With a registration level far in excess of pre-convention expectations, the Second Annual Convention of APS was truly a successful meeting from the perspective of APS officials and staff. But the enthusiasm expressed by participants, exhibitors/advertisers, and attendees made clear the utility of the three-day meeting for everyone involved.

The general euphoria that envelops APS — and that made possible such a successful first convention in Alexandria, VA — continued through the past year and spilled over into this second convention. Overriding the importance of the many positive statements made by attendees and participants was the underlying, strongly felt sentiment that APS is the natural organization for persons interested in science and psychology.

From the quantitative perspective: There were 1,300 registrants (300 more than last year), 47 exhibitor booths (14

**President McGaugh Visits Top Washington Research Officials**

WASHINGTON - Mikhail Gorbachev and Nelson Mandela were not the only dignitaries to take the nation's Capital by storm this Spring. Long before Gorby made the scene, APS President James L. McGaugh set the pace in a whirlwind series of meetings with leaders of the federal government's research establishment. Twenty-four hours later, the discipline of psychology had a new visibility in Washington.

President McGaugh was warmly welcomed by the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS) and other top officials of the health research funding system, including the director, Lewis Judd, and deputy director, Alan Leshner, of the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) and the acting director, William Raub, of the National Institutes of Health (NIH). He also met with the head of the National Science Foundation's (NSF) Biological, Behavioral and Social Science Directorate, Mary Clutter.

The message carried to each of these meetings was simple, he said. "APS is new on the scene, and we have a very specific purpose — which is to represent psychological research on a national level."

McGaugh told the federal officials: "We have the information and the network of resources needed to help plan..."
BUSINESS AS USUAL

James L. Mcgaugh
President, APS

For those of you who were unable to attend the APS convention in Dallas I am happy to report that we had a remarkably successful meeting. The meeting was well-attended (over 1300 participants!) and the program was superb. Our thanks are due to Ann Howard, Jim Kalat, and David Olton for planning the program and to Ellen Kimmel for handling all of the local arrangements. And, of course, Alan Kraut and the APS staff did a very professional job of managing the convention.

The APS Board and the Washington Office staff have already started to plan for the third (yes, third) convention which will be held in Washington, DC, June 13-17, 1991. We are very pleased that Jim Kalat has agreed to serve as program chair for the 1991 convention. It is not too early to think about suggestions for next year’s program. The Board hopes you will be pleased to know that the 1992 convention will be held on the West Coast. We will select the city and hotel(s) for that convention after determining hotel costs and available dates as well as estimated travel costs.

It is also not too early to think about nominations for the APS Board and President. My term of office, as well as that of half of the APS Board will end next year at the end of the convention. The Nominations Committee is chaired this year by Kay Deaux. A call for nominations appears in this issue of the Observer. Please respond to this request.

Note that these remarks convey a “business as usual” spirit. Remarkably, in a very short period of time our organization — through the efforts and dedication of its members, Board, and staff — has become well-established. Our membership has continued to grow, as we expected it would. Our continued growth is, of course, essential for our continued effectiveness.

This brings me to my final point. It is a simple fact that running a national scientific organization costs money. Our annual dues are, as we know, our major source of funds. The Board has pledged to keep the dues low and has made every effort to keep the costs of running APS at a minimum. Nonetheless, we need more funds to support our programs. At the convention in Alexandria I asked that you take the “McGaugh Pledge” to work to double the APS membership. And, you did.

I now ask that you reaffirm your commitment to this pledge (or to take it for the first time). There are still many psychological scientists who have not yet joined APS. If each of us will make the effort to get one new member we could easily double our membership once again by the time we meet in Washington next June. Let’s make every effort to do it so we can continue with our important “business as usual.”
and implement the nation's research agenda. We are 10,000 members strong, and we expect to be able to help in developing the federal research initiatives of these agencies.”

McGaugh said afterward that he and APS Executive Director Alan Kraut were “very well received” in their visits. He noted the “keen interest” in APS’s existence, and felt in each case that there was an “immediate rapprochement” concerning the mutual interests of the agencies and psychological science.

On a personal note, McGaugh said he was a bit overwhelmed when HHS Secretary Louis Sullivan started their meeting by expressing his congratulations on McGaugh’s pending installation as a member of the National Academy of Sciences.

Upon receiving McGaugh and Kraut in his suite of offices in the Hubert H. Humphrey Building, Secretary Sullivan wasted no time in indicating his awareness of APS and the contributions that psychology has made to the nation’s health research agenda. Topics ranged from APS’s beginnings and rapid growth, to health promotion, smoking, drug abuse, social psychological research, AIDS, behavioral neuroscience, and prevention versus treatment.

At the meeting’s conclusion, Secretary Sullivan made a point of saying he was tracking NIH’s progress in expanding its health and behavior research activities, and he hoped that APS members would be encouraged by NIH’s efforts to plan behavioral research from a longer term perspective.

Later that day McGaugh and Kraut brought Sullivan’s views on health and behavior research to NIH Acting Director Raub in a meeting that touched on animal research, the placement of psychologists on NIH Advisory Committees, and offers of mutual support on both the federal and APS sides. Also included in the meeting were representatives of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD), the National Institute on Aging (NIA), the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute (NHLBI), the National Center for Nursing Research, and the National Institute on Neurological Diseases and Stroke (NINDS). These institutes are the major sources of support within NIH for behavioral and social science research.

In a meeting that seemed more like a reunion, old friends NIMH Director Lew Judd and Deputy Director Alan Leshner congratulated McGaugh on the rapid growth of the Society. They acknowledged APS as a leading actor in generating support for the NIMH budget, and offered their appreciation for the informal recruiting that APS has done in trying to bring senior psychologists to Washington to help direct NIMH’s new Division of Basic Brain and Behavioral Sciences.

At NSF, discussion turned to historical funding trends of psychological research, and whether changes in where psychology was administratively housed at NSF — whether in a new separate directorate, or remaining in the Biological, Behavioral and Social Science Directorate — would alleviate those funding problems. According to NSF Assistant Director Mary Clutter, NSF’s current position is to make no major changes for psychology, neither structural or funding.

The Observer Has Moved

The APS Observer has moved to its permanent home at APS Headquarters in Washington, DC. Beginning with this issue, Lee Herring is the editor of the Observer. He can be reached at:

APS Observer
1511 K Street, NW, Suite 345
Washington, DC 20005-1401
Tel: 202-783-2077
Fax: 202-783-2083
BITNET: APSKLH@UMUC
more than last year), a half-dozen members of the national media, 27 symposia and discussions including several multidisciplinary sessions, 2 debates, 14 invited addresses, a special “family night” session on primate research, over 450 research posters displayed in 8 poster sessions over 3 days, a special poster/reception session on federal funding featuring 20 representatives of federal research agencies or programs, numerous receptions, an 11-film Public Broadcasting System film festival, a rousing “Ranch Party,” and untold numbers of reacquaintances among fellow psychologists.

In spite of these impressive numbers and without creating a sense of crowding, all sessions and meetings were housed in the same hotel, all on one floor! The setting was a perfect environment for the intimate scholarly exchange that permeated the meeting.

Eleanor Maccoby of Stanford University kicked off the highly energetic convention with a Keynote Address on explanatory approaches to gender differentiation (see related story). The receptive audience enjoyed her concise synopsis of gender socialization research and resonated to her delivery style.

Convention Committee Chair Ann Howard, Convention Committee members James Kalat and David Olton, and organizers Ellen Kimmel, Murray Benimoff, APS staff, and numerous others who made the convention so successful received a generous and well-deserved showing of appreciation by attendees of the APS business meeting.

APS Staff Writer Don Kent contributed the following stories on the convention sessions. This is necessarily a mere sampling of the available sessions. Future issues of the Observer will contain more such stories. Readers will get, hopefully, a sense of the breadth of topics presented at the convention.

APS in Good Condition, McGaugh Tells Members

“It’s easy to talk about the state of APS because it’s in good state,” APS President James McGaugh told a large crowd attending the APS business meeting at the convention.

“Membership has doubled in a year, and we are a 10-K member organization right now,” he said. “But we think there are probably as many as 25,000 people like us who should belong to this organization.”

McGaugh cited the opening of APS’s Washington office, the launching of the journal Psychological Science, the “jazzy, sexy new format of the Observer newsletter, and APS’s highly successful second summit meeting which brought together 65 scientific psychological organizations to discuss a national research agenda.”

“So the good news is we have grown, we’re healthy, and everything looks good. But this is tempered by the knowledge that there are more people out there that we have not yet reached . . . . The original APS joiners were the valiant, the foolhardy, the enterprising . . . now it’s time for us to talk to those folks who [are] sitting on the side . . . . because we have plenty of things . . . . to indicate we’re an established organization that’s going to be around for a long time.”

Elections and the Next Convention

McGaugh noted upcoming elections for a new president and three board members, with nominations due by October 1 (see the Announcements section of this Observer issue).

He discussed the site options (Toronto versus Washington, DC) for the next convention. Since then, Washington has been selected due to many complicated points McGaugh noted at the business meeting. While it is APS policy to move the convention around geographically, next year, by exception, APS will go to Washington, DC. He emphasized that it certainly is not APS policy to have Washington as the site every other year.

McGaugh stated the support for this decision rested on: a potentially negative impact on the closely scheduled Canadian Psychological Association meeting in Toronto; logistical advantages of having
Maccoby: Children Are ‘Ruthless Stereotypers’

“Americans should continue with the exhilarating task of thinking through what we truly want ourselves and our opposite sex partners to be,” Keynote Speaker Eleanor Maccoby urged at the opening session of the APS convention. We have a wide range of possibilities about what the norms and range of models can be that we present to children for their adoption,” she said.

“There is no reason to believe that we have come anywhere near the limits of change that are possible,” she said in a crackling survey of dozens of studies of gender differentiation and sweeping examination of theories to explain differing gender styles and personality.

Children’s self-socialization may be the most powerful force in sextyping, Maccoby said, more powerful perhaps than the family. “When it comes to stereotyped sex behavior, children more and more put on the cultural cloak that is provided by the society they are growing up in. They use the basic categories of ‘male’ and ‘female’ as hooks on which to hang a great deal of culmulative information . . .”

Stereotypes: Ramming Games To Social Gains

“Children from the age of six to ten are simply ruthless stereotypers. And I’m not sure there is a lot we can do to prevent it, except by changing the models and the values in the pictures that we present to children to develop their stereotypes from. In the first two years there is very little differentiation in the ways boys and girls develop, Maccoby said. In the third year, spontaneous sex segregation begins, then from three to five there is a rapid increase in segregation. Boys and girls then have different types of play — boys are rougher, with more loud shouting, more interested in dominance, and they like vehicles.

“On wheeled vehicles boys (3 to 5) play ramming games while girls ride around and try not to bump into each other,” Maccoby said. Girls tend to interact more and have two primary

SEE MCCOBY ON NEXT PAGE

APS’s new office and newly formed staff in Washington; and the financial savings for the Society. In the following year the convention will occur somewhere on the West Coast, he said.

McGaug then introduced Alan Kraut, Executive Director of the APS Washington office, who described the first days of the Washington office last autumn when there were only two staff.

Bigger Staff

Today the APS office has grown to six staff members besides Kraut, and he introduced them at the meeting.

“Even though we only opened in late August last year, we had an impact on this current year’s appropriations for psychological research,” Kraut said. “We worked with the Senate to instruct the National Institute of Mental Health to initiate new programs aimed at increasing logical research,” Kraut said. “We

He noted meetings with Louis Sullivan, Secretary of Health and Human Services, and with almost every high-level official in Washington who deals with psychological science. Kraut also described efforts to make the National Science Foundation more cognizant of the importance of behavioral research.

Budget

APS Treasurer Milton Hakel cited the phenomenal growth of APS and reported the Board had adopted a budget for $900,000 for this year. Revenue through May has been $670,000, with better than 70 percent of it from dues, and the revenue is tracking well with the budget.

He said membership renewals were nearly 90 percent. Members will soon see a membership directory — provided free to those who paid their dues before November 11 — which will be available for purchase.

“The services the society is providing are extremely impressive, and we need that kind of a budget and support and membership and growth to be able to continue to do it,” Hakel said.

Summit

Janet Spence reported on the APS summit of 65 psychology organizations in Tucson on the theme “Shall Psychology Establish a National Research Agenda?” From the start of the meeting “it was obviously ‘yes’ and the busy and active two days were devoted to the shape it should take and what it should look like,” Spence said. An interim steering committee has been appointed as an outcome of the summit, of which Spence is co-chair. She called for any good ideas on how to conceptualize and draft an agenda representing the concerns and needs of the 65 societies involved.

Students Report

The business meeting heard from Kathy Chwalisz, Past-President, and Kenn White, President, of the 3,500-member APS student affiliates group.
Maccoby

(From Previous Page)

objectives — to get their own way and to maintain social interaction — whereas “social interaction among boys seems more to have the single agenda of self-assertion.”

Handling Feedback

Looking at how men and women respond to evaluative feedback concerning something they have done, Maccoby noted: “Women consider the feedback . . . as informative. If they are told they didn’t do well they tend to believe it and think they had better change their ways. If they are told they did well they increase their estimates of how well they are going to do the next time.

“For men, positive feedback increases their self-confidence, and so does negative feedback. They tend to interpret it as a challenge, and sometimes question the motives [of the evaluator],” she said.

Intimate Pairs

In romantically involved couples, “dominance of men over women diminishes very noticeably. Students of power in intimate relations have practically thrown up their hands trying to determine who has more power between a long-married husband and wife . . . . The fact is that when a couple forms a team and develops joint objectives and joint plans so that each one’s achievements feel like achievement as well for the other, for the team, this kind of joining of goals makes power issues very much more irrelevant. Nevertheless, there are certain things about their interactive styles that each have developed earlier in same-sex groups that continue to be apparent to some degree, with men using more direct forms of influence and women using more indirect ones,” she said.

Socialization

Maccoby explored the main theoretical approaches to gender differentiation, starting with socialization explanations. “I think every psychologist has a kind of underlying assumption that much of what we have been talking about is the result of ‘socialization’ in some sense” Maccoby said. “And if you consider cross-cultural differences in the way people of the two sexes behave, it is obvious that culture has a profound impact on what is passed on from one generation to another . . . but we need to ask ourselves through what processes and at what ages.”

Social learning theories point to direct socialization pressures (through reinforcement and punishment and management of children’s environment) and indirect or observational learning (e.g., observing life, television, reading) about what is appropriate for one’s own sex. “I believe that the child’s spontaneous adoption of sex-appropriate behavior, is a very powerful process, perhaps the most powerful one,” she said.

Teasing

Maccoby focused on the way boys tease and isolate effeminate boys. “Where does that come from?” she asked. “Many of us have made an implicit assumption that it must be derivative, that boys were already socialized in their homes to be a certain way and then they are passing it on to their playmates. I think we ought to examine that assumption, because I believe that the pressure from boys is stronger than what comes from parents . . . boys are reinforcing each other to a greater degree than parents. So it’s even possible that what fathers are doing is derivative and what peers are doing is the primary pressure.”

Freudian Theory Slips

Maccoby summarized the psychanalytic assertion that gender personality structure is not to be taken for granted, that it must be achieved. Human beings, Freud thought, are bi-sexual to some degree and there is pressure toward gender differentiation. Another psychoanalytic theme is children’s pre-Oedipal (i.e., during the first two years of age) sexualized love for their mother.

Stating that most developmentalists would not embrace these tenets, Maccoby said “the development of sex-type behavior in children is not related to whether they have discovered the genital differences between sexes. Their coding of gender in others need not be based upon genital knowledge at all. It precedes it in many cases. Developmentalists doubt that there is any merging of ego boundaries between mother and child. I must say that Freud and many of his followers never observed mother-child interaction . . . . Psychoanalytic theory doesn’t offer much help in attempting to understand the development of sex typing.”

Biological Factors

Calling them the “hard part,” Maccoby reviewed the evolutionary and biological explanatory viewpoints. She assumed most scientists have moved “beyond any attempt to determine whether any piece of behavior is innate or learned, or to portion it out by percent learned and percent innate. That would be . . . like asking whether the area of a rectangle was due to its length or its width.”

“Everything we do is jointly determined by species characteristics and what we have learned. Indeed, the capacity to learn is one of our species characteristics. I don’t think, however, that any of us would be outraged by the thought that there are three biological imperatives that ought to influence our behavior: (1) striving to survive to reproductive maturity as individuals, (2) striving to reproduce, and (3) striving to rear offspring to their reproductive maturity. These are the three sociobiological big points.

“Now as far as individual survival is concerned there really isn’t an awful lot of reason, it seems to me, why the characteristics that support that should differ by sex. I believe that for the most part they don’t . . . . “I think it’s reasonable that reproductive strategies should be different — and parenting behavior as well — between the two sexes, because of the fact that we are mammals and women give birth and men don’t . . . . “Male reproductive strategy, we have often been told, is to impregnate as many females as possible as often as possible. That is Strategy A, and it does pay off under certain conditions . . . . But there is also Strategy B, widespread in many lower species in which males cooperate with females in raising young . . . . “Across species reproductive strategy and parental investment are closely linked in males. Monogamy goes with high parental investment in the young. So evolutionary theory tells us . . . males biologically are multi-potential when it comes to parental investment. Much less variation would be expected among

Continued on Next Page
Psychologists Report on Brain Research Progress

"Work of psychologists in understanding brain mechanisms of learning and memory is progressing rapidly — we are doing our share of the progress in this the Decade of the Brain," APS President James McGaugh said wrapping up the presentations of four speakers in the Presidential Symposium on the brain at the APS June convention. The presenters included Larry Squire, Univ. of California–San Diego; Daniel Schachter, Univ. of Arizona; Michela Gallagher, Univ. of North Carolina; and Gary Lynch, Univ. of California-Irvine.

Amnesia and Hippocampal Research

Squire recounted research with amnesia patients, pointing out numerous tasks that they are "not just good at, but completely normal at." Though they lack explicit or declarative memory that handles facts and events, their implicit or nondeclarative memory remains intact, providing a vast collection of abilities, skills and habits. By examining such patients, Squire and his colleagues have been able to approach fundamental problems of patient diagnostic classification and patient differences.

"But most of what we are learning about the anatomy of memory and will continue to learn over the next decade is coming from the animal model of amnesia." Squire said. "This work has led us to the conclusion that the hippocampus is a critical component of the medial temporal lobe memory system, the amygdala is not an important part, and other anatomically related parts play an important part in the function that is damaged in amnesia," he continued.

Cognitive Research

Daniel Schachter, known for his application of cognitive principles to studying brain females and it would be more uniformly high. We could expect, I think, that the social structures of the world's societies would be more often designed to induce or coerce males into making parental investment, especially if resources were scarce, and that societies would rely mainly on women for child rearing . . . ."

Is Biology Destiny?

"Given this congruence between patterns of gender differentiation identified in sociobiology, am I concluding that biology is destiny? By no means. The main deficiency with [the biology as destiny] view is its failure to account for the vast variations across human society and among people within the same society in the roles and behaviors of a given sex.

"Sex roles are clearly highly malleable through social forces. Although there may be some biological predispositions that underlie early differences in play styles, early preferences for same-sex playmates, early toy preferences, and even early asymmetries in the directions of influence between the two sexes, children very soon arrive at the age when they know their own gender. They know that of others. And then the powerful forces of self-socialization come into play." "

Aging and Memory

Gallagher spoke about her work on animal models for age-related changes in learning and memory. She said that the combination of behavioral and psychological

See Brain on Next Page

Larry Squire discusses anatomical structures important in memory.

Daniel Schachter discusses cognitive research and related brain structures for memory.
Blushing: When and Why
The Face Turns Red

What are you thinking about my behavior? If I think you're thinking I might blush, I'll probably do so.

Embarrassment depends more upon what we think others are thinking of us than on what we are thinking about ourselves, Rowland Miller of Sam Houston University told an APS convention audience.

Social esteem — the evaluation of others — is certainly the dominant source of embarrassment but not the sole source, he said. Issues of self-esteem and awkwardness also count, but to a lesser degree.

Mark Leary, paired with Miller in the symposium, said however that the social esteem model, which he also uses, does not quite answer the question of why people blush.

“It tells us when people blush, but not why they blush,” Leary said. What Leary and his colleagues (Jack Rejeski and Thomas Britt) at Wake Forest University wanted to explore was what could possibly be the function of blood rushing to our faces when we become concerned with what other people think.

Charles Darwin was one of the first scientists to address the question. He somewhat uncharacteristically said blushing has no function, Leary noted. He saw it simply as an accidental physiological by-product of self-attention — that when you think about certain parts of your body, blood rushes to those parts, contracting the arteries to those parts.

Darwin Blushes

“I think if Darwin were here today he’d be blushing about that explanation,” Leary said. Odd as Darwin’s explanation may be, it’s not as odd as some psychoanalytical explanations, Leary stated. The most common one says that blushing is repressed exhibitionism, he added — that persons want to expose their genitals but the superego makes them hold back, and so the blood goes from their genitals to their face.

“That makes blushing a form of facial flushing,” he said. But Leary preferred his own simpler explanation: “I think it is an appeasement gesture. It is a non-verbal behavior that occurs when we perform a behavior that might otherwise result in our being devalued, rejected, excluded by other people.

“It’s very much like a non-verbal apology. It symbolizes, ‘Oops, you’ve caught me in this transgression; I’m really sorry, and I really do believe in the rule that I violated but I goofed up; Please forgive me.’”

Only in Public

“It’s important to note blushing always occurs in public, in front of other people. When you’re by yourself, no matter how stupid you behave, no matter how shamefully you act or how incompetent you are, you don’t blush.”

What this suggests is that blushing has some form of communicative function, Leary said. It is similar to the appeasement displays of monkeys and other primates of which he gave several examples.

Blushing does serve to appease people, Leary said, citing experimental studies that show forgiveness from others comes more easily following blushing.

Leary said his group had created a blushing propensity scale and examined individual differences in blushing.

Now they are looking at the question of why people blush when they are accused of blushing.

“It seems odd, because you can’t induce most other emotional expression — you can’t say people are crying and make them cry. But those data will have to wait for another time,” he said.
Aging: Glucose-Memory Relationship

Hormonal Regulators Are Memory Storage Link

In an entertaining invited address at the APS convention, University of Virginia psychologist Paul E. Gold described his systematic alternation between elderly human and rat populations in research on that phenomenon that debilitates all living creatures, biological aging. Checking results obtained with one species against those of the other and then extending the research to progressively refine his understanding of the hormonal (e.g., epinephrine) regulation of memory, Gold's ultimate message related to the role of glucose tolerance in age-related memory loss.

The glucose tolerance-aging relationship already established in aged humans and animals may soon yield ways to predict which young humans are at risk for more rapid development of memory deficits associated with aging.

"In elderly humans," Gold said, "what we noticed first is that on the day our subjects ingested glucose, the individual differences on memory scores were in fact related to the magnitude of the increase in blood glucose level. Then we looked at the same subjects on the saccharine day, on which they received no glucose at all. We compared this day's memory performance to the previous day's magnitude of blood glucose change following the glucose ingestion. In other words, we were looking at glucose tolerance level. We found exactly the same relationship. Thus, blood glucose regulation predicts memory performance in older subjects whether or not they exhibit memory enhancements from glucose.

"This allows us to characterize which old subjects are the ones that have the memory deficits. You can give older subjects a blood glucose tolerance test, rather than a memory enhancing drug and memory test, and know which old subjects have poor memory --- age related memory loss --- and which don't."

People to Rats

Gold said that "then we looked at old rats that had been tested for inhibitory avoidance performance 30 days earlier. We gave them a blood glucose tolerance test and plotted the magnitude of their blood glucose rise against their performance. We saw the same correlation in rats.

"Age-related memory loss is a characteristic of a various species — rats, people, even the sea slug. Memory loss is a biological fact of old populations. But within these populations are other ways to characterize these people and animals. One is to note that ones with poor glucose regulation are the ones with poor memory. Another is the correlation found in memory deficit subjects' patterns of paradoxical sleep. So we have different physiological measures and behavioral measures that characterize "aging" as distinct from "chronological age," and I think that is going to be important. With animals we can begin some longitudinal studies on blood glucose tolerance and memory deficit development with age."

"One guess is that young subjects who have poor glucose regulation become the old subjects with poor glucose regulation. If that's true, we can test it in a longitudinal design in young animals, give them blood glucose tolerance tests, and then watch their memory deteriorate with age. That may enable us to pick out young animals who are at risk for age-related memory deficits. That will be a big advantage for understanding aging research because we will be able to target those who are going to age biologically, not just chronologically.

"I've been impressed by the ease with which we can move between animal and human models. 'Model' may even be the wrong word. Aging is a biological fact, and it isn't that aged animals are a model of aging. They are the real thing. Such basic biological laws will be true both in humans and in animals, and the animal models will let us find them."
Estes and Graham Become APS William James Fellows

DALLAS - Two psychologists whose outstanding scientific achievements are lighting the directions of much current research in psychophysiology, mathematical psychology, attentional processes, and visual information processing were named William James Fellows at the June APS convention.

Frances K. Graham of the University of Delaware and William K. Estes of Harvard University were installed as fellows at a ceremony directed by APS President James McGaugh.

McGaugh characterized Estes as one of the giants of modern psychology and Graham as a pioneer who has significantly influenced research in physiological, developmental, cognitive and clinical psychology.

Perinatal Risk

Graham's early research in the late 1940s resulted in a test widely used to determine brain damage by testing performance in reproducing simple visual designs from memory. In the 1950s she launched a new line of research into perinatal risk, including low blood oxygenation during the first hour of life, showing the broad spectrum of deficits that perinatal events can produce.

In the mid-1960s she shifted attention to the orienting reflex, a form of passive attention reflected in autonomic changes. She found that heart rate slowed rather than accelerated when orienting was elicited. That spurred an upsurge in research on heart rate change. It also led to evidence of what she calls a defense reflex under intense stimuli that impairs sensory discrimination, and a startle reflex to sudden stimuli that interrupts ongoing activity.

Later she showed that the predominant mode of an infant's mental processing shifts in the first three months of life from a startle-defensive mode to an orienting mode, as the cortex matures. In the 1970s she initiated research into the reflex blink, which, like heart rate, can be studied across the lifespan in nonhuman, nonverbal, and sleeping subjects. The pioneering nature of her infant research and her contributions to understanding of the orienting response were cited in her installation as a member of the National Academy of Sciences (NAS) last year.

Cognitive Revolution

Estes, also a member of the NAS, is known to most APS members as the editor and creator of the Society's journal, Psychological Science, as well as for his rank as what James McGaugh termed "one of the giants of this era."

Estes played major roles both in founding modern mathematical psychology and in bringing about the cognitive revolution in experimental psychology. Artificial intelligence is deeply influenced by his research in mathematical learning theory, especially his stimulus sampling theory and resulting Markovian models.

In the mid-1960s his research shifted from learning to memory and information processing, particularly visual information processing. The APS Fellow citation said his work is characterized by extremely effective, deceptively simple models and much careful experimental probing.

Estes has helped shape national science policy, with the National Institutes of Health from 1964 to 1973 and at the National Research Council (NRC) as chair and senior consultant on major boards and committees through the 1980s. Since 1985 he has chaired the NRC's Committee on Prevention of Nuclear War.

All the News Is Fitting

Within psychology, APS has received a great deal of attention in its short life. Now, it seems there is a fair amount of interest outside of psychology. Witness the substantial amount of press coverage of APS in recent months, both in the popular press and science and education-oriented publications.

A June-27 feature article in The Chronicle of Higher Education, "18 months After Its Formation, Psychological Society Proves Its Worth to Behavioral-Science Researchers," was just the latest of a series of news stories about the American Psychological Society. The article focuses on the Society's origins, its rapid expansion, and the success of the recent APS convention in Dallas. While the article primarily discusses the impact of a separate organization for scientific psychology, it has an in-depth discussion of APS's successes in establishing a Washington presence. APS is described as "having a lot of clout."

In addition, APS has been the subject of articles in Science magazine, The Washington Post, USA Today, The Scientist, Science and Government Report, and stories by United Press International. In most instances, APS is portrayed as having been born of controversy but with a strong future. Other common topics are the growth of the Society and our journal Psychological Science.

Long after the formation of APS ceases to be news, however, we will continue to be visible in the public arena as a source of knowledge. APS is seen as representative of the best in psychology's scientific disciplines. Already, APS and its members are regularly featured in articles about research and about science policy issues in many of the publications noted above.

The most recent example is an article in Fortune magazine (July 2, 1990) on the Civil Rights Act of 1990, which quotes an APS letter to U.S. Senator Ted Kennedy concerning the Act's impact on employment evaluation procedures.
John Guthrie: APS Now 10,000 (Members Strong)

"I've never won a game of luck in my life, but I guess this would have to be it. I've become a kind of celebrity, too, it seems," said University of Maryland psychologist John Guthrie in a recent telephone interview. Guthrie became a part of APS history in late June when membership records revealed he had become APS's 10,000th member.

To commemorate the event, APS President James McGaugh telephoned Guthrie to congratulate him on being a part of this membership milestone for APS. Guthrie expressed surprise, especially since he had been "sitting on the sidelines for a while before joining APS, waiting to see whether anything significant would come of this new organization."

"I wanted a renewal of identity with psychological groups... and this was something other psychological organizations could not satisfy," he responded when asked why he finally decided to join APS.

Basic Research on Information Search

Guthrie’s personal research interests relate to the psychology of literacy. Focusing on information processing studies of real-world activities that investigate what he calls "document literacy," the ability to obtain needed information from written and graphical sources, Guthrie wants to determine the basic strategies people use in such tasks.

Using both field and laboratory studies, he expects the results to be useful in determining the feasibility of designing, and how to design, instructional methods for teaching effective information acquisition strategies across types of information sources. Guthrie has developed a cognitive information processing model currently being tested empirically with experiments and with computer simulation of tasks. While not simulating the cognitive processes themselves, the simulations are designed to help delineate problem solving approaches and track the "search" process by which people scrutinize sources for specific information relevant to the accomplishment of a task.

Basic Research Applications: National and International Literacy

Guthrie’s work has particular relevance to the area of assessment. He will be involved in the development of the document reading test that will be part of the National Assessment of Educational Progress 1992 test.

An international literacy study involving 40 countries and the United States will consume some of Guthrie’s research focus in the near future and will examine and compare narrative, document, and expository literacy within and across these countries. One objective of the research will be the eventual development of enhancements of teaching strategies for reading.

Research Administrator and Service Director Helping Young Researchers

In addition to his teaching and research activities within the Department of Human Development, since 1984, Guthrie has directed a unique faculty research support unit, the Center for Educational Research and Development, in the University of Maryland’s College of Education. The research support unit is an internal, competitive, research grant program that provides seed money to new assistant professors among the 150-person faculty of the College. Working as the liaison to the faculty committee that makes the funding decisions, Guthrie monitors research progress and manages the grants program which is intended to support faculty research productivity. The program is supported by the university’s “designated research initiative,” earmarked funds for entering faculty.

Related to his literacy and quantitative research interests is his management of the information retrieval services (online database access) for the 7-department College. Overseeing some 14 research service programs, including the provision of statistical consulting and assistance, Guthrie also manages a program that supports research conferences and visiting scholars.

Guthrie is an educational psychologist by training, having received his PhD from the University of Illinois. He is a Fellow of Division 15 (Educational Psychology) of the American Psychological Association.
In 1916, the distinguished psychologist Dr. Robert M. Yerkes wrote the following in Science: “I am wholly convinced that the various medical sciences and medical practices have vastly more to gain... than any considerable number of medical experts can imagine from the persistent and ingenious use of the monkeys and the anthropoid apes in experimental inquiry.”

“Likewise, I am convinced,” he also wrote, “that education and all other forms of social service will profit immeasurably from experimental studies of the fundamental instincts of the other primates and from thorough investigation of the forms of habit formation and of the characteristics of social relations...”

Fourteen years later, in 1930, Yale University, the Rockefeller Foundation and the Carnegie Foundation provided funds to establish the Yale Laboratories of Primate Biology in Orange Park, FL. Dr. Yerkes, Professor of Psychobiology at Yale University, was the first director of the laboratories, known today as the Yerkes Regional Primate Research Center of Emory University.

Upon Dr. Yerkes’s retirement, the institute was renamed the Yerkes Laboratories of Primate Biology in honor of Dr. Yerkes’s leadership and contributions to science. The Yerkes Center’s seventh and current director, Dr. Frederick A. King, is a psychologist and neuroscientist who shares Dr. Yerkes’s commitment to both behavioral and biomedical primate research.

Sixty Years of Science

This year, the Yerkes Center marks its 60th year as a scientific institute dedicated to the improvement of human health and well-being; the advancement of fundamental knowledge of primate behavior, biology, and care; and the conservation and improvement of the quality of life of all primate species.

Today, the Center is a division of Emory University’s Robert W. Woodruff Health Sciences Center, in Atlanta, GA, and is one of seven Regional Primate Research Centers sponsored by the National Institutes of Health (NIH). The NIH primate centers program, established by an act of the U.S. Congress in 1960, enabled the transfer of the laboratories from Orange Park to the Emory campus. In 1956, ownership of the laboratories was transferred from Yale to Emory University.

Yerkes research is conducted at four facilities in metro Atlanta:

- **Yerkes Main Station**, the site of most of the Center’s biomedical studies and several specialized laboratories, including a Scanning Electron Microscopy and X-ray Microanalysis unit that ranks as one of the best and most powerful of its kind in the world, and an Excimer Laser unit for ophthalmic research on refractive surgery;

- **Yerkes Field Station**, a unique 117-acre facility where social behavior and its biological bases are studied in several species of primate social groups that live in large outdoor enclosures with attached indoor shelters for inclement weather;

- **Language Research Center**, jointly operated by Georgia State University and the Yerkes Center, for linguistic, cognitive and neuropsychological studies of primates, particularly the great apes, and for research that benefits children with severe mental retardation who have problems in communication; and

- **Zoo Atlanta**, where 16 gorillas and a number of orangutans are on loan from Yerkes for exhibit as well as conservation and reproductive and social behavior research.

Size and Growth of Yerkes Center

The Yerkes Center, fully accredited by the American Association for the Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care, also has collaborative research programs with 20 institutions throughout the United States and other nations. The international collaborations range from the Pasteur Institute in France, for studies related to AIDS, to the National Museums of Kenya, for conservation and ecological programs.

Approximately 2,600 primates, representing 15 species, constitute the Yerkes colony, the only research collection in the world that includes gorillas, orangutans, common chimpanzees, bonobo chimpanzees, and gibbons, in addition to 10 species of monkeys. Over the past decade, the primate population has more than doubled as a result of births and growth of breeding colonies at the Center.

Perhaps the best index of the Center’s growth, over the same decade, has been the faculty: 10 years ago it totaled 58 investigators. Today, 185 scientists conduct research at Yerkes. The increase is due to the participation of investigators based at Emory, and other universities and research institutions across the nation. More than 148 affiliate and collaborative scientists depend on the Yerkes Center for its resources and scientific and primate expertise. Chief among the resources are...
Basic Science and Its Applications

Behavioral Science

Behavioral science is particularly important at Yerkes. Behavioral Biology is the Center's second largest research division according to number of scientists, but it ranks first in the number of primates studied. Other divisions are Neurobiology, Pathobiology and Immunobiology, Reproductive Biology, and Veterinary Medicine.

The Division of Behavioral Biology is sufficiently large and diverse in research interests that three sections of specialization were created during the past year: General Psychobiology and Psychopharmacology, Behavioral Neuroendocrinology and Social Behavior, and Language and Cognition.

Language, Cognition, and Vocalization

Throughout its history, the Yerkes Center has been particularly strong in the area of primate cognition. At the American Psychological Society’s annual meeting, in June, 1990, Yerkes scientists Drs. Duane Rumbaugh and Sue Savage-Rumbaugh were the featured speakers for the “Science and the Family” program in which they described their studies at the Language Research Center on the ability of common and bonobo chimpanzees to acquire and use a symbolic language. In a separate session, Dr. Mary Ann Romski of the Language Research Center spoke about the augmented language system—developed from Yerkes studies with chimpanzees—that can provide communication skills to many children who are severely mentally retarded.

While the Language Research Center scientists focus on a language of graphic symbols, scientists at the Yerkes Field Station have been studying vocal communication of primates. Drs. Harold Gouzoules and Sarah Gouzoules recently found that female juvenile pigtail macaque monkeys are more proficient than male counterparts in making recruitment calls, vocalizations that elicit support from the caller’s allies. By analyzing the wave patterns of the vocalizations, as well as the social context of the calls, the Gouzoules determined that sex differences exist in vocal performance or competence, similar to those that may occur in human children.

The Yerkes study was the first to demonstrate that male and female monkeys differ in vocal proficiency, a finding that suggests parallels with the human sex differences in the development of communicative competence. The primates may provide a model for the evolutionary precursors of human language.

Sexual Behavior

Behavioral studies on topics ranging from aggression to reproduction also are conducted at the Field Station. The Field Station provides an opportunity for psychologists and students to study social groups of living primates exhibiting behavior that is similar in many respects to that of their counterparts in the wild. One advantage of a field station over the natural, wild habitat is the ability to observe and access the primates 24 hours a day if necessary. The Field Station also allows scientists to obtain blood samples in order to determine hormonal and other biological influences on behavior.

For example, Yerkes scientist Thomas P. Gordon found that the reproductive behavior of rhesus macaques living in a social group is tightly linked with cyclic hormonal changes, and that female rhesus macaques confine their mating activity to the peri-ovulatory period. The results contradict previous findings from other laboratories that seemed to indicate that primates are free of the hormonal influences on behavior that exist in lower mammals and that their mating occurred throughout the menstrual cycle.

Based on Professor Gordon's studies, Yerkes scientist Dr. Kim Wallen initiated studies with direct relevance to the treatment of women who need hormone replacement therapies and to the medical understanding of the psychological effects of hormonal contraceptives.

His studies were among the first to show in primates that ovarian hormones have psychological effects on sexual desire and motivation. He found that the cyclic hormonal changes responsible for ovulation also influence the social interactions of the female. At mid-cycle, at or near ovulation and increased fertility, the female rhesus monkey spends significantly more time than at any other time of the cycle approaching the male monkey and staying near him. Changing her proximity to the male is the primary behavioral cue the female uses to communicate sexual interest.

Menopause, Hormone Replacement, And Contraception

These striking increases in the female’s sexual initiation were found by Dr. Wallen to be strongly associated with increases in the hormone estradiol, but were unrelated to changes in the hormone testosterone. The lack of an apparent role for testosterone in regulating female sexual interest is relevant to hormonal therapies given to post-menopausal women and females who have undergone hysterectomy. In addition to estrogen, these therapies have used testosterone based on the perhaps false belief that testosterone was the hormone that influences libido in both men and women.

When estradiol production in the female monkey is suppressed, Dr. Wallen discovered, her distinctive peri-ovulatory behavioral pattern disappears. Hormonal contraceptives currently under development have exactly the same hormonal
consequences for the human female’s ovarian cycle. This research illustrates the importance of assessing the psychological side-effects of potential hormonal contraceptives in addition to the physiological effects.

Revealing Cocaine’s Hazards

Not all Yerkes behavioral studies occur at the Field Station or Language Research Center. The Main Station is the site of Dr. Larry Byrd’s behavioral pharmacology studies with squirrel monkeys that helped to demonstrate that cocaine and other psychoactive drugs can dramatically increase heart rate, blood pressure, and body temperature to unsafe, and indeed, deadly levels. Current studies with monkeys focus on agents that can help humans recover from cocaine addiction or that might prevent such addiction.

Increasing Primate Reproductive Success

Also headquartered at the Main Station is a behavioral study by psychologist Dr. Kim Bard to identify factors that predict the socio-sexual behavior of infant and young chimpanzees. Once these factors are understood, intervention strategies that will maximize normal development in all chimpanzees in captivity may be possible. These studies, which use the Brazleton Neonatal Assessment Scale, are part of the National Chimpanzee Breeding and Research Program, sponsored by NIH, to ensure a self-sustaining population of chimpanzees for the future.

Indeed, many of the Yerkes Center’s behavioral studies have provided knowledge that has added to the quality of primate care, social life, and the breeding of primates, particularly the endangered gorillas. In addition to improving scientific understanding of primate reproduction, Dr. Ronald Nadler’s unique studies on hormonal regulation of mating in great apes have provided zoological parks with information important to the optimal care and socialization of these species.

Medical Science

Research in the medical sciences has increased dramatically in part as a consequence of the Center having become a division of Emory’s Robert W. Woodruff Health Sciences Center when it moved to the Emory campus in 1965. Noteworthy achievements in the fields of AIDS, Parkinson’s disease, periodontal disease, infertility, fertility control, atherosclerosis, and cataracts and other visual problems of children and adults have occurred recently at Yerkes.

"Dr. Yerkes’s predictions about the value of primate research certainly have been proven to be valid,” said Dr. King. “Based on past experience, I am confident that in the coming years much, much more will be learned through primate research and applied to a wide range of fields in human behavioral and medical sciences.”

COUNCIL OF UNDERGRADUATE PSYCHOLOGY PROGRAMS

New Organization for Chairs and Directors of Undergraduate Psychology Programs

For several years, a group of interested individuals has been meeting with the aim of establishing a national organization for undergraduate department chairs and directors of undergraduate psychology programs. The expectation is that this group would be similar in function to the Council of Graduate Departments of Psychology (COGDOM) and, like COGDOM, independent of APA and APS.

Last year, by-laws for the Council of Undergraduate Psychology Programs (CUPP) were approved, thereby establishing the organization. Its purposes are:

• to promote the development of undergraduate psychology by providing a forum for discussion of matters of interest and concern to undergraduate programs in psychology.
• to promote effective leadership of undergraduate psychology programs by providing a forum for undergraduate psychology chairpersons and program directors to exchange ideas, and
• to interact with and to make recommendations to appropriate officers, boards, and committees of national and regional professional psychological associations, representatives of government agencies, foundations, and other organizations and persons on topics relevant to the interests and activities of undergraduate programs in psychology.

CUPP is now calling for charter members. Departments with undergraduate programs in psychology, in institutions accredited by their regional accrediting association, are eligible for membership on the Council. Normally, the representative of the member department or its equivalent is the chairperson of the department or the director of the undergraduate program. The annual membership fee is $25.00. For information and an application form, write to Norine Jalbert, Acting Secretary-Treasurer, Dept. of Psychology, Western Connecticut State University, Danbury, CT 06810.

Two CUPP events have been scheduled for members and interested persons in conjunction with the APA Annual Convention in Boston:
• a social hour on Saturday, August 11, from 6:00-6:50 pm in the Maine Room of the Boston Marriott Copley Place Hotel, and
• a business meeting on Sunday, August 12, from 9:00-10:50 am in Room 301 of the Hynes Convention Center.
National Research Council Solicits Comments on Data Confidentiality

Many users of federal statistics are aware of the balance that must be struck between protecting the confidentiality of information provided by persons and businesses for statistical purposes and the need to make publically collected data widely available for legitimate research and statistical uses.

In search of new ways to deal with this issue, the Committee on National Statistics and the Social Science Research Council, with support from several federal agencies, have convened a Panel on Confidentiality and Data Access. As part of its two-year study, the Panel, which had its first meeting in December, 1989, will be compiling relevant information from both producers and users of federal statistics.

The scope of this panel study includes publicly supported statistical data collection activities on individuals and establishments, such as censuses, surveys, administrative record data (when used for statistical purposes), and epidemiological studies. Data from clinical trials, while very important, will not be considered in this study. There are some special issues associated with clinical trial data that would require a separate study focusing on the bioethical aspects of confidentiality and data access.

Readers are invited to submit short statements on any or all of the following subjects:

Access problems. Specific examples of instances where federal agency confidentiality laws or policies have made it impossible for you or your colleagues to obtain data needed in your work or caused excessive delays in arranging for access to the data. Please indicate the sources and specific kinds of data desired and the purposes for which the data were needed.

Suggestions for improving access. Have you had any experience in obtaining access to data not disclosed for general public use? How was this arranged? Do you have suggestions for improving data access with appropriate safeguards to maintain confidentiality and without undue risk of adverse effects on public cooperation with censuses and surveys?

Persons or businesses harmed by disclosure. Do you know of any instances in which persons or businesses were harmed by unlawful or unintended disclosure of information they provided to the government under the condition that the information was to be used only for statistical purposes? How did this happen? What were the consequences? (This category differs from the first two in that statements need not be based on your own personal experience.)

Submit your statements to the Chair of the Panel on Confidentiality and Data Access: George T. Duncan, c/o Committee on National Statistics, National Research Council, 2101 Constitution Ave., NW, Washington DC 20418. If you have any questions, call Virginia de Wolf, Study Director 202-334-2550.
O’Leary Leaves Observer to Chair Indiana State Psychology Department

She was one of the pioneers, one of the early founders of the two-year-old APS. She helped nurture many APS institutions including the APS Observer, which she edited through the last issue. Last Fall, when APS was in need of help managing the newsletter, Virginia graciously assumed the role of Acting Editor. Now she will take the reins of the psychology department at Indiana State University beginning in August; she will be the first woman to chair the department.

But it isn’t likely to be the last APS will hear from Virginia O’Leary. She’s an APS Board Member-at-Large, a strong supporter of APS’s effort to forge a national research agenda for psychology, in conjunction with kindred organizations, and one of the principal creators, architects or — if you wish — one of the parents of the strapping organization that APS has become today.

Sounding like a proud parent, indeed, she recently said “There’s no question we’re a viable organization and that we have credibility as an important player on Capitol Hill and nationally. And, membership has grown beyond our greatest expectations,” she said.

Early APS History

Looking back to the night in February, 1987, when she and other science-oriented psychologists set the groundwork for what was to become the APS, O’Leary said:

“The issue was autonomy, pure and simple. All we really wanted was the kind of reorganization that would afford some real autonomy for science within the American Psychological Association.

“The science community was simply asking for an opportunity to pursue its own interests under the umbrella of organized psychology as a whole, but independent of many of the issues critical to the practice community.”

Not Without Data

“The other issue had to do with who speaks for psychology: If sometimes the clinical community wished to speak without the benefit of data, scientists felt strongly that something we should not be involved in. If they wanted to do that as assembly for practice that was all right. But they shouldn’t do that on behalf of all psychology. So the compromise we offered was: Look, you can speak as an assembly but not for all psychology.”

So ASAP was born, the Assembly of Scientific and Applied Psychology. Its goal at first was to get out the vote in favor of APA reorganization, not just from members of the scientific community but also the many clinicians who shared scientific values, O’Leary pointed out.

“We did a lot of mailing, a lot of telephoning, with all our energies directed towards promoting passage of the reorganization measure. It was the largest APA vote in history, but only 42 percent voted for reorganization, and a two-thirds majority was needed.”

APS Identity Package

Soon O’Leary was at work designing the identity package for the new and independent society — the logo, letterheads, membership promotions — and handling logistics for APS’s first annual convention at the doorsteps of Washington.

“With no budget, Jeannette Ickovics and I handled all the logistics — we negotiated the contracts, planned the receptions, and with the logistics office that Logan Wright was running we got such great response to the meeting that we had to move the site to accommodate all the registrants,” O’Leary said.

Then came the APS Observer.

“I saw the Observer as a monumental task, probably because I was doing numbers of other things for the Society in addition,” she said. “I was doing all of them simultaneously — along with marketing efforts to get psychology chairs to advertise their positions in the Observer, and promotions to get publishers interested in placing display ads.”

APS’s Future

O’Leary’s expectations for APS, are high but perhaps not unrealistic. “I see the future of scientific psychology strengthened enormously by the entry of APS onto the national scene. I think that having this strong national organization in place with its clear voice will make a difference in funding levels, and in relationships at the highest level. We’ve seen how Alan Kraut has already established very good working arrangements with Lew Judd of NIMH and others, and I think this means that scientific psychology will be more widely heard, better respected and more adequately responded to,” O’Leary said. ♦
WASHINGTON - “Only in Washington” is sometimes the best explanation for how things happen in this city. In that vein, only in Washington is it possible that a late afternoon congenial exchange between a Congressman and a witness might prove to be just the thing that ultimately results in the establishment of a separate directorate for behavioral and social science research at the National Science Foundation (NSF).

In this instance, the Congressman was Bob Traxler (D-MI), the powerful chairman of an appropriations subcommittee, and the witness was Alan Kraut, Executive Director of APS. The two were sitting face to face in one of the most intimate and stately rooms on Capitol Hill. It is in such prestigious chambers — deep in the tourist-free recesses of the Capitol building — that the true business of Washington has been conducted for nearly two centuries.

Kraut was appearing before Traxler’s subcommittee to present APS’s testimony on the FY 1991 budget for NSF. The Chairman was obviously tired at the end of the second full day of hearings during which witnesses were pleading their cases on behalf of a variety of federal programs, competitors for a larger share of the federal budget even as the federal budget deficit casts an increasingly broad shadow over federal spending.

Ordinarily, this circumstance would numb even the most diligent lawmaker. But when Kraut presented the cornerstone of APS’s position — that there should be serious consideration of establishing a separate directorate for psychology researchers and others in behavioral and social science disciplines — Chairman Traxler was quick to pronounce the concept “excellent” and promised to “see what we can do.”

Never one to back away from a good fight, Traxler had a devilish glint in his eye when he asked Kraut “what do you think the chances are?”

Kraut noted that many others had advocated for a separate directorate, and that perhaps the time had come to make this a priority for Congress. He detailed NSF’s resistance to changing the status quo regarding the agency’s funding for behavioral and social science research, despite urging by the National Academy of Science, Congress, and even one of NSF’s own Advisory Committees.

Traxler’s comments are particularly refreshing since, as Kraut said later in a letter, “we have heard over and over again from NSF higher-ups that there is no problem, that behavioral and social science are treated fairly, and that there is more than enough understanding of our issues within the current decision-making structure of NSF. The facts suggest otherwise.”

Copies of the APS statement on the FY 1991 NSF Budget are available from APS.

Postscript: Just as the Observer is about to go to press, we have learned that Congressman Doug Walgren (D-PA) has joined APS in asking Chairman Traxler to pursue the issue of a separate directorate. Walgren’s request to Traxler came in the form of a “Dear Bob” letter, drafted after discussions with APS staff. Walgren, who recently stepped down as chair of the House Subcommittee on Science, Research and Technology in order to chair an Energy and Commerce subcommittee, is a strong supporter of behavioral and social science research and in the past has questioned NSF’s policies regarding these areas of research. We’ll keep you informed as this issue progresses.
Master's Level Providers Confer at Joint APS-COGDOP-NIMH Meeting

NORMAN, OKLAHOMA - Master's level providers of psychological services are organizing. They seek a clearer identity, more recognition, greater legitimacy.

Community mental health services could not operate without them, as they fill the majority of provider positions there. Some of them are industrial/organization and developmental services providers, usually in state and local government settings. Estimates of their total numbers range up to 100,000.

Some would say these master's level providers have long been the most forgotten, overlooked, or neglected group of psychology graduates.

But that situation is changing, and a sign of this change is the outcome of a four-day national meeting of the National Conference on Applied Master's Programs in Psychology (CAMPP) held at the University of Oklahoma. CAMPP's membership is comprised of faculty at universities and schools that grant master's degrees in applied psychology.

About 60 CAMPP members and other trainers attended the June meeting.

The American Psychological Society co-sponsored the meeting, along with the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) and the Council of Graduate Departments of Psychology (COGDOP).

Paul Wohlford of NIMH led a series of discussions devoted largely to shortfalls in psychological services to the chronically mentally ill, children and adolescents, and rural residents.

The "master's issue" — the role and legitimacy of master's level training and service provision — has remained unresolved for more than 40 years, according to Dick Tucker of the University of Central Florida, chair of CAMPP's executive committee. It involves large numbers of people, he said, as each year more than 8,000 master's degrees are awarded by over 200 institutions, most of which offer only master's level training, mainly in applied psychology.

Accreditation was another major focus. Logan Wright, who handled logistics for the meeting at University of Oklahoma facilities, pointed out that the master's level providers are not seeking approval for unsupervised practice.

Wright also noted that master's level providers have more contact with the public than almost anyone else in psychological fields because they shoulder the major workloads in mental health centers.

"The main thing that came out of this national conference was the commitment on the part of the people who attended to carry that message back home and get actively involved in legitimizing the master's level psychological providers," Hanson said. "They have a place in the discipline of psychology.

"The master's level community needs to organize itself to promote its own interests," he continued, "because nobody else is going to do it for them."

APA Taps APS to Fill Science Post

Seeking to fill its vacant Director's position in the Science Directorate, the American Psychological Association (APA) recently netted a big fish to lead the Directorate. Developmental psychologist Lewis Lipsitt will take a two-year leave-of-absence from Brown University to assume the science director post.

Lipsitt resigned from the APS Board in anticipation of his assumption of the APA position in June 1990.

"Both APS and the science wing of APA have common goals and objectives," Lipsitt said in a recent interview. "I will continue working for these objectives through my membership in APS as well as in the APA post... and I still believe in all that APS represents."

Lipsitt emphasized the importance of everyone working toward an improved public and congressional perception of psychology. "Because we are in a time of vast advances in scientific psychology coincident with decreasing resources to do research, it is my aim to help turn this situation around."

Lipsitt founded the Brown University Child Study Center and has been at Brown since 1957. He expects to return there in the Fall of 1992.
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