue. The minimum penalty, for a first offence, is F on the assignment, and a report filed with the appropriate office on campus.**

**3. Presentations.** Two formal presentations, of 20 minutes each, with no more than one to be drawn from any perspective. These presentations should be thought of as preparations for conference presentations; questions from the audience should be kept for the end of the presentation (except for minor questions about clarification).

The purpose of the presentations is not simply to cover what is in the reading(s) for that week; you may summarize the main issues, but you should assume that people will have read the material. Instead (or in addition) you need to go beyond what is in the readings, for example, by making links to other theories (discussing similarities or differences), or by linking to one or other of the basic paradigms, or by linking to research that might support or attack the theory. The grades for the presentation will be based on the extent to which you:

- present coherently and clearly, showing that you have understood the topic and at least some of the key issues and arguments that the author(s) make(s) [**this is the most important part of the presentation**];
- “talk” to your audience (as opposed to reading from the paper), with good eye contact;
- don’t talk looking back over your shoulder at the material that appears on the overhead;
- use appropriate overheads or slides (visible, not too much information on any one overhead);
- keep to your time limit (no less than 16 minutes, no more than 21 minutes);
- have an appropriate introduction (informing your audience what you plan to cover) and conclusion (some type of summarizing statements).

It will help you to restrict your notes to a minimum (so that you are not tempted to read them) and to practice a couple of times prior to the actual presentation. Make sure that your overheads use a font that is clear and large enough to be seen, and that you do not try to get too much information on any one overhead. You should prepare a version of your presentation for all class members (using the “handout” facility in PowerPoint is the easiest way to do this).

To receive an “A” for presentation you need to satisfy all of the above requirements. Each presentation is worth approximately 15% of your final grade.

After each presentation you will be asked to write a brief critique of the presentation indicating what was covered well and what could have been improved. I will also do my own critique, verbally. As people who present first in the semester will not have had the advantage of hearing these critiques I will allow those who do a poor initial presentation to do a third presentation later in the semester and will substitute the third presentation grade for the first grade.

**4. Final paper.** A final paper should cover one of the theories of your choice. You should summarize the theory, taking no more than 50% of your paper. The remaining space should be devoted to (a) explaining how it fits into one or other of the major paradigms, (b) empirical support for the theory (i.e., relevant research), and (c) weaknesses of the theory. As with the brief discussion papers, you need to use APA style (see above) and be careful not to plagiarize (see above). The final paper is worth approximately 40% of your final grade.

**January 11:** Introduction to the class (no student presentations)

**January 18:** An introduction to paradigms (no student presentations)

Goldhaber, Chapter 1

Guba, E. G., & Lincoln, Y. S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 105-117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Winegar, L. T. (1997). Developmental research and comparative perspectives: Applications to developmental science. In J. Tudge, M. Shanahan, & J. Valsiner (Eds.), *Comparisons in human development: Understanding time and context* (pp. 13-33). New York: Cambridge University Press.

**January 25:** World views, perspectives, and metatheory (no student presentations)

Readings:

Goldhaber, Chapters 2, 3, and 4

### ***The mechanistic perspective***

**February 1:** Learning theory

Readings:

Goldhaber, Chapter 5

Bijou, S. W. (1989). Behavioral analysis. In R. Vasta (Ed.), *Annals of child development* (Vol. 6, pp. 61-84). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

**February 8:** Social cognitive theory

Readings:

Goldhaber, Chapter 6

Bandura, A. (1989b). Social cognitive theory. In R. Vasta (Ed.), *Annals of child development*, Vol. 6 (pp. 1-60). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

**February 15:** Information processing

Readings:

Goldhaber, Chapter 7

Siegler, R. S., & Crowley, K. (1991). The microgenetic method: A direct means for studying cognitive development. *American Psychologist*, 46, 606-620.

**February 22:** Behavior genetics

Readings:

Goldhaber, Chapter 8

Scarr, S. (1992). Developmental theories for the 1990s: Development and individual differences. *Child Development*, 63, 1-19.

### ***The organismic perspective***

**March 1:** Developmental psychobiology

Readings:

Goldhaber, Chapter 9

Gottlieb, G. (1996). Developmental psychobiological theory. In B. Cairns, G. H. Elder, Jr., & E. J. Costello (Eds.), *Developmental science* (pp.63-77). New York: Cambridge University Press.

**March 8: Spring Break**

**March 15:** Piaget

Readings:

Goldhaber, Chapter 10

Piaget, J., (1973). *The child and reality: Problems of genetic psychology*. New York: Grossman. Chapter 1: "Time and the intellectual development of the child" (original work published in 1962); Chapter 3: "The stages of intellectual development in the child and adolescent" (original work, 1956); Chapter 8: "The necessity and significance of comparative research in genetic psychology" (original work, 1966).

**March 22:** Neo-Piagetian perspectives

Readings:

Goldhaber, Chapter 11

Labouvie-Vief, G. (1996). Knowledge and the construction of women's development. In P. B. Baltes & U. M. Staudinger (Eds.), *Interactive minds: Life-span perspectives on the social foundation of cognition* (pp. 109-130). New York: Cambridge University Press.

**March 29:** Erikson

Readings:

Goldhaber, Chapter 12

Erikson, E. H. (1987). *A way of looking at things* (pp. 595-610). New York: Norton.

***The contextualist perspective*****April 5:** Ecological systems theory

Reading:

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1988). Interacting systems in human development. Research paradigms: Present and future. In N. Bolger, A. Caspi, G. Downey, & M. Moorehouse (Eds.), *Persons in context: Developmental processes* (pp. 25-49). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Bronfenbrenner, U., & Morris, P. A. (1998). The ecology of developmental processes. In W. Damon (Series Ed.) & R. M. Lerner (Vol. Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Vol. 1. Theoretical models of human development* (5<sup>th</sup> ed., pp. 993-1028). New York: John Wiley.

**April 12:** Vygotsky

Readings:

Goldhaber, Chapter 14

Tudge, J. R. H., & Scrimsher, S. (2003). Lev S. Vygotsky on education: A cultural-historical, interpersonal, and individual approach to development. In B. J. Zimmerman & D. H. Schunk (Eds.), *Educational psychology: A century of contributions* (pp. 207-228). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

**April 19:** The life course

Readings:

Goldhaber, Chapter 13

Elder, G. H., Jr. (1996). Human lives in changing societies: Life course and developmental insights. In R. B. Cairns, G. H. Elder, Jr., & E. J. Costello (Eds.), *Developmental science* (pp. 31-62). New York: Cambridge University Press.

**April 21 (Friday): *Your paper is due by 5 pm on April 21st; one grade removed for every day late*****April 26:** New perspectives

Readings:

Goldhaber, Chapter 15

James, A., Jenks, C., & Prout, A. (1998). *Theorizing childhood*. New York: Teachers College Press. Just read chapters 1 and 2 (pp. 3-34).