Perfect Scientific Wave Rolls into San Diego with 4th APS Convention

San Diego, California—Nearly 2,000 psychologists demonstrated, with strong evidence, their ability to delay physical gratification in favor of intellectual gratification as they made the wise choice to "catch the scientific wave" at the APS meeting in San Diego.

Eschewing all "I'd-rather-be-surfing" notions emanating from the attractive surroundings just outside the Sheraton Harbor Island Hotel, convention goers postponed enjoyment of some of America's most enticing seaside vacation vistas—thousands of sailboats, flamingos, and renowned Pacific Ocean beaches stretching as far as the eye could see.

The decision most had to make again and again was which of five or six tantalizing concurrent sessions to choose at any given time. There were more than the usual number of addresses and symposia focusing on major societal problems such as high-risk sexual behaviors on campus, environmental stressors, "repressed" abuse, strategies for caring for people with severe mental disorders, adolescent violence and delinquency, workplace problems and strategies, and post-traumatic stress disorder.

The First Wave

Side-by-side with applied psychology were basic science sessions on genetics, intelligence, memory and brain systems, and cognitive psychology direct from Ulric Neisser, a psychologist at the forefront of the cognitive revolution wave sweeping the field in the past decade.

The anxiety of choosing which session to attend was alleviated this year by a taping service. Audio-cassettes of most sessions were available in a matter of hours at a moderate price of $7 for addresses on one cassette and $10.

Behavioral Science Caught In Cross-Fire Between Congress and White House

Washington, DC—More than 30 grantees—including several psychologists—recently found themselves at the center of a political battle between the U.S. Congress and the Bush Administration, when their grants were singled out for cutbacks in funding.

The cutbacks, known as "rescissions" in federal budget parlance, were initially proposed in the Senate Appropriations Committee by Senator Robert Byrd (D-WV) as part of a multi-billion dollar response to President Bush's package of cuts targeted to congressionally favored programs and projects. Thirty-one of the grants were from the National Science Foundation (NSF), mostly from the behavioral and social science directorate, and three grants for pain research at the National Institute for Dental Research also were targeted.
A Perfect Wave

Gordon H. Bower
President, APS

Like the San Diego surf, the fourth annual APS convention in San Diego has come and gone, leaving behind traces of nearly perfect waves of scientific information in addition to fond memories shared by many. Nearly 2,000 members and others registered to enjoy the three-day feast of lectures, symposia, and posters presenting the best of psychological science. And what a great feast it was—served up by the APS program Committee consisting of Tom Nelson (Chair), Judy DeLoache, Andy Baum, Paul Gold, and Gene Stone (Posters Chair). Attendees had the luxury of choosing from over 60 speaker sessions covering most major topics in the behavioral sciences.

Smooth Sailing

Every day-time hour of the convention provided one or more invited addresses or symposia. There were 21 major invited addresses, with three followed by invited commentaries. The convention opened with a classic experimental psychology keynote address by William K. Estes and featured an entertaining and educational Bring-the-Family address by Judith Dunn. In addition, 34 symposia were spread across three days covering topics ranging from brain mechanisms in human memory through cognitive aging and occupational stress to chaos theory and models of text comprehension.

The President’s Invited Symposium on post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD) featured speakers who were renown clinical researchers of psychopathology. One of the papers on PTSD and one on people’s formation of political views were headlined in articles in USA Today on June 22 and 23.

Over 400 research presentations were offered as posters in the large exhibit hall. The poster sessions included a session—organized by Jane Steinberg (National Institute of Mental Health)—of 16 federal agencies describing their programs that provide funding opportunities for behavioral science researchers. Both the poster sessions and the commercial exhibits were well attended.

High C’s

The daily scientific waves were capped off by receptions at the end of each day’s sessions outside the hotel on the Lanai Terrace overlooking the San Diego Bay and Yacht harbor—a most gorgeous setting. The final night featured a dessert party and dance with great music provided by the Synaptic Plasticity Jazz Band whose distinguished members (four APS stalwarts: Jim McGaugh, Michael Gabriel, Len Jarrard, and Arych Routtenberg) earlier had presented, appropriately, a scientific symposium, “The Orchestration of Memory: Systems, Synapses, and Substrates.”

At the convention business meeting, we were happy to announce APS membership has now passed the 14,000 mark, the Society is out of deficit and gaining financial health (although not running a surplus), and the Board of Directors commended the APS staff and extended for five years the contract of Executive Director, Alan Kraut. Alan has done extremely well in his job for the past three years. The five-year contract is the Board’s vote of confidence in his ability to guide the future of APS, providing more services for our members and strong advocacy for our behavioral science agenda in Washington.

Next year’s convention will be held June 26-28 at the Sheraton Hotel and Towers in Chicago, Illinois. Andrew Baum has agreed to serve as chair of the convention Program Committee. Suggestions you have for invited speakers and symposia should be submitted in the next few months to Andy at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences, 4301 Jones Bridge Rd., Medical Psychology Dept., Bethesda, MD 20814.
Transfer Was a Cliffhanger

It's Official: NIMH Is Moving to NIH

Washington, DC—After a series of ups and downs that rivaled a good old-fashioned movie cliffhanger, the transfer of the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) to the National Institutes of Health (NIH) has been approved by Congress. The transfer, which is part of a bill to reorganize the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration (ADAMHA), has enormous implications for the behavioral science programs of NIMH and the other two ADAMHA research institutes which are being transferred to NIH—the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) and the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA). The overall status of behavioral research at NIH also will be greatly affected by the transfer.

APS supported the transfer of NIMH from the beginning because the study of mental illness and the promotion of mental health should be part of the mission of the NIH. In addition, the presence of NIMH should instill a strong psychological and behavioral science approach more broadly throughout NIH, and will bring an important new behavioral perspective to NIH’s research on an array of physical health issues, such as lung disease, cancer, brain disorders, AIDS, alcohol and drug abuse, accidental injury, and numerous other issues that NIH addresses which involve behavior.

While congressional approval of the transfer closes the book on one part of the process, a whole new set of issues is raised concerning the preservation of the behavioral science missions of NIMH, NIDA, and NIAAA, and what form the new presence for behavioral science will take at NIH.

It Kept Going

In the May Observer we said the sudden resurrection of the legislation containing the transfer was akin to the rising of the mythical phoenix. Soon thereafter, it was clear that the Eveready Energizer bunny would be a more appropriate image, because it kept going...and going...and going.... For a while, we even thought the bunny’s batteries would finally run out.

What kept it going was the fact that the legislation’s path toward final passage by Congress was fraught with perils having nothing to do with the proposal to move the ADAMHA institutes. But other provisions in the bill proposing to revamp ADAMHA have been controversial—most notably alterations in the block grant formulas to states for mental health and substance abuse services.

In Our Last Episode...

...the House and Senate were still in conference, reconciling their different versions of the ADAMHA reorganization bill. Having accomplished that, a compromise version containing the transfer provisions intact was sent to the respective floors of the House and Senate for final approval.

Included in the report that accompanied the compromise was language initiated by APS in order to ensure that NIMH’s behavioral science mission and the behavioral science missions of the other

SEE NIMH TRANSFER ON PAGE 16

NEW EMAIL ADDRESSES for APS STAFF

Effective immediately, APS staff can no longer be accessed at the UMUC node on BITNET. They can now be reached via BITNET/INTERNET email at the APS node located on the BITNIC computer system at BITNET headquarters in Washington, DC. INTERNET users should append "@BITNIC.EDUCOM.EDU" as the node for the APS staff addresses listed here:

Alan G. Kraut, Executive Director: AKRAUT@APS
Sarah Brookhart, Director of Government Relations: SARAHB@APS
Lauren Butler, Director of Convention and Special Projects: LBUTLER@APS
Sharon Hantman, Director of Membership: SHANTMAN@APS
Lee Herring, Director of Communications: LHERRING@APS
Betty Willis, Assistant Director of Government Relations: BWILLIS@APS
Main APS Address: APS@APS
The Fundamentals of Pursuing and Promoting Psychological Science

Estes’ Keynote Convention Speech Addresses Research, Policy, and Careers

William K. Estes sees brighter opportunities in years ahead for psychologists to do “what we know how to do best, and what we most want to do—work toward fundamental laws and systems of psychological science.”

In his keynote address to the June APS convention Estes said that progress in research has moved ahead “gratifyingly” and “demand for our products has shown steady growth in good times and bad.” However, the level of public esteem for psychological research and theory is showing “a much harder time in rising above its earliest levels.”

This results in situations where some policymakers in Washington, for example, “seem to have the habit of bypassing psychological science” while others recognize that there are critically important behavioral sides to every major problem the nation faces.

Estes, who has been editor of the APS journal Psychological Science since its beginnings two and a half years ago, issued a resounding call to secure wider support for psychological science, from Congress, academia, and scientific and professional societies, right down to the nation’s high schools and junior highs where many of America’s all-too-few future scientists decide their vocations.

“Young students should know that waiting for them up front is a vigorous science that will be happy to make use of their talents,” Estes said.

But all this will not come about without leadership, Estes continued. Leadership must come not just from APS, but everyone should join the effort.

He said there are some signs that Congress seems to understand the importance of basic research. Congress may desire to preserve basic research even if and when cuts in other areas of behavioral research funding are made, Estes suggested.

SEE KEYNOTE ON PAGE 6
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for symposia on two cassettes. (Cassettes can be ordered from Rivers Duplication at 213-461-2800 for these prices plus handling.)

The Surf’s Gone National

Before the second day of the convention, USA Today featured some of the 430 poster sessions in the newspaper’s “Life” section on June 22 and 23. Brisk business also was carried on between psychologists avid for research funding and the representatives of 16 research funding federal agencies in the poster and exhibit area.

And the annual Job Bank organized by student APS members provided opportunities for about 30 yet-unpublished job offers to be matched with about 80 job seekers...only time will tell.

Meanwhile, previews of a new PBS mini-course, “The World of Abnormal Psychology,” soon to be broadcast over educational television, were offered at a film festival organized by psychologist Michael Strait of the PBS Annenberg Project.

Families Included

And many children and adolescents came with parents to Judith Dunn’s bring-the-family lecture on sibling fights and fantasies. Her address emphasized the happier, brighter sides of “sib” rivalries over the more fratricidal aspects, as no doubt was appropriate for a family night.

Business as Usual

At the business meeting in the final hours of the convention APS President Gordon Bower described some bylaw-related issues voted on a few days earlier by the APS Board of Directors at its San Diego meeting. Bower noted that Alan Kraut has accepted a five-year renewal of his tenure as Executive Director, and commented, “Alan Kraut has been just wonderful for us.” Bower also noted an upcoming vote by the membership on proposed amendments to the bylaws to change the terms of the presidency. Currently a president serves for two years. The proposed change would create a three-year cycle in which the person elected serves on the Board for one year each as President-elect, President, and then Past-president. Ballots will go out in late fall.

APS Student Caucus President Carolyn Roecker of the University of Iowa reported to the business meeting on a wide range of highly successful student activities.

And APS Finance Committee Chair Paul Thayer delivered the bottom line announcement: APS is financially healthy, with a “slight, slight surplus” in its current $1.3 million-plus budget.

The final event of the convention was a well-attended dessert reception and dance to the music of the Synaptic Plasticity Band, a home-grown but highly professional APS musical group led by APS Past-president Jim McGaugh. D.K.
Sex Differences in Gifted Math Students’ Achievement

Adding It Up: Implications for the Math/Science Pipeline

SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA—Even though more women are reaching the pinnacle of success in scientific and engineering fields, females still perform more poorly than males on tests of mechanical reasoning and spatial skills, and women aspire to lower levels of occupational achievement. So concludes Camilla P. Benbow, who gained notoriety in the 1980s for her controversial study of female math aptitude, and her colleague, David Lubinski, both of Iowa State University. They presented their findings at the APS convention in June.

“Given the consistency...it appears gender differences in math and science will remain for quite some time. We’re not making much headway here,” Benbow said during an invited address at the APS annual meeting in San Diego.

Benbow and Lubinski discussed data gathered from four cohorts of gifted high school students, totaling about 500, and from a fifth cohort of graduate students in the nation’s top science or math programs.

Top Achievers

All the students in the first four cohorts, dating from 1972, placed in at least the top 3% in standardized achievement tests and were identified through the Talent Search program of the Study of Mathematically Precocious Youth (SMPY), instituted by Julian Stanley at Johns Hopkins University 20 years ago. The program originally focused on science and math “whizzes,” but has recently added verbally gifted students to the ranks. The students are so gifted, some enter college at 12 years of age; one 12-year-old boy scored 670 of 700 on the math portion of the SAT.

Among the cohort recruited in 1980, the members overall placed in the top 1/10,000 nationally (with females falling into the top 1/60,000 in math abilities), Benbow reported.

Focusing on the first three cohorts, Benbow reported that girls and young women consistently reported lower educational and career aspirations than did their male counterparts.

For example, among the 1972 cohort, 28 males but only 17 females planned to obtain a PhD, and within math and science fields, men were more likely than females to seek doctorates in the quantitative areas, such as physics.

The results were similar for the cohort that grew up during the late 1970’s, during the peak of the women’s liberation movement, Benbow noted. That group’s members were even more select than the first group, comprising the top 0.5% of students. In a still more select group, the 1980 cohort, the results were again similar.

The SMPY includes summer programs for students, during which they take college-level courses or complete 4-1/2 years of high school math in one summer. Lubinski reported that only about half of the female students take courses in math, computer science, or physics, compared with 5 of 6 males.

Low Career Goals

Lubinski has been studying the summer students to try to understand why females have lower career aspirations, using a model of work adjustment developed at the University of Minnesota. That model argues that there is a correspondence between abilities, job ability requirements, and lifestyle needs and personal values, and ultimate job satisfaction, tenure, and performance.

Using that model and others, including Holland’s hexagon of occupational values, Lubinski has put together profiles of values and abilities among the summer-program students over the past four years.

Every year, he has found a 0.5 to 1 full standard deviation difference between the weight females and males placed on theoretical versus social values. Females give the most preference to the investigative, artistic, and social values of Holland’s hexagon, while males focus primarily on investigative values, Lubinski said.

Social Scientists

“Gifted females like more social contact in their work environment than do males,” he said.

When members of all of the first three cohorts were asked if they planned for continuous full-time employment versus all other work or non-work options, 95-96% of males said yes, compared with 52-64% of females.

Ironically, Lubinski said, the females’ ability scores in such areas as mechanical competence and ability to mentally rotate objects—while lower than the scores of males—"were higher than among practicing physical scientists.”

His conclusion? “Females know they can do it [a math or science job], they just don’t want to.” Chris Raymond
Remembering “Repressed” Abuse

What Science Has to Say about the Authenticity of Claims

What scientific basis is there for the authenticity of memories of sexual abuse that were “repressed” but then “remembered” with the help of a therapist? How are scientists, therapists, jurists and distressed individuals themselves to distinguish true memories from false ones?

This question, taken up by a symposium at the APS convention, is timely and important. Stories surface daily on adults who have “recovered memories” and subsequently charge their parents, teachers, priests, or relatives with sexual abuse, many years after the alleged abuse was said to have occurred. And stories of satanic abuse and other bizarre actions have become almost commonplace.

“Survivors” have appeared as guests on national television talk shows hosted by Geraldo Rivera, Oprah Winfrey, and others, and actress Rosanne Barr claims to recall sexual abuse beginning at the age of six months. More than half the women in the United States have been sexually abused and many don’t remember it, according to Roland Summit who was cited by one of the APS panelists as a leader in the “recovered memory” movement. Summit has said the task of
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Preparation for a Career in Psychology

That emphasis on basic science remains strong at Harvard, even though Estes finds that about three quarters of the PhD students he supervises there now take their first jobs in fields of applied psychology—almost the exact reverse of the situation 40 years ago when three quarters went to academic jobs.

Estes believes this shift has not changed the fact that expertise in basic research and theory of psychology remains the best preparation for all work in psychology, whether in academia or applied areas. He said that PhDs whose education emphasizes basic science “readily acquire domain-specific knowledge and pattern-matching expertise on jobs once they have gotten into them.”

Estes asked, “Should we conclude from the trend toward jobs in applied areas that we should be putting more of our effort into training our graduate students for specific kinds of applications while we have them for four or five years?”

“I think such a conclusion would be wrong,” he said, supplying graphic data on his own PhD students of the last 40 years.

“First, ... all of the students represented who received their training under my benign or malignant influence, depending on how you look at it, [all had] the same concentration of effort on acquiring knowledge and expertise in basic research and theory of psychology. Unless there was some moonlighting that I never knew about, not one of them ever had a course in specific applications.”

An aspect that surprised me a little when I put the data together was how many had been going into applied jobs all this time without my really noticing it. So far as I could judge, those going into applied areas were as often succeeding and becoming eminent in their fields as those who had chosen academia,” said Estes.

Basic Principles of Science

“Something our students get from the training that we historically have been giving them prepares them for a wider range of careers ... than we may realize at the time. One of the things they may be getting is a grasp of basic principles of psychology that we cannot agree on in terms of formulas that can be put into textbooks. But [those principles] are probably reflected in a common way by experts in psychology in different fields.”

Estes proposed “dietary guidelines for graduate training of psychologists,” presenting a pyramid-shaped figure that he said resembled the federal dietary guidelines recently appearing in the press “though no one spent a million of your tax dollars to put this one together.”

The psychology diet included “generous servings of mathematics and basic science given early in place of rice and other cereals. Then, at the top, we allow an occasional seminar in a specialty in the place of ice cream.”

Estes said the formal training “should be complemented at every stage by actual experience, at first almost entirely in research and then in research plus teaching and other activities that go to make up the life activities of a scientist. Starting research early and having it go on continuously with all the formal training is something that should definitely be part of the program.”

This type of training gives psychologists their greatest expertise, Estes said. It’s an expertise which “must not be equated with skill in solving practical everyday problems,” he said. “The principal expertise we psychologists have developed over the century is in basic research. There we have made the greatest advances, and there lies our main hope for the future.”

Referring to William James, the keynoter said that “his agenda was not to hurry to bring psychology to the marketplace but to concentrate on trying to pierce the veil of mystery that shrouds the mind and the brain.” Estes added, “After 100 years I’m not sure that we can improve on his agenda.”

A Balanced Agenda

He noted, “I hope that the APS, while seeking support for psychological science in Washington and elsewhere, will not urge our case solely on the basis of possible immediate payoffs,” he said. “A public that has been willing to spend its tax dollars to find out what’s on the other side of the moon or whether there’s life on Mars or how deep are the black holes may be led to rise similarly to the challenge of explaining mind and behavior.” D.K.
therapists should be to find those women and help them uncover the memories. And a book by E. Bass and L. Davis, *The Courage to Heal* (Random House, 1988), that has sold more than 200,000 copies suggests that “if you are unable to remember any specific instances ... but still have a feeling that something abusive happened to you, it probably did,” and “if you think you were abused and your life shows the symptoms, then you were.”

**Profiles of the Accused and Accusers**

Hollida Wakefield, one of the five panelists of the APS symposium titled, “Remembering ‘Repressed’ Abuse: Initial Research, Theoretical Analysis and Evaluation of the Claims,” said that “many of the so-called survivors groups advise suing the parent who allegedly abused you as a way of psychological healing and dealing with the trauma.”

Wakefield and Ralph Underwager, both of the Institute for Psychological Therapies of Northfield, Minnesota, described a new survey they are conducting of parents whose adult children have accused them of recently recovered memories of repressed childhood sexual abuse. The participants responded to newspaper articles and other media presentations from the False Memory Syndrome Foundation of Philadelphia. To date, 133 families have completed the institute’s 26-page questionnaires.

**Surprise Empirical Findings**

Wakefield and Underwager expected that most of the families would be dysfunctional and that the adult child would have a history of significant disturbance. However, emerging from the preliminary data is a picture of functional, intact, successful families and well educated adult child accusers. Only a third of the adult children had psychological or psychiatric treatment prior to adulthood. Nine in ten are female and one fourth of them have graduate degrees and all but one has a B.A. or some college.

“Four-fifths of the parents are still married and four-fifths of these judge their marriages to be happy,” Wakefield said. Two-thirds of the fathers and half of the mothers have an undergraduate or graduate degree. Their median family income is between $60,000 and $69,000. The majority of the parents report routinely dining together as a family, vacationing together, and being actively involved with the children when they were growing up.

“These appear to be families that have realized the American dream,” Wakefield said, though some of the retrospective accounts are likely not to be completely accurate, she noted.

A feature common to the sample was the therapy received by the children when they were adults, according to Wakefield. In almost all the cases where the parents had knowledge of the therapy program, the book *The Courage to Heal* was used along with other survivor or self-help books. Hypnotherapy, dream interpretation, and survivor groups were frequently reported. Fringe therapy techniques such as meditation, age regression, neurolinguistic programming, reflexology, and “casting out demons,” and primal scream therapy were also reported. The therapists were identified as psychologists (33%), “counselors” (33%), social workers (24%), and psychiatrists (8%).

In this survey and other studies of recovered memories they have undertaken, Wakefield and Underwager have found no corroborating data for many or most of the claims. “To believe in the reality of these memories requires suspension of critical reasoning and a leap of blind faith,” they said. “On the other hand are the known and credible scientific data on social influence, expectancy effects, the nature of memory, the malleability of memory, the problems in diagnosis and concepts of disorder, and the power of a psychotherapeutic relationship to produce conformity in the patient, together with quantifiable data on sexual abuse,” they report.

Wakefield and Underwager proposed 14 provisional criteria for assessing the probability or improbability of an allegation of recently remembered abuse. One is that when there is no corroborating evidence and the alleged behaviors are highly improbable, it is unlikely that the abuse actually happened. Another is that if the accusations emerge only following reading *The Courage to Heal*, or after hypnosis, survivors’ group participation, or dream analysis, they are likely to be the result of the influence of the therapy.

Martha L. Rogers, a symposium participant with considerable courtroom experience in cases involving recovered memories of abuse, suggested the collection of systematic data about a range of past memories of abuse from individual non-litigating therapy clients on the one hand, and from litigants in therapy on the other. Such a data bank would begin to provide forensic examiners with better tools to differentiate valid from invalid claims for injuries, she said.

Elizabeth Loftus of the University of Washington, panel discussant, pointed to evidence suggesting that it is possible to create an entire event in the mind of someone for whom “it would have been mildly traumatic, had it happened, but in whom it presumably didn’t happen.”

Loftus said, “This is just showing us a mechanism by which an entire memory might be created, but it doesn’t mean, of course, that these recently unearthed memories of childhood trauma are a result of this mechanism.” She would not put all the blame on therapists as the sources of false memories, Loftus said, because “there are a lot of other places where we do get information that can become incorporated into our memories.”

Sometimes a cherished personal memory may actually be a scene from an old movie, Loftus suggested, citing for example President Ronald Reagan’s “repeatedly misremembering cinematic scenes as if they were historical facts.”

Loftus said perhaps Reagan’s most famous mis-memory of this type was of an act of heroism pulled from a Grade-B movie. “He told it in his campaigns of 1976 and 1980 again in 1983.” Loftus said.

D.K.
**Tips on Finding and Obtaining Federal Research Funding**

APS Convention Attendees Get Personal Attention at Posters Given by Federal Research Programs

"What kinds of grants do you offer? What training grants are available? Are there grants for new investigators? How does one apply? These are the kinds of questions I've been getting again and again here at the APS convention," said Sarah Broman of the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke (NINDS).

Broman was giving the inquirers information on the activities of NINDS's research branches and the types of research they sponsor, along with phone numbers of the key contact persons concerned with each research area. She said NINDS hopes to recruit additional outside researchers.

Besides NINDS, 16 other federal research funding offices and agencies were represented at the special APS convention poster session including programs of the National Science Foundation (NSF); the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration; the National Institute of Mental Health; the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development; the Office of Naval Research; and the Air Force Office of Scientific Research.

**Practical Advice**

Joseph Young of NSF's cognition and perception program and Fred Stollnitz of NSF's animal research program said they were getting many specific inquiries from people who have research projects already lined up and are ready to apply for funding.

One project Young cited was for research on what people infer from diagrams of machines, what they infer from diagrams about how the parts of the machine will operate. Preliminary research indicates that people can't imagine at once the whole system in operation. Instead, they break it down into components. Such a project, Young said, was potentially fundable and suggested that this kind of research also "may be a prime candidate for joint review with our Research in Teaching and Learning program in our education directorate."

Practical advice such as this on the basics and subtleties of submitting proposals for research grants was the whole

*CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE*
purpose of this special federal agency poster session. And if the NSF program directors' experiences were typical, then lots of researchers and potential researchers got a lot of useful tips to get a healthy start in good grantsmanship.

Workshop for New NIMH Investigators

Young mental health researchers were treated to a workshop breakfast sponsored by the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) with presentations by Gordon Bower and by Stephen Koslow, Hilleary Everist, and Mary Ellen Oliveri, all of the NIMH Division of Basic Brain and Behavioral Sciences. Researchers who have never before received NIMH support eagerly absorbed information on how to obtain presubmission consultation from NIMH staff and how to direct a proposal to the appropriate funding component of NIMH among other useful topics.
They’re Everywhere!

Psychologists in NIH Review Groups

There are different ways of gauging psychology’s presence in the various federal research agencies. In the March Observer we examined data on psychology grantees from the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). Another aspect is the level of psychology’s participation in an agency’s scientific review system. In this issue, APS takes a look at the peer review committees and other committees of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) to see where psychologists turn up. Not surprisingly, there are a lot of us.

Support for Behavioral Research

Estimates vary, but several hundred million dollars in NIH extramural funding goes to behavioral research, much of which is conducted by psychologists. Virtually every Institute at NIH supports behavioral research. Traditionally, when thinking of the main sources of support for psychology research, the Institutes that come to mind are the National Institute on Aging (NIA), the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD), the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute (NHLBI) and the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke (NINDS). So it is important for researchers submitting grants to recognize that others at NIH are psychology “strongholds” as well, such as the National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders (NIDCD), the National Eye Institute (NEI) and the National Center on Nursing Research (NCNR).

NIH relies on a system of almost 200 advisory committees of outside experts to review grant proposals and provide guidance on issues of science policy. There are two stages of review of research proposals. Participants on scientific study sections, which perform the initial level, are active experienced researchers in fields directly relevant to that committee’s jurisdiction. The recommendations of the scientific review committees are ultimately decided on by the advisory councils of the individual Institutes. Members of the advisory councils include not only preeminent scientists, but also community leaders, and others in the public with an interest in health and science issues.

Across the NIH Mission

Psychology’s involvement cuts across the entire mission of NIH, ranging from basic biobehavioral investigations of brain and cognitive function, to research on social and behavioral influences on the health and development of various populations. Psychologists are also involved in research on vision, speech and language, nursing care, and other fields. This diversity is reflected in the array of NIH advisory panels on which psychologists currently serve.

Following are psychologists who are members of standing NIH committees. Although not listed here, psychology’s presence is extended by a sizeable number of psychologists on whom study sections routinely rely for ad hoc review of grants.

NIH Division of Research Grants (DRG) Study Sections

AIDS and Related Research
Sarale Cohen, Univ. of California-Los Angeles
William Holzemer, Univ. of California-San Francisco
Jeffrey Kelly, Univ. of Mississippi
Vickie Mays, Univ. of California-Los Angeles
Howard Moss, National Cancer Institute
Mary Jane Rotheram-Borus, Columbia Univ.
Robert Scabassi, Univ. of Pittsburgh
Lydia Temoskok, Walter Reed Army Medical Center

Behavioral Science and Neurosciences
Donald Bailey, Univ. of North Carolina
Mark Berkley, Florida State Univ.
Elizabeth Capaldi, Univ. of Florida
Keith Crutchor, Univ. of Cincinnati
Mary Florentine, Northeastern Univ.
Lynn Ann Hasher, Duke Univ.
Diane Kurtzberg, Yeshiva Univ.
Lynn Liben, Pennsylvania State Univ.
Suzanne McKee, Smith-Kettlewell Eye Research Institute
Maureen Powers, Vanderbilt Univ.
S. Murray Sherman, State Univ. of New York-Stony Brook
James Smith, Florida State Univ.
Paula Storer, Univ. of Toronto
E.1. Terasawa, Regional Primate Research Center, Univ. of Wisconsin

Behavioral Medicine
Timothy Baker, Univ. of Wisconsin
Laurie Chassin, Arizona State Univ.
Richard Jennings, Univ. of Pittsburgh
Ernest Johnson, Univ. of Miami
Francis Keefe, Duke Univ. Medical Center
William Lovatto, Veterans Administration Medical Center
Suzanne Miller, Temple Univ.
Ralph O’Brien, Univ. of Florida
William Redd, Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center

Biopsychology
Stephen Glickman, Univ. of California-Berkeley
Robert Goy, Univ. of Wisconsin
Norman Henderson, Oberlin College
Joan Lorden, Univ. of Alabama at Birmingham
Ralph Norgren, Pennsylvania State Univ.
John Rohrbaugh, Washington Univ.
James Rose, Univ. of Wyoming
Friedrich Stephan, Florida State Univ.
Arnold Towe, Univ. of Washington
Carol Van Hartesveldt, Univ. of Florida
Hearing Research
Robert J. Dooling, Univ. of Maryland-College Park

Human Development
Bennett Bertenthal, Univ. of Virginia
Robin Chapman, Univ. of Wisconsin
Rachel Clifton, Univ. of Massachusetts
Walter Cunningham, Univ. of Florida
Judy DeLoache, Univ. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Douglas Detterman, Case Western Reserve Univ.
Jill De Villiers, Smith College
Kenneth A. Dodge, Vanderbilt Univ.
Carol Dweck, Columbia Univ.
Jacquelynne Eccles, Univ. of Colorado
Diana Erdley, Simon Fraser Univ.
Arthur Flavell, Brandeis Univ.
Susan Fernald, Smith College
Melvin Wilson, Univ. of Virginia

Social Sciences and Population
Joseph Rodgers, Univ. of Oklahoma

Visual Sciences
Patrick Cavanagh, Harvard Univ.
Leo Chalupa, Univ. of California-Davis
Carol Cicerone, Univ. of California-Irvine
Anthony Norcia, Smith-Kettlewell Eye Research Institute
Cynthia Owsley, Univ. of Alabama-Birmingham
Denis Pelli, Syracuse Univ.

NIH Advisory Councils
Advisory Committee to the Director, National Institutes of Health
Frederick A. King, Yerkes Primate Research Center, Emory Univ.

National Advisory Council on Aging
Anderson Smith, Georgia Institute of Technology

National Institute on Aging Board of Scientific Counselors
Suzanne Corkin, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Neuroscience, Behavior and Sociology of Aging Review Committee
Fergus Craik, Univ. of Toronto
Catherine Ann Cornell-Jones, Syracuse Univ.
Muriel Lezak, Portland Health Sciences Univ.

National Cancer Institute Clinical Trials and Cancer Interventions Committee
Carlo DiClemente, Univ. of Houston

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development Council
Anne Petersen, Univ. of Minnesota

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) Board of Scientific Counselors
Joseph Campos, Univ. of California-Berkeley

Peter Juszczyk, State Univ. of New York-Buffalo
Robert Remez, Barnard College
Myrna Schwartz, Moss Rehabilitation Hospital

NICHDP Maternal and Child Health Research Committee
Carolyn Rovee-Collier, Rutgers Univ.

NICHDP Mental Retardation Research Committee
Gershon Barkson, Univ. of Illinois
Michael Cataldo, Johns Hopkins Univ.
Roscoe Dykman, Univ. of Arkansas
Medical Sciences
Rebecca Ellers, Univ. of Miami

National Deafness and Other Communication Disorders (NIDCD) Advisory Council
Ursula Bellugi, Salk Institute

National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders Communication Disorders Review Committee
Robert Contreras, Florida State Univ.

NIDCD Maternal and Child Health Research Committee
Carolyn Rovee-Collier, Rutgers Univ.

NICHDP Mental Retardation Research Committee
Gershon Barkson, Univ. of Illinois
Michael Cataldo, Johns Hopkins Univ.
Roscoe Dykman, Univ. of Arkansas
Medical Sciences
Rebecca Ellers, Univ. of Miami

National Deafness and Other Communication Disorders (NIDCD) Advisory Council
Ursula Bellugi, Salk Institute

National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders Communication Disorders Review Committee
Robert Contreras, Florida State Univ.

Deafness and Other Communication Disorders Programs Advisory Committee
Robert Butler, Univ. of Chicago
Susan Schiffman, Duke Univ.

National Advisory Eye Council
David Sparks, Univ. of Pennsylvania

Minority Programs Review Committee
John Carlson, Univ. of Hawaii

National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute Research Training Review Committee
Neil Schneiderman, Univ. of Miami

National Advisory Neurological Disorders and Stroke Council
Leslie Hicks, Howard Univ.

National Advisory Research Resources Council
Janet Spence, Univ. of Texas

Comparative Medicine Review Committee
Gordon Gallup, State Univ. of New York-Albany

Hearing Research
Robert J. Dooling, Univ. of Maryland-College Park

Human Development
Bennett Bertenthal, Univ. of Virginia
Robin Chapman, Univ. of Wisconsin
Rachel Clifton, Univ. of Massachusetts
Walter Cunningham, Univ. of Florida
Judy DeLoache, Univ. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Douglas Detterman, Case Western Reserve Univ.
Jill De Villiers, Smith College
Kenneth A. Dodge, Vanderbilt Univ.
Carol Dweck, Columbia Univ.
Jacquelynne Eccles, Univ. of Colorado
Diana Erdley, Simon Fraser Univ.
Arthur Flavell, Brandeis Univ.

Social Sciences and Population
Joseph Rodgers, Univ. of Oklahoma

Visual Sciences
Patrick Cavanagh, Harvard Univ.
Leo Chalupa, Univ. of California-Davis
Carol Cicerone, Univ. of California-Irvine
Anthony Norcia, Smith-Kettlewell Eye Research Institute
Cynthia Owsley, Univ. of Alabama-Birmingham
Denis Pelli, Syracuse Univ.

NIH Advisory Councils
Advisory Committee to the Director, National Institutes of Health
Frederick A. King, Yerkes Primate Research Center, Emory Univ.

National Advisory Council on Aging
Anderson Smith, Georgia Institute of Technology

National Institute on Aging Board of Scientific Counselors
Suzanne Corkin, Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Neuroscience, Behavior and Sociology of Aging Review Committee
Fergus Craik, Univ. of Toronto
Catherine Ann Cor nell-Jones, Syracuse Univ.
Muriel Lezak, Portland Health Sciences Univ.

National Cancer Institute Clinical Trials and Cancer Interventions Committee
Carlo DiClemente, Univ. of Houston

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development Council
Anne Petersen, Univ. of Minnesota

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) Board of Scientific Counselors
Joseph Campos, Univ. of California-Berkeley

Peter Juszczyk, State Univ. of New York-Buffalo
Robert Remez, Barnard College
Myrna Schwartz, Moss Rehabilitation Hospital

NICHDP Maternal and Child Health Research Committee
Carolyn Rovee-Collier, Rutgers Univ.

NICHDP Mental Retardation Research Committee
Gershon Barkson, Univ. of Illinois
Michael Cataldo, Johns Hopkins Univ.
Roscoe Dykman, Univ. of Arkansas
Medical Sciences
Rebecca Ellers, Univ. of Miami

National Deafness and Other Communication Disorders (NIDCD) Advisory Council
Ursula Bellugi, Salk Institute

National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders Communication Disorders Review Committee
Robert Contreras, Florida State Univ.

Deafness and Other Communication Disorders Programs Advisory Committee
Robert Butler, Univ. of Chicago
Susan Schiffman, Duke Univ.

National Advisory Eye Council
David Sparks, Univ. of Pennsylvania

Minority Programs Review Committee
John Carlson, Univ. of Hawaii

National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute Research Training Review Committee
Neil Schneiderman, Univ. of Miami

National Advisory Neurological Disorders and Stroke Council
Leslie Hicks, Howard Univ.

National Advisory Research Resources Council
Janet Spence, Univ. of Texas

Comparative Medicine Review Committee
Gordon Gallup, State Univ. of New York-Albany

APs OBSERVER July 1992
APS Selects the 1992 William James Fellows

SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA—David E. Rumelhart of Stanford University and Lawrence Weiskrantz of Oxford University each received APS's highest recognition for leadership in psychological science as they were named William James Fellows at a session of the APS convention in San Diego on June 20. (See opposite page text of the award citations.)

Rumelhart uses computer models of "brain style computation" to gain improved understanding of the relationship between mind and brain. In turn, his aim is to build computational models to explore the relationship between behavior and brain processing. His work spans many areas including memory, perception, reasoning, learning, language, and many other areas. The principles of brain processing are the subject of his interest.

His work has suggested new frameworks and structures for understanding cognitive processes—from individual perception to global processing levels. Most notable among his theories is the parallel distributed processing approach which he and James L. McClelland published in their 1986 book, Parallel Distributed Processing: Explorations in the Micro-Structure of Cognition, published by MIT Press. The theory has been highly influential in shaping the way researchers think and theorize about cognitive processes.

The common theme throughout Rumelhart's work is computational or mathematical modeling, he said in an interview, noting that he majored jointly in mathematics and psychology as an undergraduate at the University of South Dakota before going to Stanford for his PhD. At Stanford he attended the Institute for Mathematical Studies in the Social Sciences working under William K. Estes. He then taught at the University of California-San Diego for twenty years where he co-founded (with Donald A. Norman) the Institute for Cognitive Science. He has been at Stanford teaching and doing research for the last five years.

Rumelhart explained that the idea underlying his work is that "if we really understand how the mind works we are going to be able to implement it on a computer and study it in model form."

"Basically, we formulate computer models in which we try to mimic certain aspects of human behavior by having the elements of our models be things as close to neural entities as possible," Rumelhart said. "Then we try to show how from the activity of many, many simple neural elements we can get complex behavior arising. We try to arrange the pattern of connectivity between neural elements to allow us to mimic the complex behavior of people."

Asked about the significance of his work in the area of human memory, Rumelhart believes that perhaps the best contribution relates to clarification of an increasingly popular view of memory/knowledge as not being analogous to that of computer memory/knowledge. In his words, "knowledge isn't simply stored in the system the way books are indexed and stored in a library, for example." Further, the distinction between the knowledge itself and the processing of that knowledge is artificial, he believes. Rather, learning (or the formation of a memory) involves a modification of the brain in such a way that the brain simply operates differently (i.e., it computes a different function) as a result of the learning. Its output (answer) is different following learning. This is a very different image of how information is processed and how it is "stored" by the machine. "There is no distinction between the knowledge in the machine and the machine's behavior," explained Rumelhart.

Upon accepting the APS Fellow award, Rumelhart acknowledged colleagues who influenced his career: Donald Norman, George Mandler, and James McClelland, among others, and expressed pleasure at sharing the convention podium with three of his teachers—Richard Atkinson, Gordon Bower, and William Estes—in his familiar territory of San Diego.

Weiskrantz, who was born in Philadelphia and received his PhD at Harvard, has worked and taught primarily in England, where he has been a professor and lecturer in the experimental psychology department of Oxford University since 1967. Working with a clinical psychologist, Elizabeth Warrington, at London's National Hospital, Weiskrantz is noted for his discovery of the "blind sight" phenomenon, demonstrating that certain visual abilities remain intact even after a loss of the primary visual projection area of the cerebral cortex.

Earlier, his memory work with brain-injured patients and others yielded results demonstrating that subjects retain far more moment-to-moment experience than they believe they have. Weiskrantz said in an interview that he worked with brain injured patients who had very severe memory loss. "They apparently lost their ability to remember anything from one minute to the next. But what emerged, and it is very surprising, is that these patients have no awareness of storing any new information and they do not treat any
new experience as being remembered beyond a minute or so. Nevertheless, some of the information is being stored and can be retained in extremely good form for very long periods—weeks of or even months. But the patients don’t know it, and they don’t treat it as a memory. So you have to sneak up on this and test them in a way that does not require them to say what they remember or recall or recognize; you have to give stimuli to which they can give a response ... of a particular kind (e.g., “yes, I have seen that stimulus before”).

Hence, priming with pictures or words was used at the start of Weiskrantz’s research in this area in the mid-1960s, and the results of that research led him to consider what kind of memory system is involved in priming that is distinct from the memory system involved in recognition.

“We considered multiple memory systems. Then we examined the visual context, because in animals we know that nine other pathways can in fact sustain visual discrimination at a reasonably high level. Why wasn’t that also true in humans? It turns out humans can do the same. They can discriminate stimuli in their putatively blind field, but they have to be forced to guess about those stimuli, and indeed they believe they are guessing. The object of the research is to find some indirect evidence that the information going into the blind cortex field is being processed, even though the subject does not realize it is being processed. One way of doing this with patients who still have an intact half field of vision is to see whether information coming in through the blind part of the field will affect, or modulate, what the subject actually sees in the good part of the field.”

Weiskrantz is currently concentrating on blind sight research, particularly with children who have had hemispherectomies —removal of the cortex of one of the two cerebral hemispheres as a last course of action in severe cases of epilepsy. The plasticity of cerebral processing in the young makes such work promising, he says.

Upon accepting the APS Fellow award, Weiskrantz said as someone residing outside the United States, it was a special honor to receive the award from an American psychological society. Drawing an analogy between music as a universal language and science as a universal language, Weiskrantz said that just as “music is composed, orchestrated, instrumented, and appreciated ... in science we are all composers. We have our themes and our dissonances and our orchestrations, but in the end we are all participating in and judging each other’s work. And to be judged by one’s peers in this sense I cannot think of any greater honor.” D.K.

The William James citation to Weiskrantz:

Lawrence Weiskrantz’s incisive experimental work with monkeys and people coupled with his creative theoretical thinking, carried out over nearly four decades, has profoundly influenced the field of cognitive neuroscience. His studies of brain-injured patients have yielded dramatic results that have materialized contemporary views of different memory systems. He is one of the few scientists who have conducted landmark research on the neurobiology of both visual perception and memory in monkeys and people. His discovery of the ‘blind sight’ phenomenon has elucidated the extent of visual abilities that remain after loss of the primary visual projection area of the cortex.

For his inspired and imaginative leadership in the exploration of the intricate relation between the brain and the mind in memory, perception, and thought, he is recognized as a leader in psychological science.
The Severeley Mentally Ill And the Homeless Mentally Ill

Federal Reports on Research Priorities, Services, Funding Examine Difficult Issues

The needs of two highly vulnerable populations—the severely mentally ill and the homeless mentally ill—have drawn the attention of federal policymakers. The result: two extensive reports released over the past year. Taken together, the reports paint a distressing picture of the fragmented nature of existing programs to assist millions of mentally ill citizens to maintain or regain their ability to function as community members.

The maze of services and procedures confounds both the people in need of help and psychological researchers who wish to understand the epidemiology of mental illnesses, their natural courses, and the best approaches to accurately diagnose and treat sufferers in real-world settings, the reports conclude.

They also provide comprehensive reviews of existing research and service programs and identify major gaps in existing knowledge. The report on the severely mentally ill establishes a set of priorities for new research initiatives, suggests ways to restructure academic research, and makes provisions for new funds for research.

Homeless Mentally Ill

The most recent report, Outcasts on Main Street: Report of the Federal Task Force on Homelessness and Severe Mental Illness, released in March, outlines a national strategy to eradicate homelessness among people with severe mental illness, including more than 50 specific steps federal agencies are urged to take to improve the nation’s system of mental health care and housing options.

The task force, sponsored by the departments of Health and Human Services and Housing and Urban Development and chaired by Alan L. Leshner, deputy director of the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH), proposed two major federal initiatives: “Safe Havens” (low-cost, semiprivate lodging sites for mentally ill homeless persons unable or unwilling to participate in existing shelter or housing programs) and “ACCESS” (a program to encourage states and localities to develop comprehensive, integrated systems of treatment, housing, and support for homeless people with severe mental health or substance abuse problems).

The President’s 1993 budget request for HUD calls for $50 million for Safe Havens and $27 million for ACCESS. HUD is also consolidating, into one $204 million transitional housing program, three of its programs set up under the provisions of the 1987 McKinney Homeless Assistance Act. Altogether, the report estimates that about 200,000—5% of the 4 million Americans with severe mental illness—are homeless. (See box for a summary of the report’s recommendations for disseminating research knowledge.)

In an interview with the Observer, Leshner described the Outcasts report as a conceptual companion to the earlier report, Caring for People with Severe Mental Disorders. The Outcasts report, he said, “talks about what the overall system of care should look like and how to literally deliver services” to the homeless mentally ill. The question for research, Leshner explained, is “How do you integrate services?”

Severe Mental Disorders Research

Of more immediate significance to psychological scientists is last spring’s report, Caring for People with Severe Mental Disorders: A National Plan of Research to Improve Services, for which a detailed implementation plan was released in April 1992. (The plan provides detailed areas of research for which NIMH is accepting proposals; see announcement information below.)

To prepare the report, three panels of researchers met over a two-year period to assess the current state of clinical services research, service systems research, and research resources. (See box for each panel’s recommendations.)

The report’s roots are traced to the success of an NIMH-commissioned plan for schizophrenia research, which succeeded in the 1980’s in expanding the scope and magnitude of clinical and basic research on that illness, according to Jack D. Burke, Jr., head of the Division of Applied and Services research at NIMH when the report was being prepared.

One of the seven panels convened for the schizophrenia plan called attention to the problems communities were experiencing in maintaining services of high quality. That prompted Lewis L. Judd, then the NIMH director, to convene a new group to span the growing field of research on the delivery of mental health services in general.

Realizing their potential to trigger suicide or create chronic disability, the Caring for People national plan focused on schizophrenia, major mood disorders, and other severe mental conditions. And, like the Outcasts report, Caring for People emphasizes the large gap between basic research—in this case, knowledge of the

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE
The central generation of researchers and provide an basic psychology, from besides providing a wealth of "unprecedented struggle to overcome not only the despair of illness but the confusing, fragmented maze of bureaucracy created by a wide range of human service providers and agencies."

Lesher says this report is being used as a framework to establish a research agenda for NIMH. And he argues that besides providing a wealth of opportunities for research into clinical services, the report’s implementation plan can be an avenue to explore fundamental issues of basic psychology, from “motivation to the role of family processes” in provoking and ameliorating mental illness. It also opens doors for researchers in cross-cultural facets of mental illness and its treatment.

Following the report’s release, Clifford Attkisson, chair of the panel on clinical services research, argued that the plan’s recommendations, if carried out, would greatly enrich the training of the next generation of researchers and provide an “unprecedented opportunity to participate in systematic research over several years.”

Specifically, Attkisson said that implementing the plan would vastly improve knowledge in the following areas: the epidemiology and natural course of severe mental disorders; the best methods to assess them and select the best treatment regimens; the nature and extent of co-morbidity problems of substance and alcohol abuse; and the clinical outcomes of specific interventions.

Similarly, David Mechanic, a noted medical sociologist and chair of the panel on research resources, argued that, although there is a “long tradition of research on mental health in the social and behavioral sciences ... very little effort until recently has been focused on the services system itself and how it can be organized more effectively.” With the release, in April, of the detailed implementation plan, which calls for research proposals to carry out research demonstration projects and develop the careers of researchers in the areas of clinical services, service systems, and mental health economics, HHS policymakers hope to change that.

A special session, chaired by Jane Steinberg of NIMH, at the APS June convention reviewed the research plan in an effort to familiarize psychologists with the research implications and opportunities. Participants included Attkisson, William Hargreaves, NIMH panel; and Lee Sechrest, University of Arizona.

C.R.

**Caring for People: Conclusions for Research**

Among the many findings of the three panels that prepared *Caring for People with Severe Mental Disorders* are:

Clinical Services Research - The central question is “What works, for whom, and under what circumstances?” More research is needed to determine not just rates of disorders but levels of impairment; to ensure that, in routine, day-to-day settings, individual diagnoses are accurate and complete and that treatment plans are tailored to the individual and integrated with other rehabilitation services; and to improve methods to assess outcomes, both clinically and in overall quality of life.

Service Systems Research - It is still unclear how best to provide coordinated care. For example, is it better to have a single “case manager” to coordinate services from several bureaucratic entities, or to set up a single agency to integrate systems of care? One higher priority is research on the impact of programs such as Medicaid, federal block grants, and direct state appropriations, and how best to structure expenditures to achieve the broader goals of improved care for the mentally ill. More research also is needed on how best to assess and manage violent behavior in community settings, and how to minimize or overcome the stigma of mental illness.

Research Resources - The panel advised NIMH to develop new mechanisms to support multidisciplinary efforts in the area of services research. It also made a number of recommendations to alter the ways in which research personnel are trained and their careers developed. “Society confers great prestige on basic science and clinical research,” the report noted. “By contrast, mental health services research is a relatively new and less prestigious field that has more limited funding and far fewer established research mentors” and is carried out in settings that often intimidate novice investigators not accustomed to carrying out research in natural settings. Thus, the panel recommended instituting new incentives to recruit researchers already well-grounded in basic behavioral and social science, including new fellowships with more generous stipends than currently exist for postdoctoral study in mental health services. Such a program would encourage people with clinical experience, such as nurses and social workers, to carry out needed research. The panel also recommended steps to improve the career structure for mental health services investigators, a new research journal, and a research clearinghouse modeled on the National Clearinghouse for Alcohol and Drug Information.

**Outcasts on Main Street: Recommendations for Disseminating Knowledge**

The *Outcasts on Main Street* report makes three recommendations to address what it described as critical gaps in information:

- The Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration (ADAMHA) should undertake a national community education initiative to inform people about the population of homeless people with drug, alcohol, and mental health disorders. That initiative is to include research and research demonstration programs, and dissemination of information through publications and conferences.
- NIMH and ADAMHA are to fund an integrated treatment center to assess its efficacy in dealing with co-morbidity problems of the homeless.
- NIMH is to identify “exemplary comprehensive programs that integrate housing and support services for homeless severely mentally ill persons” and “disseminate information on how they were developed and how they can be adapted to other communities.”

**Outcasts on Main Street** can be ordered from the Office of Programs for the Homelessly Mentally Ill, NIMH, Rm. 7C-08, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857.

**Caring for People with Severe Mental Disorders** can be ordered from the Division for Applied and Services Research, NIMH, Rm. 18C-26, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857. The research program announcement number for the implementation of Caring for People is PA-92-85 (issued April 1992). A copy can be obtained by writing to the Division of Applied and Services Research, NIMH, Rm. 18C-14, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857.
NIMH TRANSFER FROM PAGE 3

ADAMHA institutes are protected when the agencies go to NIH:

The conferees do not intend the reorganization to diminish the important behavioral science portfolios of the three former ADAMHA institutes. Indeed, the conferees expect that the transfer of these three institutes will bring to all of the NIH institutes an increased appreciation for and emphasis on behavioral science and health services research. The conferees reiterate expectation that the transfer of these institutes. Indeed, the conferees port for important behavioral science portfolios of the three Institutes will bring to all of the NIH institutes an increased appreciation for and emphasis on behavioral science and health services research. The conferees reiterate expectation that the transfer of these institutes.

The need for a smooth transition is further underscored by the bill’s provisions to “hold harmless” the existing peer review systems of the three Institutes; that is, the review systems would be transferred intact, and would not be merged into the NIH system for several years. APS support for the transfer was contingent in part on this provision, in recognition of the need for careful planning before the review systems are combined, and also because there are several aspects of the NIMH system that may serve as models for improvements in the NIH system.

And Then...

...in a relatively rare occurrence, the full House voted to return the ADAMHA bill to the conference committee. Opposition was based on two main issues: changes in block grant formulas which reduce federal funding for services in Texas and Florida as well a few other states; and language permitting states to use federal funding for needle exchange programs.

The concern over block grant formulas was not new, having been part and parcel of the debate since the bill was proposed last year. The objections concerning needle exchange were only recently raised, even though the needle exchange provision had been in the bill for some time, leading to the speculation that it was used by those concerned about the block grant formulas to drum up more votes against the bill.

And Then...

...the bill’s status in the House was further weakened by a conflict within the Bush Administration that pitted Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) officials against political operatives within the Administration. Just as HHS was preparing to send a letter to the House endorsing the compromise bill, another Administration official—drug czar and former governor of Florida Bob Martinez—sent a letter to the House asking that the conference bill be returned to the conference committee because of the needle exchange program.

Martinez apparently was acting unilaterally, but his letter caused health officials in the Administration to step back from their previously strong position, giving House Republicans mixed signals and opening the way for a final vote to recommit the bill.

Normally, being returned to conference committee would be enough to kill a bill. In fact, the initial reaction of frustrated congressional staffers was to wash their hands of the whole thing and wait until next year. But the conferees regrouped, moved quickly, deleted the needle exchange program, and the bill was then brought up before the Senate, where despite much storm und drang it was approved overwhelmingly.

The Suspense Is Over

On July 1, following some parliamentary maneuvering, the House finally

New Journal, Ergonomics in Design, Moves Forward

SANTA MONICA, CALIFORNIA—Planning and design for the Human Factors Society’s (HFS) new publication, Ergonomics in Design: The Magazine of Human Factors Applications, are proceeding smoothly, reports the Society.

In April, the Society’s Executive Council appointed Daryle J. Gardner-Bonneau to assume the editorship following Norman D. Schwalm’s regretful resignation in order to accept a university position in Israel. Schwalm had assembled a distinguished editorial board and established many of the procedures for gathering contributions for the magazine. Gardner-Bonneau, who considers herself a generalist in the human factors field, is a senior scientist with CTA, Incorporated, in McKee City, New Jersey.

Ergonomics in Design is a quarterly magazine aimed at professionals working or interested in the field of human factors/ergonomics. The editorial focus is on the application of ergonomics research in all areas and will include articles describing concept development, research, design, testing and evaluation, and manufacturing processes. Articles, commentaries, reviews, and industry overviews are invited. The premier issue is scheduled for January, 1993, and nonmember subscription and advertising rates will be available this summer. For manuscript preparation guidelines, contact: Human Factors Society, PO Box 1369, Santa Monica, CA 90406-1369 (tel.: 310-394-9793).

The Human Factors Society is a multidisciplinary professional organization of 5,000 members in the United States and throughout the world. Members include psychologists, engineers, designers, and other scientists and professionals, all of whom have a common interest in designing systems and equipment to be safe and effective for the people who operate and maintain them.
appreciation for behavioral science on Congress's intent concerning the missions of the three institutes; increased research at all NIH institutes; and recognition of the role of behavioral science research in addressing physical conditions as well as mental and addictive diseases.

Although APS has supported the transfer to NIH from its earliest moments, many in behavioral science remain concerned that NIH's overwhelmingly biomedical orientation may overshadow the behavioral research mission of NIMH and the other ADAMHA institutes.

Executive Director Alan Kraut, in a July 1 letter to NIH Director Bernadine Healy, asked "that steps be taken immediately (i.e., during the planning of the transition from ADAMHA)" to assure the concerns of those in the behavioral science community about the transfer. He asked Healy to undertake "some near-term action that can be used as a sign to demonstrate to all the commitment that NIH has to behavioral science."

Suggested actions range from assigning permanent status to the existing ad hoc NIH Health and Behavior Committee to inclusion of a behavioral science initiative in the current version of the NIH strategic plan.

"In the longer term," Kraut wrote, "there has to be a more visible role for behavioral science in NIH's strategic plans and other priority setting activities, including appropriate recognition of the unique behavioral science priorities of the NIMH, NIDA and NIAAA." S.B.
Spotlight on Research

What’s Makes a Good Leader?

New real-world research bolsters findings from questionnaire data: Performance monitoring and communication of consequences are key

After conducting detailed field studies of work groups in settings as diverse as insurance company offices and regatta sailboats, Judi L. Komaki, a psychologist at CUNY’s Baruch College, has identified two key behaviors that seem to distinguish effective from ineffective managers: monitoring worker’s performance and communicating consequences.

The results are surprising, given the fact that numerous other studies relying on questionnaires administered to workers have failed to identify any consistent set of factors that pinpoint effective leaders.

The actions Komaki has uncovered are among seven that, on the basis of surveys, the literature has suggested are important, but which have not been consistently backed by studies in the field.

“There’s been lots of research using questionnaires. And it’s not as if no one has found anything,” Komaki said in an interview. However, she added, “the results they find are weak.”

Speaking at an “in-process” review seminar convened by the Army Research Institute, which funds psychological research in such areas as group leadership, deception, and motivation, Komaki noted that the classic reference, Bass and Stogdill’s Handbook of Leadership, reports no identifiable factor, based on questionnaires, that distinguishes effective and ineffective leaders in the field.

Sailing and the Seven Keys

The seven general categories of behaviors that Komaki has been using to study leaders include: solitary actions, such as drafting speeches; non-work related activities, such as participating in sports; work-related activities, such as discussing work issues but not actual performance; referring to one’s own or others’ work to convey expectations of what is to be done (called antecedents); monitoring workers’ performances; and providing consequences by evaluating those performances and communicating knowledge of that performance to the worker (for example, by saying “you did that right.”)

In 1986, Komaki developed a measure called the Operant Supervisory Taxonomy Index (OSTI), to conduct observations of supervisors’ behaviors. The index is based on operant conditioning theory, which holds that consequences are the key to shaping behavior. In turn, Komaki said, “only monitoring of behavior permits a supervisor to provide consequences.”

Using the OSTI, Komaki had observers—within hearing distance of supervisors—recorded supervisors’ behaviors minute by minute. Initial testing showed that the index was “useful, doable, reliable, and essential” to identifying effective leaders.

For example, Komaki found “a correlation of zero between a manager’s estimate of the percentage of time devoted to specific tasks, and the actual observational data acquired with the OSTI.”

Since then, Komaki and her colleagues have used the OSTI to study managers in an insurance company, newspaper printing company, theater group, and skippers in a sailing regatta. As a group, the studies confirmed her initial hypothesis that monitoring and providing consequences are the keys that separate effective managers from ineffective ones.

For instance, 11 of the top 12 insurance managers sampled subordinates’ work as a source of monitoring information, while only 4 of the bottom 12 even once in 7 months picked up a claim form of a subordinate. The top supervisors also watched employees working at their computer terminals and asked the employees themselves about their work. Among the newspaper managers, the most effective ones spent, on average, about 50% more time providing consequences than did the ineffective ones.

Supervising

Komaki and her co-worker, Mitzi Apter-Desselles, grew interested in examining how managers supervised the work of groups of subordinates. Komaki was prompted to look at the differences between skippers when she (using her own funds) seized on a once-in-a-lifetime chance to take advantage of a near-perfect experimental setup: a round-robin regatta in which skippers were randomly assigned to the same type of boats, and crews were randomly assigned to skippers. Each crew consisted of three sailors with varying levels of experience. The team’s standings in the race provided a simple measure of effectiveness, and a variation of the OSTI, used by an observer standing within 10 feet of the skipper, provided a measure of leadership.

Komaki found a substantial correlation between the standings and the skippers’ uses of monitoring and providing consequences. “Despite this being a tumultuous activity, sailing still permits managers to monitor and provide consequences,” Komaki said at the ARI seminar.
In an interview, she noted that Australian psychologist Neil Brewer, in his study of police sergeants; and Finnish psychologists Stina Immonen and Marita Hyttinen, in their studies of, respectively, revenue collectors and construction workers, have reached conclusions similar to hers. That’s one of the reasons Komaki is so excited about her line of research.

**Combining Behavioral and Cognitive Approaches**

The other Komaki is enthusiastic about this research is that she foresees a way to start connecting behaviorist and cognitive theories of leadership in new research she has planned: studying leaders in action aboard larger boats.

One of the criticisms of Komaki’s work, she says, is her finding that a small difference in the amount of monitoring one manager provides over another—as little as one hour a week—can exert such a strong effect.

Based on her own laboratory work and the field work of Sonia Goltz at the University of Notre Dame, Komaki has concluded that even a little monitoring sets off a cascade of interactions, a “rich dialogue,” triggered by a subordinate’s sense that the supervisor cares about the worker. Komaki is starting to videotape interactions between supervisors and subordinates to permit a minute-by-minute analysis of the interplay of behaviors and interpretations.

Already, she says, business managers react positively to her work because “it’s so straightforward and provides things for them to do” to improve their managerial effectiveness. With the new work, she hopes to provide additional insight into a nearly unexplored topic: what makes for good followership.

---

**AARP Andrus Foundation Announces New Grant Program**

WASHINGTON, DC—The AARP Andrus Foundation Board of Trustees announced in early June that it will begin receiving pre-application abstracts that describe action-demonstration projects. The projects must apply the results of research to meet the needs of America’s older population.

“Andrus Foundation Trustees want to fund projects that use research results to encourage improved services, programs, and information to meet the intergenerational needs of an aging society,” Andrus Foundation Director Kenneth Cook said in making the announcement. The projects must bridge the gap between research and practice, according to Cook.

Cook said the action-demonstration project grants will be awarded to colleges, universities, and other nonprofit organizations that have as a major organizational purpose providing service to older adults, or those who work on their behalf.

Action-demonstration projects develop and evaluate innovative programs for improving service delivery, assess and develop program priorities, demonstrate the need for new or expanded services, outline information for policy consideration, or provide other usable findings of direct benefit for current application. The areas of interest include:

- maintaining the independence of older people;
- health and long-term care;
- work and volunteer opportunities; and,
- improvement in service delivery.

Pre-applications on other topics will be considered if particularly meritorious. Grants are awarded for up to three years at a maximum of $150,000 per year.

The AARP Andrus Foundation has become a leader in providing funding for applied gerontological research. It has also expanded grantmaking activities to ensure that the research it funds is used to the fullest in serving the needs of older Americans.

For an application package, write to: AARP ANDRUS FOUNDATION, 601 E St., NW, Washington, DC 20049.

AARP is the nation’s leading organization for people age 50 and older. It serves their needs and interests through legislative advocacy, research, informative programs, and community services.
The recissions have raised the specter of a decade ago when behavioral and social science programs of NSF and other federal agencies were drastically cut or in some cases eliminated by the Reagan Administration, with support of some in Congress. But the current situation is different. For example, a key Senate staffer sees the grants as the unintended victims or “hostages” in the political hardball going on between the Administration and Congress and believes that the recision proposals were not intended as wholesale criticisms of behavioral and social science research.

Another difference is that the entire scientific community objected in force to the rescissions, which were seen as an attack on the scientific peer review system and science more generally.

Beyond their immediate impact on individual grantees, the rescissions, which have been signed into law by President Bush, represent a significant setback to the behavioral and social science community. One major problem is that grants were singled out because of their titles, and it was the titles that were used by Congress to embarrass the Administration. (See complete list of the NSF grants proposed for rescission on opposite page.)

Makin’ Bacon

Although the cuts in the NSF grants amounted to only a little more than $350,000—out of a total package of $8.1 billion—the grants were portrayed as being highly symbolic of “wasteful executive branch” spending “executive branch pork,” according to Senator Byrd. “Pork”—as in pork-barrel projects—is the term of art used to describe projects that have been funded on the basis of political influence more than on the basis of need.

One of the benefits of seniority in Congress typically has meant being able to steer funds to one’s district for improvements in roads, water systems, or other projects related to infrastructure. But the debate over pork has now been extended to large-scale defense projects, most notably the Seawolf submarine and the Strategic Defense Initiative.

Byrd talked at length about why these grants were targeted.

“An examination of a host of grants in the NSF led me to conclude that while there may be some theoretical value for these items, the American taxpayers may wonder why their hard earned money is being spent on these items,” Byrd said, referring to the NSF grants.

“Given the importance of the Foundation’s work in manufacturing technology, which have direct ties to our

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE
future economic competitiveness, it is ludicrous that the NSF is spending limited resources on these unnecessary and wasteful items.”

**But Was There a Dentist in Eden?**  
Later in discussing the NIDR grants, Byrd said, “Another wasteful executive branch item... was $94,000 for a grant to study why people fear the dentist.”

Warming to the subject, he continued. “Well, people have been fearing the dentist since Adam and Eve were driven from the garden for their sins and people will continue to fear the dentist from now until kingdom come, and it will not require a $94,000 study to determine that.”

In criticizing another NIDR grant “to study the incidence of dental fear in the population,” Byrd summed up his views: “Common sense tells me that everybody fears going to the dentist. I might go to the dentist two times a year, and I always fear going. So we do not need to waste money to study that.”

**APS Responds**

In testimony before the Senate Appropriations subcommittee which oversees the NSF budget, APS Executive Director Alan Kraut said that “whether intended or not, it is not difficult to see how this rescission action by the Senate could feed the same ideas that gave rise to the prohibitions on surveys of sexual behavior at NIH, or the fetal tissue research ban, or even the attacks on the National Endowment for the Arts.

“That is, no matter what the reasoning behind these proposed cuts...they give comfort to those who would attack any research on issues of social concern—those who do not want to study AIDS or unintended pregnancies or racism or a host of sensitive issues,” he said.

In response, Senator Barbara Mikulski (D-MD), chair of the subcommittee, stressed that the proposed grant rescissions were the unfortunate result of political battles with the Administration, who had “picked the fight,” and not the Senate targeting science or social research. She apologized for the NSF having been the “victim” and gave her opinion that the conference report allowed the NSF flexibility in deciding where to make its spending reductions.

It should be noted, however, that in a kind of “they started it” mentality, Senator Mikulski and others in Congress have not ruled out similar actions in the future in the event that President Bush escalates his attack on congressional spending.

**Senate Support for the HCI**

Mikulski also commended APS and the psychological community on developing the Human Capital Initiative (HCI) (see February 1992 Observer). She told Kraut that this is exactly the kind of thing we need and indicated that the HCI would be used in the Subcommittee’s discussions about NSF. Since the hearings, Mikulski’s staff has been in touch with APS concerning specific ways that NSF should be using the HCI.

**Welcome to Washington**

Another difference from the cuts of a decade ago is that behavioral and social science research has its own directorate at NSF, which should make a significant difference in meeting the challenges posed by the rescissions. Dr. Cora Marrett, who arrived in Washington as the director of the new Social, Behavioral and Economic (SBE) Sciences directorate at NSF just as the rescissions were being handed down, has met with APS and clearly recognizes the long-term implications of the rescissions. Among other things, she indicated that the Human Capital Initiative will be useful as something NSF can use in several ways but especially to help explain behavioral research to Congress.

**The Outcome**

In the final version of the FY 92 rescissions legislation, there is a compromise on the NSF provisions. The specific grants are no longer mentioned in the bill itself. But the explanatory report accompanying the compromise bill chides NSF for funding these grants and calls for a reexamination of those same grants. At the same time, NSF will be hit now with a general $2 million rescission, compared to the original amount of approximately $350,000 for just the targeted grants. The funds to be rescinded at NIDR were reduced by half, but the cuts still are targeted to the pain research projects singled out in the Senate proposal. **S.B.**

### Titles of NSF Grants proposed for rescission as cited in the May 5, 1992, Congressional Record:

- Middle Class Lawyers: The transformation of small firm practice
- Monogamy and aggression
- Holism in psychobiology in the Twentieth Century
- Affective bases of person perception
- The representation of attitudes
- Economic opportunity in urban America (1850-1870)
- A historic study of Japan’s famous slogan ‘Rich Nation, Strong Army’ and its impact on Japanese technology
- Status attainment in Chinese urban areas
- Firm age and wages
- American perceptions of justice
- An east-west collaborative study
- Herd behavior: Microfoundations and evidence from decision making by firms and about the global environment
- Analysis of mental computation performance and estimation strategy-use among Japanese students and curricula of these topics in Japanese schools
- The timing of control and stock externalities in the presence of learning with application of global warming
- Conflict paradigms and the instance theory of automation
- Exemplar-based processing in social judgment
- A history of applied science in France, 1681-1941
- Emerging coalitions in the Soviet All-Union Republican Legislature
- Compensation system design, employment and firm performance: An analysis of French microdata and a comparison to the U.S.A.
- The structures and processes of building provisions: A case study of master-planned communities
- The transformation of the large law firm in England: A comparative analysis
- The evolution of optimizing behavior and of attitudes towards risk
- Applying space technology to global change: Values, institutions and decisions
- Traditional and nontraditional forms of popular religion in Sicily
- Auctions with entry/exit decisions
- Maintenance of a polymorphism in mate selection
- The systematic study of senate elections
- The late prehistoric political economy of the Upper Mantaro Valley in Peru
- Sexual mimicry of swallowtail butterflies
- Song production in freely behaving birds
- American legal realism, empirical social science and the law professor’s professional identity
- Norms, self-interest and taxpayers’ decisions: Adaption to 1986 tax reform
APS Staff Additions . . .

Betty Willis Joins APS Government Relations Team

APS welcomes Betty Willis as the new Assistant Director of Government Relations. Betty is the latest addition to the APS headquarters office (now 10 staff) and was previously the Legislative Analyst for the Society for Neuroscience where she was responsible for issues under the jurisdiction of the Society's Governmental and Public Affairs Committee, the Committee on Animals in Research, and the Ad Hoc Committee on the Decade of the Brain.

Many of Betty's past legislative responsibilities, including analyzing and reporting on appropriations bills for research-supporting agencies, as well as preparation of congressional testimony in support of those agencies, will be very similar to her current duties at APS. She is very familiar with the federal agencies of primary interest to APS (e.g., National Science Foundation, National Institutes of Health).

In addition, Betty has had extensive exposure to the issue of the use of animals in research and has worked closely with various researchers and national organizations in promoting the importance of animal research. Her close ties with biomedical research and scientific organizations and congressional and federal agency staff will certainly be beneficial to APS's legislative and public policy advocacy. Betty will work closely with Sarah Brookhart, APS Director of Government Relations.

Prior to her position with the Society for Neuroscience, Betty directed the Washington Office of the State of Georgia where she was the Governor's liaison to Congress and federal agencies regarding legislative and regulatory issues impacting the state. She also has six years experience working in a congressional office handling a number of legislative issues including health, aging, biomedical research, energy and environment, and telecommunications.

"Our country is experiencing an unprecedented period of political and social uncertainty, with fierce competition for scarce resources and services. The APS-initiated Human Capital Initiative [HCI] does an excellent job of defining how psychology can contribute to the solutions and amelioration of this uncertainty," said Betty. "It will be a pleasure to advocate on behalf of scientific psychology with the HCI document and initiatives to back me up," she added. [The HCI document describes six major problem areas facing our society today and will be an important tool for APS to use in focusing congressional attention toward resolving them. (See February 1992 Observer.)]

Betty emphasized that "because each of these problems involves human behavior and a national research effort, APS can play a significant role in improving the nation's overall health and future prosperity. However, with funding opportunities continuing to decline, we will have to work even harder to present our agenda as priority issues that cannot be put on the back burner."

Betty said she was very enthusiastic about being a part of this exciting challenge, particularly because the issues of scientific psychology "affect every one of us and are so integral to all aspects of our society's well-being in general. I cannot imagine anyone not recognizing the crucial importance of them or being the least bit reluctant to support these initiatives."
The news media in recent weeks has featured interviews with several APS members on various research-related topics. They are listed here along with each member’s affiliation, the name of the publication in which they were quoted and a brief description of the topic on which they spoke.

The Observer editor welcomes readers to submit such news item summaries for publication in future issues of this column. If you know of an APS member featured in the media, please send a copy of the original published story. Or, in the case of TV/radio broadcasts, send a description of the program, broadcast station name, its broadcast origin (city/state), interviewee and his/her affiliation, and time and date of the broadcast. Include your own phone number and postal or email address as well.


Nicolas Christenfeld, University of California-San Diego, National Public Radio, May 21, 1992: The frequency of various expressions in everyday speech and in technical discourse.


Howard E. Gardner, Harvard University, *Chronicle of Higher Education*, June 17, 1992: Gardner is the recipient of a $2.3 million research grant from the Spencer Foundation to study how children learn.


---

**Behavior Therapy Is First-Line of Treatment for Urinary Incontinence**

**HHS Recommendations Are Contained in Clinical Practice Guidelines**

The Department of Health and Human Services’s (HHS) Agency for Health Care Policy and Research (AHCPR) issued clinical practice guidelines in March that recommend behavior therapy as the first-line approach to treating urinary incontinence in adults.

The guidelines are the result of an extensive review of the medical literature and describe the most effective treatment options for urinary incontinence in adults. Establishing three effective treatment approaches (behavior modification, drug therapy, and surgery), the guidelines stress that behavior modification is the least invasive and that, if feasible, it should be the first option employed of the three.

The behavioral approach involves training patients in bladder control and pelvic muscle exercises. Drug interventions, particularly anticholinergic agents, are recommended as an option only after behavior therapy is tried. Calcium channel blockers are not recommended. Surgery is viewed as a last resort.

At a press conference in which the panel’s report was released, HHS Assistant Secretary James O. Mason noted that more than 25% of women aged 30 to 59 years have incontinent episodes and that, overall, the problem affects some 10 million Americans. Three quarters of those are women.

Mason indicated that at least 80% can be helped (i.e., a 50% reduction in incontinent episodes) or cured through the recommended treatments.

A free copy of the report, *Urinary Incontinence in Adults*, is available from the AHCPR Publications Clearinghouse (toll-free 1-800-358-9295) or write to the AHCPR Publications Clearinghouse, PO Box 8547, Silver Spring, MD 20907.
People

**Emmerich Elected Chair Of CUDCUP**

David Emmerich, acting chair of the Department of Psychology at the State University of New York-Stony Brook, has been elected chair of the Council of University Directors of Clinical Psychology for 1992 to 1994. The council includes the directors of 144 doctoral programs in the United States and Canada.

At Stony Brook, Emmerich is conducting research on auditory perception, psychological and physiological measures of auditory function, and signal detection theory.

**Movshon Receives Rank Prize For Opto-electronics**

LONDON—APS Member Anthony J. Movshon received on June 1, 1992, the prestigious Rank Prize for his outstanding contribution to the science of Opto-electronics. He shared the prize with E. H. Adelson (MIT Media Lab), W. T. Newsome, III (Stanford Univ Shool of Medicine), and S. Zeki (Univ College-London). Opto-electronics explores the interface between the long established science of optics and the new technology of electronics in such fields as thermal imaging, optical fibers, liquid crystal displays, lasors and thermography.

The Rank Prize Funds, established in 1972, are a continuing memorial to the charitable interests of Lord and Lady Rank. There are two funds: Human and animal nutrition and crop husbandry and opto-electronics. Each of the Funds not only awards substantial prizes in recognition of significant advances in the fields of science with which they are concerned, but they also actively promote the extension and spread of human understanding in these areas by sponsoring research projects and organizing large international symposia and workshops for young scientists.

The Rank Prize Funds are administered by a group of distinguished Trustees and Advisory Committees. The Funds are intended to play an important part in recognizing and fostering significant advances in areas of science which were of interest to the late Lord Rank and which he believed would be of special benefit to mankind. Below is the text of the award citation.

**THE RANK PRIZE FOR OPTO-ELECTRONICS**

**Awarded to**

JOSEPH ANTHONY MOVSHON

For his outstanding contribution to the Science of Opto-electronics

In monkeys and humans each eye sends a million nerve fibres to the visual cortex at the back of the brain. In a series of papers starting in 1973 S. Zeki obtained evidence that its different parts analyze different qualitative aspects of the image, such as colour and motion. He also demonstrated that neurons in one particular area, called V4, correlate well with subjectively observed colour sensations, whereas those recorded at earlier points in the visual pathway do not (Nature, **284** 412-418, 1980).

E.H. Adelson, J.A. Movshon and W.T. Newsome have shown that another area, called MT, specializes in visual motion. Their first experiments determined when human subjects see two parts moving separately in a "plaid" of crossed gratings, and when they obtain a unified percept of the plaid moving coherently in an intermediate direction (Nature, **300** 523-525, 1982). Since neurons early in the pathway respond to the separate components of the plaid, seeing the unified percept requires the combination of information from two different sets of lower level neurons. They therefore looked for neurons that combined such information in the brains of cats and monkeys and eventually found them in area MT (Experimental Brain Research, Supplementum **11**, 117-151, 1986). In further experiments they trained monkeys to detect coherent motion among the dots of a randomly flickering array. When they recorded impulses from single cells in such trained monkeys they found that the performance of the single neuron was sometimes as good as or better than that of the whole animal. This is an astonishing and widely hailed result.

This work on the analysis of colour and motion in the visual cortex has revealed how individual nerve cells assemble the information needed to perform particular perceptual tasks, and it is an important step towards understanding how the human brain synthesizes a unified and accurate representation of the objects in the world around us—the miraculous gift of visual perception.
Coming Soon to Your Mailbox: 1992 Membership Directory

Inclusion of Psychology Department List Makes Directory One-of-a-kind Reference

APS members will soon receive in the mail their free 1992 Directory of the American Psychological Society (3rd Edition). To be off-press in early August, the Directory will be the most unique single source of information about the scientific psychology community to date.

In addition to the usual roster of APS's (now 14,000) members, affiliates, and fellows, the Directory also will list nearly 800 departments of psychology in undergraduate and graduate institutions. Complete with address, phone and fax numbers, the simple alphabetical listing of institutions and their psychology departments will be the only published one of its kind and should serve as a valuable resource to people attempting to locate individuals or programs.

Another enhancement over the 1991 Directory is the inclusion of a list of all APS Fellows (e.g., Charter Fellows, William James Fellows) organized by their individual areas of primary research interest (e.g., experimental psychology or social psychology). This list should prove useful to anyone wanting to locate distinguished psychologists by their primary field of interest.

Preparation and editing of the Directory began in late February but will include members and affiliates who were recorded as having joined the Society by May 6. The editor asks each member and affiliate to carefully review their individual listing in the Directory (both in the alphabetical name section and in the institutional affiliation or geographical sections) and to report any errors to the Membership Officer using a correction form included in the Directory.

Additional individual copies of the Directory will be available for sale for $25 to nonmembers and $15 for APS members and affiliates (plus $3.00 shipping/handling) in early August.

WHY TRY EQS?

• Easy To Set Up
• Contains Robust Statistics
• Requires No Matrix Algebra
• Runs On A Variety Of Computers
• Choice of Researchers From Many Fields

EQS is the easy to use, yet powerful structural equations modeling program developed by one of the world's leading authorities on structural equations modeling, Dr. Peter M. Bentler of UCLA.

EQS has command procedures that are easy to write, and the procedural setup is unmatched by competing programs. Take a look at the example – no knowledge of matrix algebra is needed.

EQS is the only program of its kind that includes the Satorra-Bentler scaled chi-square statistic, the most reliable test statistic for evaluating covariance structure models under various distributions of variables and sample sizes.

EQS also test the full range of structural equation models including Multiple Regression, Multivariate Regression, Path Analysis, Simultan-

neous Equations, Latent Variable Models, Confirmatory Factor Analysis, Structured Means Analysis, and Multiple Population Comparisons.

EQS is available on PCs, Mainframes, Workstations, and Macintosh computers – all reasonably priced. Call us at 800-238-BMDP for your free examples disk and to find out about the EQS Seminar being taught by Dr. Bentler at this year's APA Convention.

BMDP Statistical Software, Inc. • 1440 Sepulveda Blvd. • Suite 316 • Los Angeles, CA 90025 • (310) 479-7799 • FAX: (310) 312-0161
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Student Chapters and the APSSC: Development through Partnership

Outstanding Chapter of the Year

The APSSC Chapter at the University of Scranton in Scranton, Pennsylvania, submitted an annual report of stellar activities for this past year. The student group organized monthly “Brown Bag” lectures and conducted an alumni survey to build a computerized data base. The APSSC chapter and the Psychology Club cosponsored a conference attended by more than 200 persons from 14 institutions. An outstanding outreach program included participation in the first Brain Exchange Electronic Mail Network (BEEM). BEEM is a new electronic mail utility providing communication for interactive conferences. Scranton members spent a morning answering questions about psychology for fourth graders in inner-city Chicago. What an outstanding chapter; nice accomplishments, Scranton!

Student Chapter Activities Growing

Every March, APSSC chapters submit an annual report of chapter activities. Reports this year reflect diversity and creativity among members through a variety of well developed activities. APSSC continues to grow through the commitment of its members and member chapters. Below are ideas and events from several chapters:

The University of Pennsylvania had their second APSSC conference in which over 80 persons attended. The chapter also provided workshops on using “PsycLIT” for undergraduates, and on how to create a poster presentation display.

Central Michigan University reported a good and environmentally aware fund raising event, a permanent receptacle for recyclable bottles and cans. Proceeds collected through recycling will be used for conference travel and other expenses.

Nazareth College of Rochester reported extraordinary member turnout for an outreach program. This chapter held a Valentine Party with dancing, games, and food for juvenile delinquent boys at their residential facility. The chapter reports that the boys and students had lots of fun.

An interdisciplinary effort was provided by the University of Evansville-Indiana. This APSSC group joined forces with the biological sciences club to present student research related to hereditary factors in alcoholism. This chapter also participated in providing recreational therapy to a group of children in a psychiatric hospital.

The University of West Florida demonstrated that diligence can be rewarding. This APSSC was able to obtain funding through their student government to finance conference attendance for nine students.

New Member Recruitment Contest

Touro College in Manhattan, New York, won the new member recruitment contest with a total of 37 new members acquired over the past academic year. The student group garnered support for their newly developing undergraduate chapter by organizing presentations by international guest researchers and by beginning plans for regional conferences with neighboring schools. A within-school mentorship program was established with faculty from Touro’s research institute. The chapter has also begun an excellent enterprise, the publication of a journal called “Dimensions,” for student projects and communication. Congratulations, Touro!
Ask the Advocate ... Bonnie Eberhardt

Q: I've been reading the Observer articles about the Summit on accreditation. While I understand the importance of attending an accredited school, I would like to know more about the accreditation process. How does a school become accredited?

A: While other countries have governmental supervision or control of educational institutions, the accreditation process is unique to U.S. universities. Accreditation is a voluntarily sought status indicating that a university or a specialized program within a university has met or exceeded certain criteria. A non-governmental granting body, the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation (COPA) oversees this process. Because of the number and diversity of programs seeking status, COPA designates specialized accrediting bodies to actually evaluate categories of programs. There are 56 such accrediting bodies. These bodies are required to represent both professional and educational interests. The accrediting body for psychology has been the American Psychological Association's (APA) Committee on Accreditation.

The evaluation process takes place every 5 to 10 years and involves psychology programs developing a detailed self-evaluation report. Programs point out what they do well and what areas require improvement. The Committee on Accreditation then sends a team to visit the program and develop a report and recommendations. In addition to the structure of the program itself, the Committee looks at school financial conditions, student personnel services, and administrative strength. All of this information is then forwarded to COPA for a decision. Once accredited, any substantive changes in a program require prior approval by COPA. COPA can review a program at any time.

Accreditation is important to students because in most states, attendance at an accredited school is a prerequisite for applying for licensure. However, because of the importance of licensure, particularly to clinical students, there is a tendency for programs to develop a narrow focus. So many resources are required to satisfy clinical-licensure requirements that scientist-practitioner or research-academic training may suffer. In addition, many accredited free-standing psychology schools have sprung up, turning out practitioners with no emphasis on scientific training. Thus, there is no guarantee of quality in an accredited program. As the market for clinicians becomes more saturated, accreditation and licensing laws are coming under pressure to change. For more on this I suggest:


The Pavlovian Society is dedicated to the scientific study of behavior and promotion of interdisciplinary scientific communication. It recognizes the value of research at the molecular level but encourages members to stress the significance of their scientific observations to the whole functioning organism. Thus, the Society fosters an integrative scientific approach and encourages scientists to adopt it in publications and in presentations. The Society’s interests range from basic to clinical science activities. Regular activities include an annual scientific meeting, publication of the official Society journal, *Integrative Physiological and Behavioral Science,* and a quarterly newsletter. The Society also operates within a confederation of similar organizations, with a Pavlovian tradition, in Europe and the Orient.

The Society was established in 1955 by W. Horsley Gantt at The Johns Hopkins School of Medicine. Early meetings were held in the Baltimore-New York area, but as the membership started to assume an international character, annual meetings were held abroad as well as throughout the United States. Membership includes physicians, PhDs, clinicians, and scientists. Past presidents include Howard Lidell, Harold Wolf, B.F. Skinner, Stewart Wolf, Jr., Wagner Bridger, William Schoenfeld, Carmine Clemente, William Reese, Orville Smith, Gyorgy Adam, Herbert Kimmel, K.V. Sudakov, David Randall, Joseph Brady, Roscoe Dykman, Shoji Kakigi, John Furedy, and Jaylan Turkkan.

The September 1991 Baltimore meeting was attended by 80 registrants. Symposia and individual presentations provided 35 scientific papers. The annual meeting also includes a reception, an evening banquet, and an awards luncheon. Annual meeting sites are selected to promote the collegial atmosphere of the Society. The 1992 meeting will be in Los Angeles at the Holiday Inn-Westwood Plaza Hotel, October 9-12.

**OFFICERS**

**Presidents**
- Yo Miyata, President (1991-1992)
- Kwansei Gakuin Univ., Japan
- Benjamin Natelson, President-Elect (1992-1993)
- VA Medical Center, East Orange, NJ, and
- New Jersey School of Medicine
- Jaylan Turkkan, Past President (1990-1991)
- The Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine

**Executive Committee**
- Stewart Wolf, Chairman
- Plus present officers and past presidents

**Secretary-Treasurer**
- William P. Pare
- VA Medical Center, Perry Point, MD

**BACKGROUND**

The "Organizational Profile," a fairly regular feature of the *APS Observer,* informs the research community about organizations devoted primarily to serving psychological scientists and academicians. It is difficult for anyone to keep abreast of the various organizations of potential personal interest. This section should help in that task. The Editor welcomes your suggestions as to organizations warranting coverage.
Dear Editor:

In response to the May, 1992, Observer article on the impending dearth of young investigators, I suggest that NIMH create and implement a large-scale research-apprenticeship program. For investigators who obtain research grants in the usual fashion (i.e., by creating a research program, initiating requests for grants, and going through a peer-review process) some mandatory minimum number of undergraduate apprentices should be a part of the program.

In addition, on many campuses there faculty who cannot (for whatever reasons) create research projects de novo but who could inspire students to love and do good science under the proper conditions. I estimate these conditions to be the initiation of a research project by someone else, good technical and analytic support, and relatively frequent tough-minded consultations and monitoring provided in benign ways. These conditions should exist in the context of overarching goals which make it important for all parties to succeed. Given these conditions, I think many of the faculty would make fine mentors and many of the apprentices would evolve into good researchers.

For years, APS, SPSSI, APA, and NIMH have been discussing large-scale research programs with high social payoff. My suggestion would be for NIMH (in consultation with the other organizations) to start one or more of these programs (which generally would benefit from multi-site data collection), and to assign, by bid or by direct negotiation, parts of the program to different investigators, all of whom would be committed to training and mentoring undergraduate apprentices and to accept the monitoring, mentoring, and consultations of the sponsoring body.

I do not know the cost of establishing such a program, and I suspect starting would demand a level of cooperation among scientists and agencies rarely achieved, but I think the final results might, indeed, be worthwhile.

Alfred F. Glixman, PhD
98 Pleasant Avenue
Portland, ME 04103

Letters to the Editor

Calls for Papers


Behavioral Sciences and the Law announces two special issues: (1) CIVIL COMPETENCIES and (2) COERCION IN MENTAL HEALTH CARE The Civil Competencies issue will cover empirical, legal, ethical, and clinical-legal aspects of the various civil competencies such as competency to consent/ refuse medical and psychiatric treatment, manage personal or financial affairs, write a will. Deadline for manuscripts: Oct. 1, 1992. The Coercion in Mental Health Care issue is under the guest editorship of Steven K. Hoge, MD, and Charles W. Litz, PhD. The issue will focus on formal and informal coercion in mental health care. Of interest are papers from empirical, legal, ethical, and clinical-legal perspectives which address coercive practices by mental health professionals, health care systems, family members, and others. Manuscript deadline: Dec. 1, 1992. Detailed style sheets for the journal are available from the Editor. Manuscripts for both special issues should be 20-30 double-spaced pages adhering to the Publications Manual of the APA or the Harvard Law Review. They should contain a 150-word abstract and be submitted in triplicate to Robert M. Weitzstein, MD, Editor, Behavioral Sciences and the Law, Law and Psychiatry Program, Western Psychiatric Institute and Clinic, 3811 O'Hara St., Pittsburgh, PA 15213, Tel.: 412-624-2161.

Alfred F. Glixman
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