

Beyond Psychopathology in Clinical Psychology: Developmental Pathways to the future

Olusegun Emmanuel Afolabi

Department of Behavioural and Social Sciences, Atlantic International University, USA

Abstract: Evidence in the past two decades on psychopathology has come up with a suggestion that research should to toy the line of dynamism and innovativeness ,both in theory and practice. Drawing together outcomes from various psychopathology's studies, this article presents an overview on the need to move beyond psychopathology and clinical intervention and embraces developmental perspectives to elucidate adaptive and maladaptive in human behaviour and functioning The paper highlights the need for professionals in the field of clinical psychology to shoulder the policy of equivalence and gives developmental perspectives the same treatment and status enjoy by psychopathology. In realizing this objective, this paper highlights and addresses three underlying themes: 1) to understand the fact that amelioration of psychosocial problems, needs a multidisciplinary and multidimensional quality and experiential consideration from other disciplines, 2) to analyse how the field of clinical psychology and mental health in general gain from assessing psychopathology from developmental perspectives, 3) to examine behavioral, emotional and learning problems using the principles, advancement and prospect of developmental paradigm to address the concept, challenges and variances associated with human psychopathology. Finally, the study concludes that a continued and expanded interface between normal and atypical development,coupled with interdisciplinary perspective, if fostered, will create an inspiring innovative epoch of hypothetical and experiential work in developmental sciences.

[Olusegun Emmanuel Afolabi. **Beyond Psychopathology in Clinical Psychology: Developmental Pathways to the future.** *Academ Arena* 2014;6(5):25-39]. (ISSN 1553-992X). <http://www.sciencepub.net/academia>. 4

Key Word: Psychopathology, developmental psychopathology, developmental perspective, behavioural, emotional problem

Introduction

Most notable scholars have commented on the need for research to toy the line of dynamism and innovativeness in their efforts ,both in theory and practice. Similarly, Thomas khun in his publication titled, *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, established that science characteristically progress from simple to complex, uses the past to lights the future, and also gradually develop until one or more irregularities are faced. Kuhn's, also explained that inconsistency is a phenomena that goes beyond simple explanation or effectively elucidated by the foremost theoretical paradigm embraced by scholars at that period of time. Atypical example of this assumption is the Newton's theory of gravity that was replaced by Einstein's theory of relativity once it became obvious that the Newton's theory could not meet the recent challenges in research findings. Despite the demands in scientific endeavor, once exposed, anomalies requires a move from "natural science" to the expansion and discovery of a new concept. Therefore, the need to move beyond psychopathology and clinical intervention and embraces developmental perspectives for proper understanding of adaptive and maladaptive in human behaviour and functioning could not be more manifest. It is on this template that this paper based.

Research shows that as human problems addressed by clinical psychologist increases, so is the

importance on psychopathology continue to influence the field of mental health. Specifically, the expressions like 'psychopathology', 'mental ailment' and 'disorder' have long become a common treatise, that label people as 'different', extenuating the recent upsurge in the provision of social and mental services and help in advancing clinical psychology. Recent literature on psychopathology reveals that less prominence is given to psychosocial issues by clinical psychologist both in practice and research. For example, the general activities designed for classifying psychopathology is not the same for psychosocial problems. It is also becoming apparent that people who demonstrate both emotional and learning problems of a non-pathological nature is apportioned compulsive diagnostic labels like depression, ADHD, (attention deficit hyperactive disorder) and LD (learning disorder). Although it is a general believe that improper and inconsistency diagnosis contaminate research sample, it is also a common knowledge that this process if not properly addressed can lead to inappropriate clinical intervention. If this happens, the primary emphases placed on pathology will adversely influence efforts directed toward addressing psychopathology and psychosocial problems.

Although clinical psychology tackles an increasingly wide range of issues, the fact remains that the discipline's main emphasis on psychopathology

must be equated with knowledge of psychosocial issues. The reductionist clarifications of psychopathology are well notable in both research and practice globally (Fee, 2000), and this stem from 'systematic' effortstoward 'objectively' recognise and categorizediverseforms of illness that fall under the heading of 'abnormality'. To address this, research must look beyond psychopathology and clinical practice and belief that 'psychopathology' can be assigned and createdthrough socio-cultural and historically-precise connotations (Golsworthy, 2004, Parker *et al.* 1995). Such sense of balance will go a long way to refine and promote the work done in the discipline and also provide broader perspectives of addressing clinical issues. Thus, relative to epochs and environmental context, psychopathology remains a broader concept that can be addressed using various perspectives. Most literature shows that clinical psychologist faces some difficulties in the course of their practice, and this sometimes influences their approaches to intervention. However, the emergent of developmental perspectives has gone a long way to help the discipline address and comprehend the intricacy of human development, particularly on psychopathology.

Therefore, to nurture the progresses achieved in developmental perspectives, both in psychopathology and normal development, it is very essential that professional knowledge should be channel towards inculcating aninterdisciplinary and multi-levels analysis. As mostly stated in research literature, the main goals of DP is to understand people's adaptation, and to say the least, 'entire being' (Sroufe & Rutter, 1984; Zigler & Glick, 1986), This further established the fact that calls for interdisciplinary and multi-level research approach has gained recognition among researchers all over the world (Cicchetti & Dawson, 2002; Cicchetti & Posner, 2005; Pellmar & Eisenberg, 2000). Interestingly, scholars such as Cummings, Davies, and Campbell (2000) use different models to explain and illustrate the developmental psychopathology framework. According to them, development is a multi-determined concept that can be analyzed and addressedusing an interdisciplinary process that cut acrossvarious domains i.e. from heredities to culture and social ecologyto biology . They also postulate that developmental psychopathology relates to series of upshots, i.e. (from typical development of psychopathology) and the arrayin between those outcomes. Research showsthatcertain outcomes are possible, even in response to the terrible ecologicalstressor and this distinguishes the risk and protectingelements that elucidate different behavioralupshots in human development.

Similarly, Bronfenbrenner (1979) argued that, differences in behavior happen across various systems (e.g., individual, family, extra familial), and that developmental psychopathology method that assesses adjustment and amladjustmentconductis not constant. This showsthat human and the contextual milieu are dynamic and their relationship and behavioraloutcome changes over time.Also, developmental psychopathology does not only explaining disorder in children, but signifies theperception that entails a fusion of two separate disciplines into a novel and integrated field of study. Historically, most research literature in psychiatricemphasis more on adult, therefore, relegates research on child psychopathology as compare to those of adults (Achenbach, 1974). Developmental literatures confirmed that this measure have been largely overlooked in most psychopathology research, and this makes it difficult for researchers to address fundamental psychosocial problems in psychopathology. Conversely, developmentalists such as, Flavell, (1977); Mussen, (1970); and (Piaget &Inhelder (1969) have come up with a process that explains normal cognitive, affective, social, perceptual, and biological development. They focus more on normal development and thecauses of developmental transitions (Rutter, 1986). Some of thechallenges confront developmental psychopathologist is how to resourcefully pool the two different scientific disciplines into a complete strategy that studies, children's normal and abnormal functioning across developmental stages, and at the same time maintaining continuities and discontinuities between normality and disorder and also from one developmental stage to the other.

Purpose of study

This paper looks beyond psychopathology to classify behavioural, emotional and learning difficulties and clinical intervention model. The paper highlights the need for professionals in the field of clinical psychology to shoulder the policy of equivalence by given developmental perspectives the same treatment and status enjoy by psychopathology. In realizing this purpose, this paper focuses on two underlying themes: 1) to understand the fact that amelioration of psychosocial problems, needs a multidisciplinary and multidimensional quality and experiential consideration from other disciplines,2) that the field of clinical psychology and mental health in general gain from assessing psychopathology from developmental perspectives. Moreover, the paper analysed behavioral, emotional and learning problems using empirical analyses that go beyond psychopathology and clinical intervention models. Lastly, the paper uses the principles, advancement and prospect of developmental psychopathology as a

paradigm to address the concept, challenges and variance associated with human psychopathology.

Background Information.

Research established that developmental perspectives are source of intervention strategy for both developmental psychology and psychiatry. Also, as an emerging field, developmental psychopathology (DP) is strongly linked with scientific knowledge (Cicchetti, (1984), (1990a)); Cummings, et al., (2000); Masten, (1989); Masten, Burt, & Coatsworth, in press; Sameroff, (2000a); Sroufe & Rutter (1984). This view point signifies union of pronounced intellectual disciplines and research on adjustment conduct, with focus on psychopathology and development respectively (Masten et al., in press). This result from the need to examine the aetiologies and interventions for stern mental health disorders in children and adults. Research established that people show evidence of psychopathology in life due to personal or family disorder (Masten, 1989). Therefore, research on children at risk of psychopathology must emphasis on the systematic thought that measures adaptive demeanor and individual differences and at the same time, encourages both the partnership and knowledge of developmental and clinical scientists.

Also, it is interesting to know that a significant number of scholars support the blending of development and clinical science perspectives. For instance, scholars such as Norman Garnezy, Irving Gottesman, Michael Rutter, Arnold Sameroff, Alan Sroufe, and Ed Zigler did not only work and pooled knowledge together, they also educated powerful students, like Thomas Achenbach and Dante Cicchetti, to mention a few about the importance of adopting multidisciplinary methods to psychopathology. Most support for DP is developed from books such as *Developmental Psychopathology* (Achenbach, 1974), *Child Development* (Cicchetti, 1984), Rochester Symposia on Developmental Psychopathology (Cicchetti, 1987), *Development and Psychopathology* (Cicchetti, 1989), and the compilation on *Developmental Psychopathology* (Cicchetti & Cohen, 1995). However, unlike psychiatry that focuses on evaluation, the process of treatment and service delivery, developmental psychology emphasizes on the universal application of developmental processes.

Similarly, earlier studies portrayed developmental psychopathology as none or "hardly exists" field (Achenbach, 1974, p. 3). Even till now, the subject is still referring to as an "emergent" discipline, that can be discerned and shape to meet a necessary need. The rising of the discipline sketches and extends the boundary of clinical psychology beyond the concept of psychopathology. A decade of research shows that developmental psychopathology

merges with disciplines that has immensely contributed to knowledge based on risk, psychopathology, and resilience in human development. Research also confirmed that developmental psychology elucidate the interaction between genetic, psychological, and social-contextual feature of characteristic and uncharacteristic behaviour and equally committed to emerging and assessing processes that prevent as well as ameliorate maladaptive and psychopathological effects. Despite its modern crystallization as a logical framework for probing and conceptualizing relationships between psychopathology and development, the recent ascendance of DP is linked to the most historically based activities such as developmental, embryology, epidemiology, heredities, sociology, neuroscience, beliefs, psychiatric therapy, psychoanalysis, scientific, and developmental, (Cicchetti, 1990).

On the other hand, developmental psychopathology underlines the following factors such as change and adaptation, the "abnormal" responses to anxiety or difficulty, and the interaction between the two outcomes (Rutter, 1986). Historically, research highlights lack of well-expressed and dependable scheme for categorizing poignant and conduct problems in youngsters as the main problem to developmental psychopathology. Also, lack of perfection and unbiased strategies for recognizing maladies, has made interaction and sweeping statement across studies a difficult task. Similarly, the continuous manifestation of issues both in research and handling of syndromes like autism (Rutter & Schopler, 1978) and juvenile depression (Schulterbrandt & Raskin, 1977) is linked to lack of concrete agreement on what symptoms really illustrates disorders and which children expresses them. Although no specific or generally recognized classificatory arrangement for childhood psychopathology is found as consistent and valid till today, yet, the discipline has come up with a number of taxonomies that includes clinically derived systems like: DSM (American Psychiatric Association, 1980), the World Health Organization Multi-axial Classification System (Rutter, Shaffer, & Shepherd, 1975), Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry (1966) and those postulated through Achenbach (1978; Achenbach & Edelbrock (1979), Conners (1970), Quay (1964); Quay & Quay (1965), and Soli et al, (1981).

Furthermore, developmental psychopathologist embraces and use an organismic, holistic, transactional framework to explain individual differences in typical and atypical growth (Cicchetti, 1993; Cicchetti & Cohen, 1995; Cummings, Davies, & Campbell, 2000; Garnezy & Rutter, 1983; Sameroff, 1983, 1995; Sroufe & Rutter, 1984). Besides, most researchers

repeatedly formulate their approaches to reflect structural standards and systems language that echo intensely with dynamic systems (DS) principle universally and self-organization specifically. Some of the theories explain DP models as: General Systems Theory (GST) (SameroV, 1983, 1995; von BertalanVy, 1968), Developmental Systems Theory (DST) (Ford & Lerner, 1992), ecological theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1979), contextualism (Dixon & Lerner, 1988), transactional perspective (Dumas, LaFrenier, & Serketich, 1995), organizational approach (Cicchetti & Schneider-Rosen, 1986; Garnezy, 1974; Sroufe & Rutter, 1984), holistic interactionistic (Bergman & Magnusson, 1997), and epigenetic (Gottlieb, 1991, 1992). These methods underlines process-level explanations of human behaviour, environment reliance and heterogeneity of developmental occurrences. They also embrace the following factors: multidimensional nature of development, the hierarchically rooted intrapersonal (e.g., neurochemical activity, cognitive, and emotional processes), relational (e.g., parent-child interactions; peer networks), and social systems (e.g., communities, cultures) and last but not the least, strategies that trigger changes and uniqueness (as well as constancy) in common and clinically important trajectories.

Fundamental principles of developmental psychopathology

According to developmental viewpoint, children are mature and grown organism that experience both quantitative and qualitative transformation and expresses rising differentiation and the combination of diverse functioning. Childhood psychopathology is branded on developmental perspective, such as (a) the continuity between childhood and adult psychopathology, and (b) the meaning of normality and deviance, particularly as regard to age, environment, developmental condition, and the sequence of growth over time. Although, the main goal of DP is to develop into a science that will not only viaducts the areas of study, but also detect new fundamental ideas about lifespan adjustment and maladjustment. This offers an optimum ways of averting and improving maladjustment and compulsive effects (Cicchetti, 1990; Sroufe & Rutter, 1984). While it established that DP sought to lessen the existing dualisms concerning experimental and clinical studies, it is also employed in behavioral and biological sciences in treatment of mental illness, infancy and adult high-risk situation (Cicchetti, 1990; Masten, 2006; Toth & Cicchetti, 1999).

The exceptionality and fundamental nature of DP viewpoints is based on its general belief about characteristic and uncharacteristic, adjustment and maladjustment developmental processes. Research on DP envisioned psychopathology as a distortion,

disorder, or deterioration of normal behavior. The research also highlights that, to fully understand psychopathology, one must comprehend the typical ways of evaluating psychopathology (Cicchetti, 1984, 1990, 1993; Rutter, 1986; Sroufe, 1990). However, the review of literature did not only documented the fact that understanding normal biological, psychological, and social processes is exceptionally helpful for measuring, detecting, understanding, averting, and curing psychopathology, it also agreed that the digression from and distortions of normal growth that typify pathological processes signifies how normal development is examined and comprehended. These physically stirring circumstances includes: total number of off spring nurtured in institutions, children exposure to mistreatment and abandonment, people with learning disorder, and mental illness. These situations offer an introduction into research awareness about system interaction, ineffectiveness, and restructuring that are lacking due to cultural and ethical limitations linked to empirical research on human being (Cicchetti, 2003; Rutter, 2007).

Given the fact that there are restrictions to empirical manipulations of human organism, and that the system analysis in its efficiently functional and fit state do not allow better understanding of the interrelationship between the element subsystems, therefore, the knowledge about people experiencing problems regularly is the only means to observe the full difficulty surrounding developmental processes. That is why developmental psychopathology linked individual pathways to able adaptation regardless of their exposure to important difficulty or long-lasting suffering i.e., resilience (Luthar, Cicchetti, & Becker, 2000; Masten, 2001). It also accentuates the significance of comprehending the performance of individuals who, despite swerved onto abnormal developmental pathways, has continue to attain a constructive operative and suitable adjustment (Cicchetti & Rogosch, 1997; Masten, 2006; Zigler & Glick, 1986). While it is established that the scope of DP go beyond traditional disciplinary margins, it is also argued that the discipline offers abundant opportunity for stirring beyond descriptive evidence of a process-level perceptive of adjustment and maldjustment, characteristic and uncharacteristic trajectories of human development.

Based on this, developmental psychopathology framework also challenged the assumptions regarding healthiness and modify the way in which the clinicians defines, measures, categorizes, writes on, and deals with adaptational and functional impairments amongst, children, youngsters, and grown person (Cicchetti & Toth, 1998). According to Cicchetti and Toth, (2000, 2006) DP's probable contributions is the experiential influence it possesses, particular, its ability

to translate evidence and knowledge into practice. Such developmental perspective prevents and reduces the burden of mental disorder both in individual and society, and also lessens the distress that mental illness provokes in human being and their immediate environment, and last but not the least aid in eradicating the shame normally linked to the existence of a mental disorder (Hinshaw, 2007; Hinshaw & Cicchetti, 2000).

The systems principle

According to scholars such as Bronfenbrenner, (1979); Cicchetti, (1990b); Ford and Lerner, (1992); Granic and Hollenstein (2003); Lerner, (1998); Sameroff, (2000a, 2000b) and Thelen and Smith, (1998), developmental systems theory is the main theoretical and recognized model in DP. The theory believes that individual is an interacting forces in his environment and this significantly influence their behavior and orientation towards immediate environment and the larger systems. Besides, as an organic system, human being possesses the following characteristics such as, self-regulatory, organizing, righting properties, and the multiple adaptive responsibilities that preserve their individual effectiveness and adjustment in their embedded environment (Masten & Coatsworth, 1995). The system principle belief that human beings interrelates with their direct environment and other significant persons in the bigger systems, like peer groups and families. Also, they directly or indirectly influence the behavior and orientation of other people and at the same time influenced by these interactions. This means that as an interactive agent, human being co-influence each other. Although the orientation and conduct of a human species are constantly swayed by internal and external contacts, it is also confirmed that this vibrant nature echoes multi-causal and pathways as a core developmental principle. Similarly, other system characteristics like the ability to resolve into steady practices or *attractor states*, and ability to sudden change that comes from internal or external perturbations explain human-environment interaction. Therefore, systems mutually impact each other in or across levels of context, and this is labelled as *transactional* impacts (Sameroff & Chandler, 1975). This shows that as a social species, we influence our peers and parents, and we are also influenced by their activities and conduct. For example, teenagers have a rights to decide the kind company to hang out with social network to belong, and this interactions might influenced his behaviour as time goes time.

The multilevel principle

Research highlights the importance of multilevel dynamics to DP perspectives. This principle view the dominant model of developmental systems theory (DST) and the salience nature-nurture interaction

models as an underlying factor for psychopathology. As a concept that involves multi-levels analysis, a multidisciplinary knowledge is necessary in order to explain the vibrant nature of systems relationships as a necessary factor in developmental processes. Some scholars and research in DP continuously highlights the significance of multi-levels interaction and analysis for comprehending normal and pathological development in human organism. Research literature also accentuates that DP is strongly influenced by main developmental interaction approaches that cut across different levels. Some of this important models include: embryology model (e.g., Weiss, 1959); behavior genetics and epigenetics models (Gottesman, 1974; Gottesman & Hanson, 2005); ecological model (Bronfenbrenner, 1979); transactional model (Sameroff, 1989, 2000a, 2000b) and last but not the least, bi-directional model (Gottlieb, 1992, 1998). Also, research maintains that interesting methods like brain imaging and genomics, nature-nurture interactions, the underlying forces of genetic sign, and endophenotypes, promote multidimensional systems in DP (Gottesman & Hanson, 2005; Masten et al., in press).

The agency principle

Most research in developmental psychopathology, including modern developmental theories, recognizes individual as a dynamic agent of development. Research also confirms that the increase in agency during childhood and adolescence stages is as a result of increasing development in the human brain, physical and learning and the environment. Besides, reports also show that children and adolescents gradually make decisions concerning their own behavior, and the situations in which they interact. This action significantly influenced their development, as well as that of psychopathology. Moreover, it is also documented that a child chooses his friends and activities, which later influence his behaviour positively or negatively. Therefore, the rising agency in early childhood promotes great anxiety in adolescence. This proves that young people in the engages in dangerous behavior that causes life-changing (Steinberg, Dahl, Keating, Kupfer, Masten, & Pine, in press).

Psychopathology as an outcome of development

Research shows that human conditions are surrounded by various factors such as risk, trauma, distress and nervousness. It also reported a widespread of review, reaction, and adjustment to menace in individual lifespan, family, group, and society. Thus, the DP approach recognizes complex conditions that add to proximal and distal effects of human being such as inherent factors, age-related maturation and knowledge, life situations, developing familial and social ecologies. Interestingly, most research literature

defines developmental psychopathology (DP) as theoretical research methods that utilizes both developmental and psychopathological differences to explain the mechanisms and processes (Rutter, 2008; Sroufe & Rutter, 1984). This concept identifies some unique features that are vital for its explanation such as, the expectancy of both continuities and discontinuities; a belief that the concept is neither theory or a discipline; individual uniqueness and not universals; emphasises on intervening methods and not just dangers; beliefs in age as an unclear mutable that reveals both life maturation and the accrual of experiences (Rutter, 1989); emphasises on unintended and intended fundamental changes; and the appreciation that unintended alteration contains multifaceted combination of both transformation and consistency (Rutter, 2008; Sroufe & Rutter, 1984).

Research also gives theoretical explanations to support the fact that DP “life” theories of systematisers (such as Freud, Piaget, and Erikson) are inadequate, and that a process cannot elucidate everything. For instance, while child psychiatry, like DP, emphasis more on individual distinctiveness and intervening mechanisms, it also engrossed with closely defined and conjectured analytical issues. These factors are fundamental to endorsed diagnostic classification, such as DSM-IV and ICD-10 (WHO, 1992), that needed revision and updating (Rutter, 2011; Rutter & Uher, 2012). Surprisingly, research also demonstrates overlapping situations in diagnostic groups than it is earlier valued, and these highlights that, there is no “clear water” between groups. Additionally, not only did research see the risks for mental disorders as mainly dimensional, it also indicates disorders as largely dimensional (Rutter, 2003, 2011; Rutter & Uher, 2012; Uher & Rutter, 2012a). Therefore, most analysis on DP shows that it focuses solely on universal explanation of development rather than individual variances, and that it, quantifying attribute stabilities over time, without the recognition of both continuities and discontinuities (Rutter & Rutter, 1993). This shows that DP involves not only in relabeling but also in paradigm shift. Although research argued about the breadth of DP approach, most of the suggestions support interdisciplinary process. A typical example of this is reported in Cicchetti and Toth (2009), where they supported the following process: interdisciplinarity, multiple levels of analysis; integration of DP with other subjects like biology, neuroscience, and genetics; application of experience for prevention and intervention, the undertaking of translational research; and last but not the least, consideration of culture and social context. Though, these processes are necessary for understanding pathology, it is also important that

they are applying to the entire sciences and not only to DP.

Current progress in Developmental psychopathology

Developmental psychopathology has made significant progress since its inception some decades ago. As a science, the concept has turned out to be more dynamic, multidisciplinary, developmental, contextual, multilevel, and shared. As highly expected in any new and integrative method that explains behavioural health and development, including its ups and downs, DP as a discipline is very complex. Surprisingly, the most remarkable development in development of DP over the past three decades is the degree in which the viewpoint reflects opinions that defines pervaded research, idea, and practice on behavioural wellbeing and associated illnesses. Moreover, as a science that studies youngsters at risk of psychopathology, even though with profound origins (Cicchetti, 1984, 1990a; Masten et al., in press), this viewpoint is an important model for analysing the roots and development of psychopathology transversely a lifetime. While it is imperative to highlight the achievements of DP approaches, it is also significant to mention that most of these outcomes are resulting from scholars who did not recognize themselves as DP scientists. These developments were derived from adult’s psychiatrists and genetics scholars (Rutter, 2010).

Attachment disorder

Most notable scholars recognize attachment disorders as the first achievement in DP (Rutter, Kreppner, & Sonuga-Barke, 2009; Rutter & Sroufe, 2000). Besides recent research shows that DP has achieved an increasing position by explaining developmental psychopathology in children. The paper will discuss the six main inclinations of attachment disorder. Firstly, research linked early anxious attachment relationships with a greater threat of future psychopathology (Belsky & Nezworski, 1988; Cassidy & Shaver, 1999; Sroufe, Egeland, & Carlson, 1999). Interestingly, most clinicians and scholars uses attachment theories to understand the cause of psychopathology in infancy and teenage years. They also use this methods to provide treatment and intervention. Besides, a significant body of research highlights the fact that attachment study starts from the theoretical approach to the meaning of attachment (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters, & Wall, 1978; Bowlby, 1969). Though, these did not only show the dimension to be an organization “as well as is lack of confidence (Main & Solomon, 1986), it also entails the combination of qualitative and quantitative methods. Recent research accentuated the fact that, the pattern of social disinhibition is more linked to social

dysregulation than unconfident attachment (Bruce, Tarullo, & Gunnar, 2010; Rutter et al., 2009) and this is continuously linked to the institutional background (Zeanah & Gleason, 2011). While, research established that glitches of social interactions in early life are prognostic of mental health outcomes in adulthood, it also acknowledged the likelihood of weak, odd situational dimensions in infancy (Grossman, Grossman, & Waters, 2005).

Autism

Another significant achievement in the field of DP is reported in autism. One of the most distinctive features of DP is the movement from the diagnostic approach to the study of the probable fundamental mentalizing deficits (Hermelin & O'Connor, 1970). At first, it appears like autism is the least diagnostic group that need a DP perspective. Traditionally, autism is seen as a stern handicap disorder that comes into view as qualitatively different from normality. Research shows that the first research on theory of mind was done among chimpanzees (Premack & Woodruff, 1978) and later analyzed in the human being, i.e. children (Wimmer & Perner, 1983), before moving to autistic children (Baron-Cohen, Leslie, & Frith, 1985). In fact, before now, the major focus of research is on continuities and discontinuities between normality and disorder, particularly, on the likely intervening processes. Similarly, research on both hereditary and epidemiological data proves that the inherited problem in autism is comprehensive and far away from the traditional diagnosis (LeCouteur et al., 1996; Rutter, 2000).

On the other hand, research on family and twin study highlights a broader autism phenotype (BAP) that is rated higher among family of those with autistic individual compares to those under the controls (Bailey, Palferman, heavy, & Le Couteur, 1998). Also, research on imaging and other neural studies confirmed that physiological brain variations are detected at 12 months of age before the evidence of clinical manifestations (Bosl, Tierney, Tager-Flusberg, & Nelson, 2011; Luyster, Wagner, Vogel-Farley, Tager-Flusberg, & Nelson, 2011). On the contrary, Pickles et al., (2009) reported different kind of results in social and language regression in early childhood. The review of literature shows that children under the age of 2 years displayed signs of autism compare to other neurodevelopmental disorders (Pickles et al., 2009). Having established the continuities between autism and normality, research also confirmed that there is a significant sign of discontinuities in autism and normality. This is obvious because the rate of epilepsy is not only increasing in autism, but also unique in later ages of inception than it is in typical situations (Bolton et al., 2011).

Childhood antecedents of adult psychopathology

Research continues to establish that childhood antecedent's prompts serious adult mental disorder. While studies long established that most mental disorders were diagnosed around the age of 20s, it is also documented that the receipt of treatment is more obvious in childhood/early adolescence (Kim-Cohen et al., 2003). Though, there was considerable (but marginal) continuousness in this kind of disorder, however, oppositional insolent and conduct disorders remain the most common experiences of adult disorders (Kim-Cohen et al., 2003). To be precise, as a common occurrence of any developmental perspective, homotypic continuity is the most persistent. This explains that what is noted as inventive is the indication of heterotypic continuity. That is to say, difficulties experiences in childhood are mostly disruptive behavior, and this is rather a different phenomenon in adult outcome, i.e., eating disorders.

Schizophrenia

Schizophrenia is another area that DP approach has contributed and recorded major achievements. This development started around early 70s, when some notable scholars like Johnstone, Frith, Crow, Husband and Kreel (1976) come up with a finding that schizophrenia is linked with distended ventricles, and that this is not a functional psychosis. Similar to autism, schizophrenia has long been labelled as a complex disorder that offers a distinct qualitative exit from normality. Most evidence on the subject shows that developmental perspective is not considered as a useful strategy because of the belief that schizophrenic psychoses does not start in childhood. Also, recent development in the study of schizophrenia highlights the needs for developmental perspective (Cicchetti & Cannon, 1999) This lent credence to the indication such as discontinuity from normality. Similarly, a long-term, longitudinal studies on schizophrenia indicates that, schizophrenia (but not bipolar disorder or depression/ anxiety) is linked with deficiencies in language and/or motor function in early childhood education and impairments in intelligence over the whole period after early years (Cannon et al., 2002). This shows that schizophrenia starts in the early stage of neuro-developmental impairment. However, during this period, it is difficult to conclude whether this is linked to problems associated with schizophrenia or something different that has a symptom that lead to schizophrenic psychosis.

Besides, research also reported that schizophrenia is linked to minor psychotic-like characteristics in childhood/teenage years (Poulton et al., 2000). Although this is astonishingly shared with the general population (Laurens, Hobbs, Sunderland, Green, & Mould, 2011), nonetheless, it connects with

a considerably augmented risk for future development of schizophrenia. Also, other research studies on schizophrenia emphasize on inherent, high family risk, study that linked abnormalities to schizotypy, as mostly noted in early adulthood. This in most cases is connected to the development of schizophrenia (Johnstone, Ebmeier, Miller, Owens, & Lawrie, 2005). Although scholars like Weinberger (1987) and Murray and Lewis (1987) maintain that overt psychosis is not evident until early adulthood, research outcomes still date still shows that schizophrenia arises from early neurodevelopmental impairment. Though, current research also concludes that neuro-developmental changes come after the beginning of psychosis (Andreasen, 2010; Rapoport & Gogtay, 2011) yet, there are still big doubts among researchers concerning the degree to which the post onset vicissitudes reveal drug effects (Thompson et al., 2009).

Testing for Environmental Mediation of Risk Effects

These multiple different approaches to test for the hypothesis of environmental mediation of risks is a recent achievement of developmental psychopathology. Most research literature on DP pointed out that no matter how strong statistical associations are, they do not represent causal effect. Studies also show that neither developmental psychologists nor child psychiatrists give serious consideration to the likely ways that the causal deduction of environmental mediation is experienced. These circumstances are altered when respect is given to ways in which “normal experiments” that separate variables that goes together reinforces or wane the causal deduction (Rutter, 2007, 2012b). It is also noted that hereditary perceptive designs can be very instructive. For example, a discordant study conducted by Kendler and Prescott (2006) on twin’s sexual experience, reveal that there is robust evidence of probable environmental mediation of such effects on the development of psychopathology.

Similarly, Jaffee et al., (2004) in their report maintain that effects of physical abuse were environmentally mediated, while those of the corporal punishment were not. This results shows that the relationship between corporal punishment and mental disorders came from the significant effects of unruly behavior that elicits parental punishment. Conversely, the findings point out that, though corporal punishment and physical abuse worked in a different way, yet, the general use of physical punishment promotes bigger risk that later upsurge into abuse. One important factor that needs to be considered when testing for environmental mediation is whether the risk factor is deliberate and rightly labelled an environment (e.g., as the case with parental conflict or

family poverty), or genetically mediated (Plomin & Bergeman, 1991). Though, some action (such as sperm donation) preserves the inherent tie between mother and child, others (such as egg donation) disturbs the link. This method tests the theory that maternal smoking during pregnancy had a prenatal result that inclined to future development of attention-deficit/hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) and disruptive conduct.

Moreover, research also confirmed that the assisted-conception plan established a prenatal consequence of low birth weight (as revealed also in observational studies and animal models), and none on either ADHD or disruptive behavior. This shows that the statistical controls for confounding were unsuccessful in delivering the needed outcome in the absence of the natural experiment. Additionally, a body of knowledge on natural experiment also established that fetal exposure to maternal smoking lead to high possibility of a low birth weight and no underlying effect on either ADHD or antisocial conduct (D’Onofrio, Rathouz, & Lahey, 2011; D’Onofrio, Van Hulle, Goodnight, Rathouz, & Lahey, 2011; Obel et al., 2011) such as fraternal comparisons (Obel et al., 2011).

Intellectual and Language Functioning

Another great achievement recorded in the field of DP is that of intellectual and language functioning. Most psychological research on the intellectual development identifies nutritional factors as insignificant. However, it is rather surprising to know that a well-conducted study on natural and experimental, continue to show the significant benefits of breast feeding (Lucas, Morley, & Cole, 1998). This is underlain by other developmental programs. Firstly, the unilateral brain injury in the main hemisphere causes aphasia in adults and general intellectual damage in infancy (Rutter, 1993; Vargha-Khadem, Issacs, Van Der Werf, Robb, & Wilson, 1992). Although unilateral brain injury is noticeable in all age groups, the form is relatively different in infancy compare to other developmental stages of life. Secondly, it is argued that severe intellectual infirmity is repeatedly linked with key pathogenic genetic factor, however, mild infirmity to some extent, is not similar (Einfeld & Emerson, 2008). Although, report established that down syndrome is the main reason for severe intellectual disability, yet, it is less commonly related to mild intellectual disability. So, pathogenic genetic mutations explain the case for a small proportion of mild intellectual disability, however, for the greater part; mild disability functions at the far end of a typical distribution. On the contrary, this is opposite to what is experienced in severe intellectual disability and it proves that there is virtually total discontinuity between severe intellectual disability

and normality, while continuities are slightly robust in the case of mild disability

Gene–Environment Interplay

Developmental psychopathology also made significant contribution in the area of gene–environment interplay (Rutter, 2012a). This achievement is well pronounced in three different forms of interaction. The first attainment is reported on the effects of epigenetic mechanisms in biological entrenched experiences (Meaney, 2010). Although much is said about the impacts of epigenetic, nevertheless, what is given much accolade in scientific research is the acknowledgment that, genetic material is important only if the genetic factor are “expressed,” and this contains a number of DNA elements, stochastic (random) effects, and experiences. Though, research confirmed that environs cannot change gene arrangements, but it can only change, its effects by influencing gene expression. This expression has a significant influence on DP because it contains an important mediating mechanism that is vital to DP research. Another important interaction is the gene–environment correlations (RGE; Kendler & Baker, 2007). These are highly important because they establish the process that shows that locales have genetically mediated impacts (Plomin & Bergeman, 1991). They also highlight several ways that support the assertion that people’s behaviour shapes and selects the environments and that significance of DP lies with the mediating mechanisms.

Stress and Vulnerability to Depression

Most research on developmental psychopathology seeks to observe the mediation effects concerning the interaction between experience of stress and susceptibility to depression. Research reveals that stress is linked with depression, and that the proposed mechanisms are mutable. Also, studies propose three important models that explain the interaction between stress, vulnerability and despair. Firstly, it is argued that, there is a distress sensitization that link stressors surges with the amount of stress experienced. Also, stress inoculation model, explain that stress experiences have a lessening consequence on a recurrent stress experience. Thirdly, diathesis–stress model argue that susceptibility to stress is related to enduring biological features. Besides, Garber et al, (2010) supports the stress sensitisation and diathesis-stress models over stress inoculation models. Despite the achievement of developmental psychopathology, the interaction between stress and vulnerability to depression is still devoid of definitive answers till date. Therefore, based on animal models, if stress is mild and controllable, it can lead to stress inoculation effects which invariably lead to an augmented resistance for future stressors (Rutter, 2012c, 2013).

Antisocial behavior

Research has long established variances in disruptive behaviour. It is also established that most individuals display antisocial conducts at some point in their lifetime, even though they are usually well functioning (Rutter, Giller, & Hagell, 1998). Also, report shows that some antisocial conduct continues into old age in relationship with considerable social dysfunction. However, Moffitt’s (1993) differentiates adolescence-limited (AL) and life-course-persistent (LCP) disruptive conduct. Also, Moffitt’s (1993), linked (LCP) with the following factors: childhood onset, individual neurodevelopmental problems, and protracted family difficulty. On the contrary, (AL) is mainly developmentally normative and its links with the disruptive peer group. Moreover, successive research continues to give more support to the distinction between LCP and AL, and at the same time specified the need for three important adjustments. Earlier studies by Robins (1966, 1978), supported by Odgers and colleagues (2008), maintain that half of people with initial onset do not carry their disruptive conduct into adult life, and this signifying the need for identifying considerable childhood-limited (CL) group. Secondly, teenage-onset antisocial conduct continually creates a sign of other severe, undying social malfunction (Odgers et al., 2007). Thirdly, the teenage - onset group varied from non-antisocial childhood, both in individual and family difficulty, though less than those related to LCP (Roisman, Monahan, Campbell, Steinberg, & Cauffman, 2010). All this shows that antisocial conduct conceptualized and displays both continuities and discontinuities transversely twin periods of behavioral variation and human development.

Future direction of developmental psychopathology

Within a short period of time developmental psychopathology has proven is important in developing our knowledge about risk and psychopathology and in linking the division that has for some time now divided the sphere of influence of research and clinical practice. For this initiative to be maintained and nurtured into a new developments, there is a need to address the future challenges. Possibly, effort should be directed toward attaining improved reliability that will promote and sustain the existing theoretic models in the discipline, applying essential definitional limits to DP perspective, and the plan, dimension, and data investigative approaches used for investigating risk, condition, and adjustment transversely the lifespan. Similarly, the recent advances in technology, information, heredities, and other area of endeavor are linked to the commencements of developmental psychopathology. This is important in order to attain

the full potential of diathesis-stressor models as a mediator that stop or develop risk.

However, research argued that the inventive risk, researchers were all conscious of the fact that research that changed risk and susceptibility in development still required enhanced measurement of risk and susceptibility, and resources to learn those procedures (Masten, 1989). Although much as been said about the improvement in specificity and instruments, it is also important to note that this development led to a ground-breaking research period on diathesis and stress, the nature-nurture interaction, and epigenesis, to mention a few, in DP. Besides, research also shows that as the investigation on brain plasticity and genetic material expression increases, a fresh form of change is imaginable. Also, research proposed that it is thinkable to “re-design” adaptive systems, like tension mediation, mental processing, listening abilities, and last but not the least, protecting brain growth in susceptible creatures, with a multi-levels mediation (from cellular to social) (Buonomano & Merzenich, 1998; Chang, Gallelli, & Howe, in press; Dahl & Spear, 2004).

Moreover, the improvements recorded in the last forty years has created a fresh integrative research that equipped researchers with concepts and tools to analyze multiple interactions at system levels, work together and lighten the methods that form and reformed adjustment, and lastly, answer persistent questions relating to public health and public good and how they work. Also, at every level of study, the developments recorded in theory and knowledge help researchers to educate each other at all system levels and also creates knowledge that prevent and improve interventions at all levels of interaction. Nevertheless, as developmental psychopathology develops, and knowledge upsurges more complex areas, a partnership is necessary, if we are to achieve progress. This is imperative because multiple efforts are required in order to understand the background and methods requisite for learning development across all levels and to relate knowledge to policy and practice. Therefore, as a new field of study, DP needs a new style of training that will not only allow young researchers to develop skills for partnership and interaction at all levels of analysis and disciplines, but also makes them acquainted with methods or languages of related disciplines and necessary expertise in their own field.

Conclusions

Developmental psychopathology is a widespread area that emphasises the full understanding of human development in relation to clinical dysfunction. Despite the momentous improvements that have been recorded in the disciplines, vital work still lies in the

future. Indeed, these imminent developments are based on the previous revered contribution. As effort in the discipline becomes gradually more interrelated and technically refined, more effort need to be concentrated to development (Harter, 2006; Sroufe, 2007). Moreover, the recent development in theory and research, particularly, on child development, i.e., biological and psychosocial impacts and their interface, branded the discipline as a theoretically open and intrinsically multidisciplinary. Research shows that most of the impetus created by DP framework came from accessibility and veneration for preceding knowledge coupled with the readiness to challenge traditional ideas has continued to encourage the disciplinary growth. Moreover, developmental psychopathologists as a discipline incorporate ideas and techniques inculcated from related areas that are mostly remote from each other, thus, creates improvements in knowledge that might not be there due to lack of multi-disciplinary discourse. Furthermore, DP perspective provides lots of valuable indications and educations for better comprehending of normal development and disorder. Although research revealed the significance of a pathways method as underlying developments that identifies both direct and indirect influences, it also admits that one risk issue can have wide-ranging concerns and make a distinctive disorder upshot from multiplicity route.

References

1. Achenbach, T. M. (1978). The child behavior profile, I: Boys aged 6-11. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 46, 478-488.
2. Achenbach, T.M. (1974). *Developmental psychopathology*. Oxford: Ronald Press.
3. Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., & Wall, S. (1978). *Patterns of attachment: A psychological study of the Strange Situation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
4. American Psychiatric Association Committee on Nomenclature and Statistics (1980). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (3d ed.). Washington, D.C.: American Psychiatric Association.
5. Andreasen, N. C. (2010). The lifetime trajectory of schizophrenia and the concept of neurodevelopment. *Dialogues in Clinical Neuroscience*, 12, 409-415.
6. Bailey, A., Palferman, S., Heavey, L., & Le Couteur, A. (1998). Autism: The phenotype in relatives. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorders*, 28, 369-392.
7. Baron-Cohen, S., Leslie, A. M., & Frith, U. (1985). Does the autistic child have a “theory of mind”? *Cognition*, 21, 37-46. Belsky, J., &

- Nezworski, T. (1988). *Clinical implications of attachment*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
8. Bergman, L. R., & Magnusson, D. (1997). A person oriented approach in research on developmental psychopathology. *Development and Psychopathology*, 9, 291–319.
 9. Bolton, P. F., Carcani-Rathwell, I., Hutton, J., Goode, S., Howlin, P., & Rutter, M. (2011). Epilepsy in autism: Features and correlates. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 198, 289–294.
 10. Bosl, W., Tierney, A., Tager-Flusberg, H., & Nelson, C. (2011). EEG complexity as a biomarker for autism spectrum disorder risk. *BMC Medicine*, 9, 18.
 11. Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and loss: Vol. 1. Attachment*. London: Hogarth Press.
 12. Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and design*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
 13. Bruce, J., Tarullo, A. R., & Gunnar, M. R. (2010). Disinhibited social behaviour among internationally adopted children. *Development and Psychopathology*, 21, 157–171.
 14. Buonomano, D.V., & Merzenich, M.M. (1998). Net interaction between different forms of short-term synaptic plasticity and slow IPSP's in the hippocampus and auditory cortex. *Journal of Neurophysiology*, 80, 1765–1774.
 15. Cannon, M., Caspi, A., Moffitt, T. E., Harrington, H. L., Taylor, A., Murray, R. M., et al. (2002). Evidence for early-childhood, pan-developmental impairment specific to schizophreniform disorder: Results from a longitudinal birth cohort. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 59, 449–456.
 16. Cassidy, J., & Shaver, P. R. (Eds.). (1999). *Handbook of attachment: Theory, research, and clinical applications*. New York: Guilford Press
 - Chang, K., Gallelli, K., & Howe, M. (in press). Early identification and prevention of early-onset bipolar disorder. In D. Romer & E. Walker (Eds.), *Adolescent psychopathology and the developing brain: Integrating brain and prevention science*. New York: Oxford University Press.
 17. Cicchetti, D., & Toth, S. L. (2009). The past achievements and future promises of developmental psychopathology: The coming of age of a discipline. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 50, 16–25.
 18. Cicchetti, D., & Toth, S.L. (Eds.). (2006). Translational research in developmental psychopathology. [Special Issue]. *Development and Psychopathology*, 18, 619–933.
 19. Cicchetti, D., & Posner, M.I. (Eds.). (2005). Integrating cognitive and affective neuroscience and developmental psychopathology [Special Issue]. *Development and Psychopathology*, 17, 569–891.
 20. Cicchetti, D., & Dawson, G. (Eds.). (2002). Multiple levels of analysis [Special Issue]. *Development and Psychopathology*, 14, 417–666.
 21. Cicchetti, D., & Toth, S.L. (Eds.). (2000). Social policy implications of research in developmental psychopathology [Special Issue]. *Development and Psychopathology*, 12, 551–885.
 22. Cicchetti, D., & Cannon, T. D. (1999). Neurodevelopmental processes in the ontogenesis and epigenesis of mental processes in the ontogenesis and epigenesis of psychopathology, 11, 375–393.
 23. Cicchetti, D., & Toth, S.L. (1998). Perspectives on research and practice in developmental psychopathology. In W. Damon (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology* (5th edn, Vol. 4, pp. 479–583). New York: Wiley.
 24. Cicchetti, D., & Rogosch, F.A. (1997). The role of self-organization in the promotion of resilience in maltreated children. *Development and Psychopathology*, 9, 799–817
 25. Cicchetti, D., & Cohen, D.J. (Eds.). (1995). *Developmental psychopathology, Vol. 1: Theory and methods*. New York: Wiley.
 26. Cicchetti, D. (1993). Developmental psychopathology: Reactions, reflections, and projections. *Developmental Review*, 13, 471–502.
 27. Cicchetti, D. (1990b). The organization and coherence of socioemotional, cognitive, and representational development: Illustrations through a developmental psychopathology perspective on Down Syndrome and child maltreatment. In R. Thompson (Ed.), *Socioemotional development: Nebraska symposium on Motivation* (Vol. 36, pp. 259–366). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
 28. Cicchetti, D. (1990a). A historical perspective on the discipline of developmental psychopathology. In J. Rolf, A.S. Masten, D. Cicchetti, K.H. Nuechterlein, & S. Weintraub (Eds.), *Risk and protective factors in the development of Psychopathology* (pp. 2–28). New York: Cambridge University Press.
 29. Cicchetti, D. (Ed.) (1989). *The emergence of a discipline: Rochester symposium on developmental psychopathology*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
 30. Cicchetti, D., & Schneider-Rosen, K. (1986). Theoretical and empirical considerations in the investigation of the relationship between a Vect

- and cognition in atypical populations of infants. In C. E. Izard, J. Kagan, & R. B. Zajonc (Eds.), *Emotions, cognition, and behavior* (pp. 366–406). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.
31. Cicchetti, D. (1984). The emergence of developmental psychopathology. *Child Development, 55*, 1–7.
 32. Cummings, E.M., Davies, P.T., & Campbell, S.B. (2000). *Developmental psychopathology and family process*. New York: The Guilford Press.
 33. Dahl, R.E., & Spear, L.P. (Eds.) (2004). *Adolescent brain development: Vulnerabilities and opportunities*. New York: New York Academy of Sciences Dixon, R. A., & Lerner, R. M. (1988). A history of systems in developmental psychology. In M. H. Bornstein & M.E. Lamb (Eds.), *Developmental psychology: An advanced textbook* (second ed., pp. 3–50).
 34. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum D'Onofrio, B. M., Rathouz, P. J., & Lahey, B. B. (2011). The importance of understanding gene–environment correlations in the development of antisocial behavior. In K. S. Kendler, S. R. Jaffee, & D. Romer (Eds.), *The dynamic genome and mental health: The role of genes and environments in youth development* (pp. 340–364). New York: Oxford University Press.
 35. D'Onofrio, B. M., Van Hulle, C. A., Goodnight, J. A., Rathouz, P. J., & Lahey, B. B. (2011). Is maternal smoking during pregnancy a causal environmental risk factor for adolescent antisocial behavior? Testing etiological theories and assumptions. *Psychological Medicine, 1*, 1–11
 36. Dumas, J. E., LaFrenier, P. J., & Serketich, W. J. (1995). “Balance of Power”: A transactional analysis of control in mother–child dyads involving socially competent, aggressive, and anxious children. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 104*, 104–113.
 37. Einfeld, S., & Emerson, E. (2008). Intellectual disability. In M. Rutter, D. Bishop, D. Pine, S. Scott, J. Stevenson, E. Taylor, et al. (Eds.), *Rutter's child and adolescent psychiatry* (5th ed., pp. 820–840). Oxford: Blackwell.
 38. Fee, D. (2000) *Pathology and the Postmodern: Mental Illness as Discourse and Experience*. London: Sage.
 39. Flavell, J. H. (1977). *Cognitive development*. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
 40. Ford, D. H., & Lerner, R. M. (1992). *Developmental systems theory: An integrative approach*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
 41. Garber, J., & Cole, D. A. (2010). Intergenerational transmission of depression: A launch and grow model of change across adolescence. *Development and Psychopathology, 22*, 819–830.
 42. Garmezy, N., & Rutter, M. (1983). *Stress, coping and development in children*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
 43. Garmezy, N. (1974). The study of competence in children at risk for severe psychopathology. In E. J. Anthony & C. Koupernik (Eds.), *The child in his family: Children at psychiatric risk*. Oxford, UK: Wiley.
 44. Gottesman, I.I., & Hanson, D.R. (2005). Human development: Biological and genetic processes. *Annual Review of Psychology, 56*, 10.11–10.24.
 45. Gottesman, I.I. (1974). Developmental genetics and ontogenetic psychology: Overdetermined and propositions from a matchmaker. In A.D. Pick (Ed.), *Minnesota symposium on child psychology* (Vol. 8, pp. 55–80). Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
 46. Gottlieb, G. (1998). The significance of biology for human development: A developmental psychobiological systems view. In W. Damon & R.M. Lerner (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology* (pp. 233–273). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
 47. Gottlieb, G. (1992). *Individual development and evolution: The genesis of novel behavior*. London: Oxford University Press
 48. Gottlieb, G. (1991). Epigenetic systems view of human development. *Developmental Psychology, 27*, 33–34.
 49. Grossman, K. E., Grossman, K., & Waters, E. (2005). *Attachment from infancy to adulthood: The major longitudinal studies*. New York: Guilford Press. Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry, (1966). Committee on Child Psychiatry. Psychopathological disorders in childhood: Theoretical considerations and proposed classification (Vol. 6, Report No. 62). New York: Group for the Advancement of Psychiatry.
 50. Harter, S. (2006). Self-processes and developmental psychopathology. In D. Cicchetti & D. Cohen (Eds.), *Developmental psychopathology* (2nd edn, vol. 1, pp. 370–418). New York: Wiley.
 51. Hermelin, B., & O'Connor, N. (1970). *Psychological experiments with autistic children*. New York: Pergamon Press.
 52. Hinshaw, S.P. (2007). *The mark of shame: Stigma of mental illness and an agenda for change*. New York: Oxford University Press.
 53. Hinshaw, S.P., & Cicchetti, D. (2000). Stigma and mental disorder: Conceptions of illness, public attitudes, personal disclosure, and social

- policy. *Development and Psychopathology*, 12, 555–598.
54. Jaffee, S. R., Caspi, A., Moffitt, T. E., Polo-Tomas, M., Price, T. S., & Taylor, A. (2004). The limits of child effects: Evidence for genetically mediated child effects on corporal punishment but not on physical maltreatment. *Developmental Psychology*, 40, 1047–1058.
 55. Johnstone, E. C., Ebmeier, K. P., Miller, P., Owens, D. G. C., & Lawrie, S. M. (2005). Predicting schizophrenia: Findings from the Edinburgh high-risk study. *British Journal of Psychiatry*, 186, 18–25.
 56. Johnstone, E. C., Frith, C. D., Crow, T. J., Husband, J., & Kreef, L. (1976). Cerebral ventricular size and cognitive impairment in chronic schizophrenia. *Lancet*, 308, 924–926.
 57. Kendler, K. S., & Baker, J. H. (2007). Genetic influences on measures of the environment: A systematic review. *Psychological Medicine*, 37, 615–626.
 58. Kendler, K. S., & Prescott, C. A. (2006). Genes, environment, and psychopathology: Understanding the causes of psychiatric and substance use disorders. New York: Guilford Press.
 59. Kim-Cohen, J., Caspi, A., Moffitt, T. E., Harrington, H. L., Milne, B. J., & Poulton, R. (2003). Prior juvenile diagnoses in adults with mental disorder: Developmental follow-back of a prospective-longitudinal cohort. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 60, 709–717.
 60. Kuhn, T. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions* (2nd ed.). Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
 61. Laurens, K. R., Hobbs, M. J., Sunderland, M., Green, M. J., & Mould, G. L. (2011). Psychotic-like experiences in a community sample of 8000 children aged 9 to 11 years: An item response theory analysis. *Psychological Medicine*, 1, 1–10.
 62. LeCouteur, A., Bailey, A., Goode, S., Pickles, A., Gottesman, I., Robertson, S., et al. (1996). A broader phenotype of autism: The clinical spectrum in twins. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 37, 785–801.
 63. Lucas, A., Morley, R., & Cole, T. J. (1998). Randomised trial of early diet in preterm babies and later intelligence quotient. *British Medical Journal*, 317, 1481–1487.
 64. Luthar, S. S., Cicchetti, D., & Becker, B. (2000). The construct of resilience: A critical evaluation and guidelines for future work. *Child Development*, 71, 543–562.
 65. Luyster, R. J., Wagner, J. B., Vogel-Farley, V., Tager-Flusberg, H., & Nelson, C. A. (2011). Neural correlates of familiar and unfamiliar face processing in infants at risk for autism spectrum disorders. *Brain Topography*, 24, 220–228.
 66. Main, M., & Solomon, J. (1986). Discovery of a new, insecure-disorganized/disoriented attachment pattern. In M. Yogman & T. B. Brazelton (Eds.), *Affective In M. Yogman & T. B. Brazelton (Eds.), Affective Ablex*.
 67. Masten, A. S. (2006). Developmental psychopathology: Pathways to the future. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 31, 47–54.
 68. Masten, A. S. (2001). Ordinary magic: Resilience processes in development. *American Psychologist*, 56, 227–238.
 69. Masten, A. S., & Coatsworth, J. D. (1995). Competence, resilience, and psychopathology. In D. Cicchetti & D. J. Cohen (Eds.), *Developmental psychopathology: Vol. 2. Risk, disorder, and adaptation* (pp. 715–752). New York: Wiley.
 70. Masten, A. S. (1989). Resilience in development: Implications of the study of successful adaptation for developmental psychopathology. In D. Cicchetti (Ed.), *The emergence of a discipline: Rochester symposium on developmental psychopathology* (Vol. 1, pp. 261–294). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
 71. Masten, A. S., Burt, K., & Coatsworth, J. D. (in press). Competence and psychopathology in development. In D. Cicchetti & D. Cohen (Eds.), *Developmental psychopathology, Vol. 3: Risk, disorder and psychopathology* (2nd edn). New York: Wiley.
 72. Meaney, M. J. (2010). Epigenetics and the biological definition of Gene Environment interactions. *Child Development*, 81, 41–79.
 73. Moffitt, T. E. (1993). Adolescence-limited and life-course-persistent antisocial behavior: A developmental taxonomy. *Psychological Review*, 100, 674–701.
 74. Murray, R. M., & Lewis, S. W. (1987). Is schizophrenia a neurodevelopmental disorder? *British Medical Journal*, 295, 681–682.
 75. Mussen, P. H. (1970) (Ed.). *Carmichael's handbook of child psychology*. New York: Wiley.
 76. Obel, C., Olsen, J., Henriksen, T. B., Rodriguez, A., Jaˆrvelin, M. R., Moilanen, I., et al. (2011). Is maternal smoking during pregnancy a risk factor for hyperkinetic disorder? Findings from a sibling design. *International Journal of Epidemiology*, 40, 338–345.
 77. Odgers, C. L., Caspi, A., Broadbent, J. M., Dickson, N., Hancox, R. J., Harrington, H. L., et al. (2007). Prediction of differential adult health burden by conduct problem subtypes in

- males. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 64, 476–484.
77. Parker, I., Georgaca, E., Harper, D., McLaughlin, T. and Stowell Smith, M. (1995). *Deconstructing Psychopathology*. London: Sage.
 78. Pellmar, T.C., & Eisenberg, L. (Eds.). (2000). *Bridging disciplines in the brain, behavioral, and clinical sciences*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
 79. Piaget, J., & Inhelder, B. (1969) *The psychology of the child*. New York: Basic.
 - Pickles, A., Simonoff, E., Conti-Ramsden, G., Falcaro, M., Simkin, Z., Charman, T., et al. (2009). Loss of language in early development of autism and specific language impairment. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 50, 843–852.
 80. Plomin, R., & Bergeman, C. S. (1991). The nature of nurture: Genetic influence on “environmental” measures. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 14, 373–386.
 81. Poulton, R., Caspi, A., Moffitt, T. E., Cannon, M., Murray, R., & Harrington, H. L. (2000). Children’s self-reported psychotic symptoms and adult schizophrenia disorder: A 15-year longitudinal study. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 57, 1053–1058
 82. Premack, D., & Woodruff, G. (1978). Does the chimpanzee have a theory of mind? *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 1, 515–526.
 83. Rapoport, J. L., & Gogtay, N. (2011). Childhood onset schizophrenia: Support for a progressive neurodevelopmental disorder. *International Journal of Developmental Neuroscience*, 29, 251–258.
 84. Robins, L. N. (1966). *Deviant children grown up: A sociological and psychiatric study of sociopathic personality*. Baltimore, MD: Williams & Wilkins.
 85. Robins, L. N. (1978). Sturdy childhood predictors of adult antisocial behaviour: Replications from longitudinal studies. *Psychological Medicine*, 8, 611–622.
 86. Roisman, G. I., Monahan, K. C., Campbell, S. B., Steinberg, L., & Cauffman, E. (2010). Is adolescence-onset antisocial behavior developmentally normative? *Development and Psychopathology*, 22, 295–311
 87. Rutter, M. (2013). Resilience: Clinical implications. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 54, 474–487.
 88. Rutter, M. (2012a). Gene–environment interdependence. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 9, 391–412.
 89. Rutter, M. (2012b). “Natural experiments” as a means of testing causal inferences. In C.
 90. Berzuini, P., Dawid, & L. Bernardinelli (Eds.), *Causality: Statistical perspectives and applications* (pp. 253–272). Chichester: Wiley Ltd.
 - Rutter, M. (2012c). Resilience as a dynamic concept. *Development and Psychopathology*, 24, 335–344.
 91. Rutter, M., & Uher, R. (2012). Classification issues and challenges in child and adolescent psychopathology. *International Review of Psychiatry*, 24, 514–529
 92. Rutter, M. (2011). Research review: Child psychiatric diagnosis and classification: Concepts, findings, challenges and potential. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 52, 647–660.
 93. Rutter, M. (2010). Child and adolescent psychiatry: Past scientific achievements and challenges for the future. *European Journal of Child Adolescent Psychiatry*, 19, 689–703
 94. Rutter, M., Kreppner, J., & Sonuga-Barke, E. (2009). Emanuel Miller lecture: Attachment in security, disinhibited attachment, and attachment disorders: Where do research findings leave the concepts? *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 50, 529–543.
 95. Rutter, M. (2008). Developing concepts in developmental psychopathology. In J. J. Hudziak (Ed.), *Developmental psychopathology and wellness: Genetic and environmental influences* (pp. 3–22). Arlington, VA: American Psychiatric Publishing.
 96. Rutter, M. (2007). Proceeding from observed correlation to causal inference: The use of natural experiments. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 2, 377–395
 97. Rutter, M. (2003). Categories, dimensions, and the mental health of children and adolescents. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1008, 11–21.
 98. Rutter, M., Giller, H., & Hagell, A. (1998). *Antisocial behavior by young people*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
 99. Rutter, M., & Rutter, M. (1993). *Developing minds: Challenge and continuity across the lifespan*. London: Penguin Books
 100. Rutter, M. (1989). Pathways from childhood to adult life. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 30, 23–51
 101. Rutter, M. (1986). Child psychiatry: The interface between clinical and developmental research. *Psychological Medicine*, 16, 151–169.
 102. Rutter, M., Shaffer, D., & Shepherd, M. A. (1975). *Multi-axial classification of child psychiatric disorders*. Geneva: World Health Organization.
 103. Sameroff, A.J. (2000b). Dialectical processes in developmental psychopathology. In A. J.

104. Sameroff, M. Lewis & S.M. Miller (Eds.), *Handbook of developmental psychopathology* (2nd edn, pp. 23–40). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum.
105. Sameroff, A.J. (2000a). Developmental systems and psychopathology. *Development and Psychopathology*, 12, 297–312.
106. Sameroff, A. J. (1995). General systems theories and developmental psychopathology. In D. Cicchetti & D. J. Cohen (Eds.), *Developmental psychopathology: Theory and methods. Wiley series on personality processes* (Vol. 1, pp. 659–695). New York, NY: Wiley.
108. Sameroff, A. J. (1983). Developmental systems: Contexts and evolution. In W. Kessen (Ed.), *History, theory, and methods* (Vol. 1, 4th ed., pp. 237–294). New York: Wiley.
109. Sameroff, A.J., & Chandler, M.J. (1975). Reproductive risk and the continuum of caretaking casualty. *Review of Child Development Research*, 4, 187–244.
110. Schulterbrandt, J. G., & Raskin, A. (Eds.) (1977). Depression in childhood: Diagnosis, treatment, and conceptual models. New York: Raven.
111. Sroufe, L.A. (2007). The place of development in developmental psychopathology. In A.S. Masten (Ed.), *Multilevel dynamics in developmental psychopathology: The Minnesota Symposia on Child Psychology* (vol. 34, pp. 285–299). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
112. Sroufe, L. A., Egeland, B., & Carlson, E. (1999). One social world: The integrated development of parent–social world: The integrated development of parent–child and peer relationships. In W. A. Collins & B. Laursen (Eds.), *Relationships as developmental context: The 30th Minnesota Symposium on Child Psychology*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
113. Sroufe, L.A. (1990). Considering normal and abnormal together: The essence of developmental psychopathology. *Development and Psychopathology*, 2, 335–347.
114. Sroufe, L.A., & Rutter, M. (1984). The domain of developmental psychopathology. *Child Development*, 55, 17–29.
115. Steinberg, L., Dahl, R.E., Keating, D., Kupfer, D.J., Masten, A.S., & Pine, D. (in press). The study of developmental psychopathology in adolescence: Integrating affective neuroscience with the study of context. In D. Cicchetti & D. Cohen (Eds.), *Handbook of developmental psychopathology, Vol. 3: Risk, disorder and psychopathology* (2nd edn). New York: Wiley.
116. Thelen, E., & Smith, L. (1998). Dynamic systems theories. In R.M. Lerner (Ed.), *Handbook of child psychology: Theoretical models of human development* (5th edn, pp. 563–634). New York: Wiley
117. Thompson, P. M., Bartzokis, G., Hayashi, K. M., Klunder, A. D., Lu, P. H., Edwards, N., et al. (2009). Time-lapse mapping of cortical changes in schizophrenia with different treatments. *Cerebral Cortex*, 19, 1107–1123.
118. Toth, S.L., & Cicchetti, D. (1999). Developmental psychopathology and child psychotherapy. In S. Russ & T. Ollendick (Eds.), *Handbook of psychotherapies with children and families* (pp. 15–44). New York: Plenum Press.
119. Uher, R., & Rutter, M. (2012a). Basing psychiatric classification on scientific foundation: Problems and prospects. *International Review of Psychiatry*, 24, 591–605
120. Vargha-Khadem, F., Isaacs, E., van der Werf, S., Robb, S., & Wilson, J. (1992). Development of intelligence and memory in children with hemiplegic cerebral palsy: The deleterious consequences of early seizures. *Brain*, 115, 315–329.
121. von Bertalanffy, L. (1968). *General systems theory*. New York: Braziller.
122. Weinberger, D. R. (1987). Implications of normal brain development for the pathogenesis of schizophrenia. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 44, 660–669.
123. Weiss, P. (1959). Cellular dynamics. *Review of Modern Physics*, 31, 11–20.
124. Wimmer, H., & Perner, J. (1983). Beliefs about beliefs: Representation and constraining function of wrong beliefs in young children's understanding of deception. *Cognition*, 13, 103–128. World Health Organization. (1992). International classification of mental and behavioural disorders (ICD-10). Geneva: Author.
125. Zeanah, C. H., & Gleason, M. M. (2011). Reactive attachment disorder: A review for DSM-5. Washington, DC: American Psychiatric Association.
126. Zigler, E., & Glick, M. (1986). *A developmental approach to adult psychopathology*. New York: Wiley.