

**Research that Helps us Move Closer to a World where Each Child Thrives**

**Adele Diamond**

**University of British Columbia, Vancouver**

submitted for publication in the journal, **Research in Human Development**

**Address correspondence to:**

Adele Diamond

Department of Psychiatry

UBC

2255 Wesbrook Mall

Vancouver, BC Canada V6T 2A1

email: [adele.diamond@ubc.ca](mailto:adele.diamond@ubc.ca)

phone: 604 822 7220

fax: 604 822 7232

## **Research that Helps us Move Closer to a World where Each Child Thrives**

### **Abstract**

Schools are cutting back on programs that very likely are needed for children to thrive in life and to achieve the most academically. The arts, physical exercise, and play are being squeezed out of school curricula — so more time and resources can be devoted to academic instruction and testing. Yet indications are that the arts (such as music, dance, or theatre) and physical activity (such as team sports, martial arts, or circus) are critical for all aspects of children's development (social, emotional, cognitive, and physical) – including success in school. Correlational studies have laid the groundwork, as have moving personal accounts and theoretical arguments. The time is ripe for rigorous multi-year studies that test whether the arts and physical activities do indeed produce the benefits seemingly evident to the naked eye and suggested by research to date. National funding agencies, however, have been reluctant to fund intervention studies of real-world arts and physical-activity programs. Instead of simply claiming that the arts and/or physical activities can transform kids' lives, that needs to be demonstrated and granting agencies need to be more open to funding research to rigorously study that.

My wish is that the field of human development take as its charge:

How can we help children (and help the adults in their lives to help the children) navigate their growing up so they grow into people we would all be proud to know – people who are upright, honest, considerate of others, compassionate, caring, self-confident yet humble, proud but not arrogant, conscientious, bright, capable, playful, full of joy and a sense of wonder, committed to making a contribution - regardless of a child's nationality or country of birth, ethnicity, or gender, healthy or challenged, born into affluence or poverty, strife or peace?

A few things follow from that. 1) I would like to see more studies with clear real-world implications and/or applications. 2) I would like to see more “flesh” on the bones of many studies. I would like to “hear” from the people who received an intervention or program. What was their experience in the program like? What were their expectations and the expectations of the people around them for what the outcomes of the program might be? Were there one or two particularly key moments or experiences in the program they can describe? Do they see themselves any differently now that they have experienced the program? That is, I would like to see more qualitative data, more first person accounts, alongside the “bare bones” of numbers entered into, and generated from, statistical analyses. And, I would like to hear from any observers or witnesses. What changes have they observed and what did they see that led them to conclude that a particular change had occurred?

Importantly, (3) I would like to see studies that enable one to draw strong causal inferences about real-world activities that I and many others would predict have a high likelihood of helping children grow into the kind of people I have described, activities that kids find fun and meaningful such as social or community action projects like “Free the Children,” music-making (be it band, orchestra, a drumming circle, choral singing, or some-thing else), team sports (whether basketball, soccer, rowing crew, or any number of other team sports), martial arts, youth circus, social communal dance, filmmaking, theatre, caring for an animal, 4-H, orienteering, building things together, repairing things together, or any number of other comparable activities (Diamond, 2014).

**Study Topics that need to be Addressed and that  
Federal Funding Agencies should be More Willing to Fund**

Sadly, there is a marked dearth of studies on the benefits of (the benefits *created* by or *caused* by) the arts and physical or community-focused activities (such as music-making, team sports, martial arts, dance, theatre, caring for animals, farming, working together on a project to help one's neighbors, neighborhood, or make the world a better place, building things together, repairing things together, circus, film-making, or any number of other activities) for healthy development, pride and self-esteem, feelings of self-efficacy and confidence, and outcomes such as better executive functions, academic achievement, high school graduation, mental health, or physical health, and reduced arrests, crime, substance abuse, depression, or unemployment.

The few studies that exist of these sorts of activities tend to be correlational, retrospective, or case studies, which cannot demonstrate causality (i.e., they cannot demonstrate that these activities produced benefits). Instead of causal studies of such organic activities, many of which have been around since the beginning of civilization, we see causal studies of more sterile and one-sided activities such as computerized cognitive training, treadmill running, or riding a stationary bicycle. Among studies meeting the minimum criteria below that looked at the effects of different activities at any age on executive functions, 29 investigated computerized cognitive training and 15 investigated aerobic walking or running or weight training, but only 1 investigated martial arts, only 1 investigated yoga, and only 1 investigated theater. No studies to date (zero) have investigated whether participation in any team sport, music-making of any kind, participating in any social or community *service* activity, dance, social circus, etc. produces (causes) any social, emotional, or cognitive benefit.

Studies of these real-world activities are needed!

The different parts of the human being (social, emotional, cognitive, physical, and spiritual) are

fundamentally interrelated (Diamond, 2007, 2014).

“Academic achievement, social–emotional competence, and physical and mental health are fundamentally and multiply interrelated. The best and most efficient way to foster any one of those... is to foster all of them... We need to see the human being and human development as one whole, that those who care deeply about developing cognitive competence, social skills, emotional wellness, or physical health and fitness are not in competition, that one component is not more important than any another, and that we have much to learn from the insights and accumulated wisdom of our counterparts in other fields and specialties” (Diamond, 2010: 789).

For example, executive functions (self-control, working memory, cognitive flexibility, focused attention, and creative problem-solving) are the first to suffer and suffer most if anyone is stressed, sad, lonely, not getting enough sleep, or not physically fit (*reviews*: Diamond, 2007, 2013, 2014; Ling, Kelly, & Diamond, in press).

Thus, if we ignore that a child is stressed, lonely, or not healthy, those unmet needs will work against that child showing the executive functions of which he or she is capable and thus showing the academic achievement of which the child is capable. Conversely, our executive functions are at their best when we are not feeling stressed, and are happy, socially nourished, well-rested and physically fit.

Trying to improve executive functions by the narrow strategy of only targeting executive functions (as with computerized training regimens) or trying to improve physical health by **narrowly** targeting only aerobic capacity (as in many exercise studies) in people who are feeling sad, lonely, or stressed is less likely to succeed than approaches that address the whole person. Activities and programs that should most successfully improve executive functions are those that not only directly train and challenge executive functions but **also those that *indirectly* support executive functions by helping to reduce things that disrupt executive functions (e.g., loneliness) and/or by increasing things that aid executive functions (e.g., happiness)**. They are precisely the programs for which it is

so difficult to get funding to study and that hardly anyone is studying with paradigms that permit drawing causal inferences.

The real-world activities for which I am calling for study address the whole person. They (e.g., making music together, dancing together, team sports, collaborating on a social or community action project, martial arts, filmmaking or theatre) require, train, and challenge concentration, focused attention, discipline, perseverance, split-second responses to the unexpected, creativity, and holding complex sequences in mind (i.e., executive functions). They provide tremendous joy and build feelings of pride, self-efficacy, and self-confidence. Participants are members of a community or team (they belong to something bigger than themselves), **all working toward the same shared goal**. These activities are hands-on. They require moving, using one's body, and often build motor skills, coordination, balance, and/or aerobic capacity.

After the initial studies, we will need studies that hone in on what works best for whom, why, and what the essential elements are. For example, would learning to play a musical instrument through private lessons be less beneficial (as I predict) than learning to play a musical instrument as is done in El Sistema (as a member of an ensemble from the start)? How important is the presence or absence of competition? How important is the mentoring piece (an adult who really and truly cares about you, listens when you need an ear and hears what you have to say, is consistently there for you, respects you, and believes in you)? Will the type of program end up mattering more or the way it is done? I have predicted that the way it is done will prove the more critical variable (Diamond & Ling, in press). How important is it to involve participants as decision-makers, giving them a say in what is done and how, granting them a degree of autonomy? Social-**service** and community-**action** projects are acts of generosity and caring. How important is that element for various desirable outcomes such as self-confidence, pride, better ability to focus and concentrate, reducing the likelihood of drug addiction or crime, or nurturing compassion?

I fear that exactly the activities needed to help children thrive are being cut from school **curricula** and from children's lives. We in psychology could do something about that; my wish is that we do.

### **Study Characteristics that are Absolutely Essential**

“Studies that enable one to draw conclusions about causality” means (1) studies that are not simply correlational (e.g., studies that look at one snapshot in time and find, for example, that children who did A were better at X; we have no way of knowing if they might have been better at X even if they had not done A). (2) Studies that include control groups (e.g., studies that document that children who did A got better at X over time; without a control group, we have no way of knowing if they might have gotten better at X even if they had not done A). (3) Studies that find differential outcomes between groups (e.g., if children who did not do A or did B improved as much and performed as well afterwards as children who did A, we cannot conclude anything about whether A did not help or helped as much as B; to draw a causal inference we need differential benefits). Those three things are minimum criteria that any study that claims to inform us about the benefits of a program or activity should meet.

### **Study Characteristics we should Aspire to Have**

Ideally, an intervention study should also have other features: (1) The control group should not be passive, waitlist, or business as usual. Such a control group is not without any value; it allows us to conclude that benefits from the program of interest were not simply due to (a) practice effects from completing the assessment measures before and after the intervention or (b) the passage of time or developmental improvements over the period between pre- and post-test. However, such a control group presents a low bar to pass because anything new might produce better results than nothing or business as usual; indeed the hopes and expectations for what the intervention could achieve might be the main causal factor rather than the intervention itself. Therefore, ideally an

intervention study should include an “active control group,” which also receives a new program for which the hopes and expectations for success are also high, and whose members also receive as much attention as those in the experimental group – i.e., which is comparable to the experimental group in all the ways that might be pivotal, except for the aspect(s) that the researcher thinks are key to the intervention’s success.

(2) Ideally an intervention study should not only look at immediate post-intervention benefits but at benefits down the road. How long do benefits last? Do some benefits grow larger over time? This is seldom done. For example, of the 62 studies that met the three minimum criteria above that examined whether computerized or non-computerized cognitive training, mindfulness, aerobic activities, resistance training, or school curriculum might improve executive functions, only 16% (10 studies) looked at any effects beyond immediately right after the program, only 10% (6 studies) looked at benefits 6 months or longer after the program, and only 5% (3 studies) looked at outcomes a year or more after the program (Diamond & Ling, in press). That is a pretty dismal record. We (i.e., the field) need to do better.

(3) Participants need to be assigned to conditions because, if they can choose, one or more factors that led them to choose different programs might be responsible for any differential outcomes observed for the programs. The gold standard is random assignment. However, random assignment should only be expected to yield groups with comparable characteristics when dealing with large numbers, not when the number of participants per group is under 100 and certainly not when that number is under 50. It is important to stratify randomization by participant variables potentially important to the results or to pair participants as closely as possible on variables that might influence the results and then randomly assigning one member of each pair to each group. The other problem with random assignment and lack of choice is that some participants might not like the activity of interest and might actively resist what the activity is trying to accomplish, thus



reducing the size of one's effect. One way to address that is to only include children who express interest in the activity of interest or only include teachers who express interest in teaching the experimental curriculum and then randomly assign half to the new activity or curriculum. It's true that in the real world teachers often have to teach an assigned curriculum without a choice. However, after a curriculum has been shown to be effective, many more teachers are likely to be open to teaching it than before effectiveness has been demonstrated.

(4) Too often studies rely on what people tell us on surveys or rating forms, yet research has shown time and again that what people report can often be inaccurate and unreliable (Austin et al., 1998; Donaldson & Grant-Vallone, 2002; Wells & Olson, 2003). Too often studies rely on laboratory tests that bear little relation to the real world. Better objective measures are needed.

### **Conclusion**

In sum, I am calling for well-designed intervention studies that permit strong causal inferences to be drawn that examine the possibility that the arts, social **service** or community action, or/and physical activities like sports, martial arts, or circus are critical for the outcomes we all want for our children. I am calling for funding agencies to be far more willing to fund such critical studies and their longitudinal follow-up. And, I am calling for studies that thoughtfully explore what works best for whom, and why -- especially what critical elements must be present for benefits to be seen. To fully understand and properly interpret the numbers generated by quantitative research, and to generate new hypotheses for quantitative research to test, it is critical that researchers make greater efforts to elicit first person accounts of participants and insights from observers.

I have offered some predictions. I predict that the most beneficial activities will be those that address the whole person: The most beneficial activities tap into something the child is, or becomes, passionate about. They provide the child tremendous joy and pride. They enable the child to work on something deeply meaningful for that child and others as part of a community, team, or

ensemble, whose members support and pull for one another. They enable a child to feel empowered and build the child's deep-seated conviction that he or she will eventually succeed. They build many skills including discipline, the ability to persevere despite setbacks, cooperation and compromise, seeing things from others' perspectives, focused attention and concentration, creative problem-solving, and flexibly adjusting to the unexpected. They keep one physically fit, with good dexterity, coordination, and balance. An arts, physical-activity, or social-action activity when done well can do all these things. I have predicted such activities are not only best for well-rounded benefits but for the best benefits in any individual sphere. If you care only about academic achievement, physical achievements, or success in business, the best way to produce any of those, I predict, is not to focus narrowly on only one domain (like more time for academic instruction to improve cognitive performance). The best way is to also address social, emotional, and physical needs, as well as cognitive ones. If the arts and physical activities were simply frills, they would not have arisen in every society and lasted for thousands of years. I fear that schools are moving in exactly the wrong direction by squeezing these out of the school day. Research in developmental science is critically needed to investigate, with well-designed studies that permit strong causal inferences, the benefits of arts and physical activities that are rapidly disappearing from children's lives.

## References

- Austin, E. J., Gibson, G. J., Deary, I. J., McGregor, M. J., & Dent, J. B. (1998). Individual response spread in self-report scales: Personality correlations and consequences. *Personality and Individual Differences, 24*, 421-438.
- Diamond, A. (2007). Interrelated and interdependent. *Developmental Science, 10*, 152-158.
- Diamond, A. (2010). The evidence base for improving school outcomes by addressing the whole child and by addressing skills and attitudes, not just content. *Early Education and Development, 21*, 780-793.
- Diamond, A. (2013). Executive functions. *Annual Review of Psychology, 64*, 135-168.
- Diamond, A. (2014). Want to optimize executive functions and academic outcomes? Simple, just nourish the human spirit. *Minnesota Symposia on Child Psychology, 37*, 203-230.
- Diamond, A., & Ling, D. (in press). Fundamental questions surrounding efforts to improve executive functions (including working memory). In M. Bunting, J. Novick, M. Dougherty & R. W. Engle (Eds.), *An integrative approach to cognitive and working memory training: Perspectives from psychology, neuroscience, and human development*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.
- Donaldson, S. I., & Grant-Vallone, E. J. (2002). Understanding self-report bias in organizational behavior research. *Journal of Business and Psychology, 17*, 245-260.
- Ling, D., Kelly, M. K., & Diamond, A. (in press). Human-animal interaction and the development of cognitive control (executive functions). In L. Freund, S. McCune, P. McCardle, L. Esposito & J. A. Griffin (Eds.), *Social neuroscience of human-animal interaction*. New York, NY: American Psychological Association Press.
- Wells, G. L., & Olson, E. A. (2003). Eyewitness testimony. *Annual Review of Psychology, 54*, 277-295.