NEW YORK CITY—Neither the dark clouds of impending declines in federal research funding nor the prospect of a city-wide hotel workers' strike—postponed at the last minute—dampened the excitement of APS's seventh annual conference in New York City, June 29 to July 2.

The 2,100 attendance figure was on a par with previous APS convention attendance levels, but more than ever before the conference participants represented the full spectrum of all subdisciplines of psychological science. And participants and attendees ranged from fledgling undergraduates to senior researchers.

Nearly 1,000 attended the 1995 Presidential Symposium to hear top researchers explore scientific merits of and premises underlying debate on differences in intelligence.

WASHINGTON, DC—In a scenario chillingly reminiscent of attacks on behavioral research in the early 1980s, basic behavioral and social science research at the National Science Foundation (NSF) is being singled out for possible elimination by an influential member of the US House of Representatives. What initially began as some seemingly offhand remarks by Rep. Robert Walker (R-PA), who criticized NSF support of behavioral and social science research, has evolved into a serious legislative initiative by the House Science Committee that Walker chairs.

One striking difference from that last go-round is the strong resistance from the entire science community, not just from psychology researchers and other behavioral and social science disciplines. Other sciences see this as an attack on NSF as a whole.
NSF Defends Against Congressional Attacks

Anne C. Petersen
Deputy Director
National Science Foundation
Guest Contributor

The recent actions by the House Science Committee, bringing into question the value of the Social Behavioral and Economic Sciences at the National Science Foundation, should serve to remind all of us about the continuing need to communicate and connect with the public and opinion leaders about the value of investing in basic research. In its markup of the NSF authorizing legislation on June 28, the Committee told NSF to reduce the number of directorates by one, and included report language that made the Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences the target for elimination. The Committee’s rationale seems to be that because this is the newest and smallest directorate, it must therefore represent the agency’s lowest priority.

This bill will be considered by the full House of Representatives. A companion bill will eventually be considered by two Senate Committees, voted on by the full Senate, and then reconciled with the House version. The community needs to use this process to address the issues raised by our critics and make the case for the value of Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences research.

Thus far the research community has worked hard to clarify the issues and make a strong case for continuing support for the social sciences. Efforts to undermine support for Social, Behavioral, and Economic Sciences research come at a time when the community has made tremendous strides in demonstrating the importance of our contributions to advancing science.

NSF Action

NSF has maintained that support of social, behavioral, and economic sciences is integral to the agency’s mission. In a meeting with House Science Committee Chairman Walker and his committee staff we emphasized the NSF mission of supporting quality research in every area of scientific inquiry. Although we felt that we made real progress in explicating NSF’s genuine commitment to research in the social sciences, it has become clear that the problems we face cannot be overcome with mere reassurances and offers to respond to specific concerns.

The recurring nature of the battle for recognition of the validity and scientific rigor of research in the social sciences reinforces the need to keep Congress and the public continuously informed, not only about who we are as a research community, but also about why research is a worthwhile and important investment of public funds. In the current budgetary environment, arguments to support a program of research cannot be based solely on the quality of the research. Lawmakers must also be informed about how lines of research are investments that can repay the cost of the research many times over. Not all areas of inquiry lend themselves immediately to this argument, but many do.

Doing More With Less

For example, at NSF we consistently strive for increased efficiency in our operations. In the past decade our budget has doubled and the workload has tripled while our workforce has actually declined. Much of this ability to accommodate more work with fewer people resulted from decisions to invest in information technology for
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American Psychological Society
Anderson Becomes First Director of NIH Behavioral Office

Psychologist Norman Anderson thinks in terms of connections. Whether talking about his own research or about his new job as the first director of the Office of Behavioral and Social Sciences Research (OBSSR) at the National Institutes of Health (NIH), his focus is on the interactions of psychological, social and physiological factors that affect health. Those connections also are at the heart (and of course mind) of Anderson's main goal: to "change the culture" of NIH, as he puts it.

"One of the reasons I was interested in the OBSSR position," Anderson said in a recent interview with the Observer, "is that I saw it as an opportunity to try to get NIH to more fully adopt the philosophy that health is determined by the interaction of biological and behavioral factors."

To do this, "the starting place should be to acknowledge the plethora of research demonstrating the connections between behavior, social processes, and physiological functioning. Once these connections are acknowledged, the need for basic and clinical behavioral, social, and multi-disciplinary research will be clear."

Anderson makes it sound a bit like "build it, and they will come," the catch phrase from Field of Dreams. In fact, there may be some parallels between building a baseball diamond in the middle of a cornfield and building up the fields of behavioral and social science research in the midst of a fiercely biomedical institution. Both require a sense of vision, some blind faith, and more than a little determination.

The behavioral and social sciences office was created on paper by Congress in 1993 to increase behavioral science at NIH. As faithful Observer readers know, the office was not exactly embraced by NIH leadership, which moved at a grinding snail's pace to find a director.

But that was then; this is now. An OBSSR director is in place, and the office has a $2.5-million budget.

Diverse Background, Interests

Anderson, 39, was chosen through a nationwide search from among dozens of candidates. An associate professor of psychiatry and psychology at Duke University and an APS member, Anderson has been involved in a variety of administrative and research posts. He is founding director of Duke's Program on Health, Behavior and Aging in Black Americans as well as Senior Fellow at the university's Center for the Study of Aging and Human Development. He also holds the post of research psychologist in the Geriatric Research, Education, and Clinical Center at the Durham, North Carolina, Veterans Affairs Medical Center.

According to Anderson, OBSSR will work with individual NIH institutes to encourage specific behavioral and social science initiatives but also will address some of the broader problems facing behavioral and social science research at NIH.

One priority will be to develop initiatives that promote a basic and clinical multidisciplinary approach across the institutions, he said. "That is, having social, behavioral and biomedical scientists working together on critical scientific questions. This approach, I believe, would be most fruitful for improving our prediction and treatment of disease."

The Very Model of Research

His research career shows Anderson practicing what he preaches. As a postdoc at Duke in the early 1980s, he developed an interest in hypertension, focusing mainly on race differences in cardiovascular reactivity. His work led to a theoretical model for understanding heightened cardiovascular reactivity in blacks as well as better understanding of racial differences in sodium retention. "Most recently," he explained, "we've been testing that conceptual model and have just analyzed a study where we found that chronic stress in African Americans is associated with sodium retention. The higher the stress, the longer the kidneys retain the sodium. Of course, if your kidneys are holding onto salt, your risk for hypertension goes up."

"We also found," continued Anderson, "that social class, which is a predictor of hypertension, also predicts sodium excretion. The lower the social class, the less salt that is excreted. We feel that the psychological mechanism involved here is higher perceived stress in lower [socio-economic status] individuals. Stress leads to an increase in sympathetic nervous system activity, causing the kidneys to retain salt."

"Our model is based on the large body of animal research demonstrating these stress/sodium connections," he adds. These findings are currently being written for publication.

A native of Greensboro, North Carolina, Anderson began graduate school there at the University of North Carolina, studying attention deficits in autistic children, and received his master's degree in that area. As a clinical PhD student, he became fascinated with behavior therapy, and was strongly influenced by Rosemary Nelson-Gray and Steve Hayes, both APS Fellows.

See Anderson on Page 12
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and in a larger sense, on all of science. However, this has not kept the full Science Committee from approving a proposal to get rid of the relatively new directorate that houses the behavioral and social sciences and could actually disperse those disciplines within NSF directorates for physics, chemistry, geoscience, engineering, biology, and mathematics.

Under the Influence

Under Walker's influence, the Committee took an indirect route to eliminate the Foundation's Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences (SBE) directorate. Rather than saying outright that the SBE must go, it approved legislation that would limit NSF to only six directorates (currently there are seven). But in the explanatory report that accompanies the legislation, the Committee expressed the view that "the current [SBE] directorate should be examined to determine if its current program levels reflect sound priorities for overall science funding."

The report continues: "The Committee is concerned that, while the activities and proposals of [behavioral and social science research] are merit reviewed, as are other programs of the NSF, they appear to reflect trends toward support of more applied research and research in areas that in tight budget times are of lower national significance. As the newest and smallest Directorate, and one whose research areas are crosscutting, SBE is the prime candidate for integration into other research Directories. SBE programs should directly compete for research funds with other disciplines to assure that scarce research dollars are allocated in the national interest."

LIFO As We Know It

These few sentences pack a mind-boggling amount of misinformation and bias. They question NSF's peer review and priority setting processes; erroneously equate behavioral and social science research with applied research; call research in these areas of less importance to the nation; make crosscutting research a liability; and use the accounting principle of LIFO (last in, first out) as a rationale for eliminating the directorate.

So while the Committee doesn't come right out and remove SBE, together the legislation and the accompanying report can only be construed as an attempt to eliminate the separate directorate for behavioral and social sciences that was established in 1991. Previously those disciplines were housed in the biology directorate, a circumstance which APS sought to change in order to make sure that behavioral science interests were fully represented at the highest levels of the agency. (For details on the history of the SBE directorate and APS's prominent role in its establishment, see the November 1991 Observer.)

Psychological science research is funded by several different programs in the directorate, primarily through the Cognitive, Psychological and Language Sciences section of the directorate's research division. Included in this are human cognition and perception, linguistics, and social psychology. Other major disciplines funded by the directorate include sociology, anthropology, geography, political science, and economics.

---

**NSF Eases Policy on Clinical Psychology Students**

The National Science Foundation (NSF) has stopped its practice of automatically rejecting the fellowship applications of students who come from clinical psychology programs. This change in policy does not signal a move away from NSF's basic research mission; all fellowship applicants still must propose a program of basic research. But now, rather than being rejected prior to review, if an applicant indicates he or she was trained in a clinical psychology program, such applications will be evaluated on the basis of substance. The automatic prohibition against fellowships to students from clinical psychology programs was lifted in response to requests from APS. Ironically, this good news is occurring at a time when NSF behavioral science is under siege (see page 1) although the agency's training programs are not directly affected by the current congressional attacks on behavioral science.

The exclusion apparently stemmed from NSF's longstanding steadfast policy of eschewing anything with the word "clinical" in it, to maintain its focus on basic research and also to avoid competing with the National Institutes of Health. "This is a wonderful move both for the agency and the field," said Alan Kraut, Executive Director of APS. "It serves to strengthen the view that there is a science of clinical psychology, and that it is a science which includes basic research."

Kraut also praised NSF officials for their "good will and good intentions," indicating they were eager to correct the inappropriate policy once they understood that modern clinical psychological science includes both basic as well as applied research and that there are clinical programs that primarily train scientists rather than clinicians. The new policy comes at a time when such programs are in the process of banding together in a new organization to be named The Academy of Psychological Clinical Science (see photo caption on page 21).

*NSF fellowship applications are generally available on campuses in the offices of graduate deans, deans of science and engineering schools, and some financial aid offices. Or, contact the NSF Graduate Research Fellowship Program, 615-241-4300; 615-241-4513 (fax); NSFGRFP@ORAU.GOV*

**Politically Correct?**

Although there had been rumblings in Congress earlier, the clearest indication that behavioral and social science at NSF was in trouble came in mid May when Walker said that behavioral and social science research is an area that NSF "wandered into" recently in order to be "politically correct." In making these comments, Walker essentially accuses NSF of making funding decisions according to a political agenda rather than on the basis of scientific peer review. NSF Director Neal Lane responded swiftly to Walker's comments. "These areas of science have been an integral part of the portfolio of research that we have funded since the 1950s," Lane wrote in a letter to Walker, "and are important to our mission to maintain the health of the Nation's science and engineering enterprise."

"Just as we cannot predict where the next breakthroughs..."
In the following excerpt from a letter by National Science Foundation Director Neal Lane to Rep. Robert Walker (R-PA), chair of the House Science Committee, Lane expresses his opposition to Walker’s proposal to eliminate the NSF’s behavioral and social science directorate.

Honorable Robert Walker  
Chair, Committee on Science  
US House of Representatives  

Dear Mr. Chairman:

I understand that you are considering an amendment that would effectively disband the Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences (SBE) Directorate. I must oppose such an effort for two reasons. First, I believe the dispersal of these disciplines and functions would not be consistent with NSF’s responsibilities to maintain the health of science and engineering across all disciplines. Secondly, I believe any attempt to restrict the management prerogatives and flexibility for me to carry out my responsibilities as the Director of the agency must be resisted.

The Directorate was established by my predecessor only after careful study and consultation with the science and engineering community and the Congress. The rationale for the directorate came from the recognized need to strengthen and coordinate planning across the social, behavioral and economic sciences to assure their health for both disciplinary and interdisciplinary work. A task force, established by the Assistant Director [of NSF] for Biological, Behavioral and Social Sciences (BBS) in 1990, was charged with assessing how well prepared this directorate and its disciplines were to meet the expected challenges of the next century. The task force, with its distinguished and broadly representative membership, heard testimony that repeatedly made the case for a separate Directorate. The task force said, "Formation of a separate directorate would permit more attention to be paid, for example, to the specific instrumentation, methodology, and data needs of the social and behavioral sciences...." The BBS task force strongly recommended the creation of a separate directorate for social, behavioral and economic sciences believing that the dispersed, diffuse approach existing within NSF at that time served neither to advance these fields nor to make them as productive as they might be in partnership with other disciplines.

I have reviewed the record with respect to the creation of the directorate and I am convinced its establishment was a carefully considered matter which has served NSF and the science community well. One of the objectives in the creation of the directorate was to assure that only the most rigorous social, behavioral, and economic research is supported based on the merit review process. Based on all the reports I have seen and reviewed, I believe that objective is in fact being accomplished. The SBE directorate also has responsibilities vital to the efficient functioning of NSF, to meeting the data needs of the Nation with respect to science resources, and to assuring international collaboration in science when such collaborations are in the best interest of the United States. Each of these important missions has been improved science they became a part of the current organizational structure. I am convinced they would be less well served were there no Directorate that focuses on the social, behavioral and economic sciences.

When we met last week, we exchanged pledges to work together in the best interests of fundamental science and engineering research and education. The evidence available to me – from reports by the directorate’s advisory committee, reviews conducted by my office, and regular discussions with directorate management and Members of the National Science Board – points to processes and programs fully consistent with those elsewhere in the Foundation and with our mission. I, therefore, strongly urge you to reconsider any proposal to disband the SBE Directorate.

Neal Lane  
Director, National Science Foundation
Science's New Editor

Scripps neurobiologist Floyd Bloom assumed post in May

On May 1, Floyd E. Bloom became the Editor-in-Chief of the most widely circulated scientific journal in the world. Because Science is the touted arbiter of what is the best and most significant in current research, and because of its ability to present and promote that work to scientists and the public, we at APS are interested in the space given to psychology in the magazine [see the May/June 1994 Observer interview with then-editor Daniel E. Koshland, Jr.]...
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tion for the Advancement of Science, and the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. He is a member of the National Academy of Sciences and of the Academy's Institute of Medicine. He has received numerous awards and honors, and has served on advisory boards to presidents, government agencies, businesses, hospitals and non-profit foundations. He brings to this job his experience on the editorial boards of 15 journals.

Interdisciplinary science...

To call Bloom a neuropharmacologist would be much too narrow. He has taken up the title of "neuroscientist," a term coined about 30 years ago by Ralph Gerard and reinforced by MIT's Frances O. Schmitt, who in the 1960s may have been the first to insert the word "neuroscience" in the name of an academic program. George F. Koob, an APS Fellow and longtime coworker of Bloom's, says of his research collaborator, "More than anything else, Floyd is known as the founder of the multidisciplinary approach to solving functional problems in the central nervous system—the molecular, cellular, and systems levels of analysis all running in parallel." But, Koob said, "many simply know Bloom by his outstanding science."

...with the personal touch

Sondra Mattox was a graduate student in experimental and biological psychology studying under APS Fellow Linda A. Dykstra at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill when she heard Floyd Bloom speak about the need for a team effort in drug abuse research. "From the biological psychologist and the geneticist, to the medicinal chemist and the director of the treatment center, and back again," Bloom emphasized the scientific continuity between members of such interdisciplinary team efforts.

Mattox was impressed and proceeded to do a two-month stint in Bloom's lab, studying the effect of opiate antagonists on heroin self-administration in rats. In her experience, Bloom was "always approachable, willing to sit and talk, always interested in my growth as a scientist. I think he'll be great as editor of Science," she says. "He is one of those few people who has a vision."

Where Koshland tried...

We asked Bloom about the status of psychology in Science. "The area of behavior is one I recognize as needing additional effort to recruit more submittals and to review them adequately. For almost all other areas, we have PhD editors whose background gives them the experience to judge the quality of the science. But as a not-for-profit organization, we can't just add staff in every area. I know the problem had been recognized; Dan was very interested in getting papers on behavior and had asked several people to author review articles just to indicate our interest. But as of this spring, we still don't have a... strong representation of behaviorally oriented people. We have some you would recognize as cognitive neuroscientists but not necessarily behavioral scientists."

Larry R. Squire, an APS Fellow, suggests that "in the less paradigmatic areas of science, it is harder to get agreement on what paper should go in Science." Bloom agrees. "When we send out behavioral studies for review, we often get back diametrically opposed appreciations. If the editors themselves don't have the experience to sort it out, it's been difficult to do so, and therefore they go on to others where the decision is easier."

APS President Richard F. Thompson, a neuroscientist himself, has served on the AAAS Board of Reviewing Editors, and yes, the members of that board did often disagree, he confirmed. In many cases, says Thompson, the staff, not Koshland, seemed to make the decisions. And "80% of those decisions went against my recommendations," he said. Not that Koshland didn't try. In a bid to educate the staff, he had asked Thompson to solicit from other National Academy members the best papers on experimental psychology in the last decade, but that collection was not completed before Thompson and Koshland left the magazine.

...Bloom might succeed

Thompson hopes Bloom will be more hands-on in this area than was Koshland. Says Bloom, "I'm physically there [in the editorial office] quite a lot." Perhaps just as important "Floyd knows more about psychology than Dan. He's more sensitive to what's important," says Thompson.

Lisa H. Gold, who does behavioral research in Bloom's department at Scripps, says, "Floyd has always been supportive. He really believes that behavioral analysis is the important functional level of analysis."

APS Fellow Frederick A. King, of the Yerkes Primate Research Center, says, "I hope and expect that behavioral science will be a part of the agenda at Science. Bloom has been committed, throughout his career, not only to nervous system studies and biological studies, but to the science of behavior taken as a whole."

Submit your best to the test. Get out your best work, work that advances the field of psychology as a whole, and especially work that may have implications for scientists in other fields, and think about how it might look in Science. Just remember, the acceptance rate is still only 10%.

"Whether this will result in more psychology publications, only time will tell," says McGaugh, "but I do think that psychology will get a fair hearing."

Paul M. Rowe

Paul M. Rowe is a freelance science writer based in Washington, DC.
CBS Draws Criticism For “60 Minutes” Show

Segment suggests teaching has taken a back seat to research

“Get Real” was the title of a “60 Minutes” segment that aired in mid-May and the scene was a University of Arizona library. Correspondent Lesley Stahl was examining covers of scholarly journals. Wide-eyed, she asked, “Is it anti-intellectual of me to look at these articles and say, ‘Come on, no one’s reading them, no one understands them?’”

She pointed to an article titled “The Definability of the Qualitative Independence of Events in Terms of Extended Indicator Functions” in the Journal of Mathematical Psychology.

“So-called scholarly journals” of this type are a $2-million item each year for the University of Arizona, Stahl said, and “. . . if all those complicated articles add up to tenure for a professor, he’s set. And if he remains productive and engaged, great. If not, he’s got a job for life anyway.”

By chance, the article showcased by “60 Minutes” was written by APS Charter Fellow Patrick Suppes, a National Medal of Science laureate and professor emeritus at Stanford University. The Observer asked Suppes how he felt about receiving prime-time attention from one of the biggest shows on television.

Suppes, unperturbed, responded, “[Stahl] doesn’t know me from the man in the moon. It was a random event.” He described the incident as “nonsense by people who don’t know any better.”

He wrote the matter off as “the kind of thing you can expect when someone from journalism quickly and superficially wanders into some scientific arena.”

If so, what about George Miller’s well-known suggestion that the scientific community help with national problems and “give psychology away in the public interest?”

Suppes responded, “I think he’s right. But science these days—in every domain—is technical, rather complex, rather opaque to [non-scientist] outsiders. I think that’s an inevitable consequence of the increasingly technical development of science. It’s a process that has been true for a long while. Nobody could read ancient mathematical observations of astronomers in the Second Century BC except experts. So it’s not a new thing.”

As to the teach-and/or-research equation, Suppes said, “In scientific areas, people who teach and don’t do any research really lose their flair even for teaching.”

It’s ironic that Suppes’s article was the exemplar for “60 Minutes,” as Suppes is noted for his commitment to teaching. In a letter sent in response to the “60 Minutes” segment, APS Charter Fellow Thomas Wallsten wrote that at Stanford University, Suppes “is highly respected for his teaching of graduates and undergraduates. Moreover, he has employed principles of mathematical psychology to develop computer-aided instructional systems that are used each day by more than a million students around the world in settings ranging from the primary grades through college.”

Wallsten, professor and director of the Cognitive Psychology Program at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill, wrote to Stahl: “Professor Suppes and your audience deserve an apology.” He said the segment “suggested that professors victimize undergraduates by devoting their time to useless research instead of teaching,” Wallsten said. “By sensationalizing and distorting the facts, you provided a major disservice to universities, students and the research enterprise that has served America so well. Particularly appalling was the scene in which you suggested that an article in the Journal of Mathematical Psychology must be trivial because you could not understand its title. In fact, that paper makes a fundamental contribution to certain aspects of behavior.”

Wallsten went on to tell Stahl that her viewers should know that in 1990, President George Bush awarded Suppes the National Medal of Science, the most prestigious honor our country gives to its scientists, in part for his work in mathematical psychology and its applications to education. (See January 1991 Observer.)

Stahl never replied. Protests sent to “60 Minutes” by University of Arizona President Manuel T. Pacheco and others also received no reply nor acknowledgment.

In the “60 Minutes” segment itself, Stahl pressed the question, “What about this whole issue of deadwood? We keep hearing that universities can no longer get rid of faculty members who are—let’s—let’s not be coy about this—too old. They’re burned out,” she said. “. . . there are lots of tenured full professors who, students told us, quote, ‘can’t teach their way out of a paper bag.’” Stahl said.

The main thrust and content of the segment, however, was that the university duped students and parents alike of their tuition by excessively employing graduate student teaching assistants to teach freshman classes, especially English classes, while experienced professors dabbled in trivial, unfathomable research pursuits.

Pacheco informed Stahl that “It would have been naive to expect a cheerleading report on higher education [from “60 Minutes”], but we should have been able to expect fair and professional treatment. What we got was a hatchet job, and that is a polite description.”

Pacheco continued, “One of the most outrageous suggestions by ’60 Minutes’ was pure fabrication. A professor from a private university agreed with the idea

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE
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Here's some good news for a change...

House Boosts Behavioral Science at NIH

The House Appropriations Committee has passed a bill encouraging the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) to maintain the B/START (Behavioral Science Track Awards for Rapid Transition) program and increase significantly its emphasis on individual investigator research grants in behavioral science.

The Appropriations Committee's support comes at a time when Congress is cutting or eliminating funding for numerous federal programs. Some members of Congress are also questioning the value of many federal research efforts, with some particularly hostile questioning directed at social and behavioral research. (See story on NSF on page 1).

APS worked with the House committee to develop its statement of support for behavioral research. Earlier this year, APS Executive Director Alan Kraut testified before the Committee in support of behavioral research and the B/START program. (See January 1995 Observer.)

The House Appropriations Committee reaffirmed its commitment to behavioral science as part of the fiscal year 1996 (FY96) Appropriations bill for the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education (Labor-HHS). The bill provides funding for the federal departments including the National Institutes of Health (NIH) beginning October 1, 1995.

It is customary for the Appropriations Committee to include policy instructions in a report that accompanies the annual funding bill, and this year's (FY96) Labor-HHS report notes that the Appropriations Committee "continues its support of basic behavioral science research." Noting the "primary importance" of training researchers in the prevention of mental disorders, the committee "encourages NIMH to maintain its support for the B/START program, both for those at the beginning stages of their career and for career transitions to behavioral science research."

Referencing the NIMH Advisory Council task force report on behavioral science (see March 1995 Observer), the Appropriations Committee encourages NIMH to heed the task force report's recommendation to increase individual investigator grants. The House Committee calls for NIMH to report by early next year on its progress in implementing the Advisory Council's recommendations on behavioral science research.

It is expected that the full House of Representatives will pass the FY96 Labor-HHS bill this summer, with Senate consideration to follow.
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that parents may be forking out $15,000 to $20,000 a year to subsidize a professor doing research.

"The plain truth is that tuition dollars are not spent to subsidize research. To the contrary, research dollars support undergraduate education," Pacheco wrote.

"Eighty percent of the equipment used by our undergraduates in science was paid for by research. Research dollars have constructed buildings, outfitted laboratories and supported thousands of students with on-campus jobs that give them real-world experience in their career field."

Pacheco concluded, "The most blatant error made by '60 Minutes' was its narrow and outdated vision of higher education. Every '60 Minutes' image of 'good' teaching was an image of a professor in front of the room, imparting knowledge to docile, attentive students. That is no longer the only way students learn."

In the months following the May broadcast, Arizona may have in fact gained, rather than lost, from the "60 Minutes" episode, a university spokesperson suggests. The university seized the opportunity to launch a full-scale public information campaign of the school's progress directed toward its own students and their parents, as well as audiences in almost two hundred other universities.

Arizona's "Quick Response to 60 Minutes," a series of briefing points, pointed to progress across the past decade-and-a-half: more senior professors are conducting first-year classes at the university; students are getting better advising; steps are under way to have all "core" classes taught by professors; and undergraduates have more chances to become directly involved in their own research.

 Arizona received very little negative feedback in the weeks following the May program or during its public information campaign—only a few dozen negative letters and phone calls, according to Sharon Kha, director of the university's News Services.

As to the driving theme of the "60 Minutes" segment, a state university that has kept records on teaching assistants (TAs) since the 1920s reports that media inferences on the topic are highly inaccurate.

"There's a wide perception out there that over the last couple of years faculty members have been focusing more on research than on teaching, and that they leave teaching up to their TAs," said Carol Livingstone, director of the Division of Management Information at the University of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign.

"When we count the percent of credit hours that are taught by TAs, there has been no change in over 60 years. Whether today's situation is good or bad, it's identical to the situation we had over 60 years ago," Livingstone said. D.K.
APS Welcomes . . .

Patricia Moore
As Database Manager

Patricia’s career at APS actually began in September, when she was hired on a temporary basis to help deal with the massive data entry needs as APS members mailed in their 1995 dues renewals. But, during the course of only a few weeks, Patricia demonstrated that her skills extended far beyond data entry.

Following the departure of longtime APS staffer Allen Walker, who had served for five years as the Society’s first member database manager, Patricia was offered a full-time position as Database Manager. Remembering back to that day, Patricia said she gladly accepted APS’s offer and said that she “had been hoping that once I was given the opportunity to prove my capabilities, the ‘temp’ title would be a thing of the past!”

As Database Manager, her primary responsibilities include: designing databases; troubleshooting software/hardware problems associated with the database; and processing mailing-label purchases, membership applications, membership record and address changes, and electronic billing transactions. Patricia also works with the Convention office assisting with registrations processing and record keeping.

Patricia comes to APS from the District of Columbia Chartered Health Plan, where she worked her way up from mail clerk to Database Administrator. In this position, she maintained the database and supervised several employees in the data entry department. She believes her experience at DC Chartered prepared her very well for her new APS position.

Patricia takes computer courses at Prince George’s Community College, but continuing her education is second only to caring for her two-year-old daughter Allisyn. In her spare time, Patricia works with her husband in their trucking/hauling company.

Elizabeth Ruksznis
As Editorial Assistant

Elizabeth became the new Editorial Assistant in the Communications Department in July. She will work primarily on the Observer, doing writing, editing, desktop publishing, and advertising management.

A Maryland native, Elizabeth said she is excited to be working in nearby Washington, DC. Having mostly been involved with the writing side of publications, Elizabeth is looking forward to immersing herself in every aspect of the Observer.

Elizabeth comes to us from USAE, an international weekly newspaper covering the meetings, conventions and tourism industries, where she was the hotels editor.

She has also worked as a staff reporter and sports editor for a local weekly newspaper in Ocean City, Maryland, where she covered every aspect of the beach resort from policy and financial matters to social and entertainment issues.

An avid traveler, Elizabeth studied Spanish for three months in Spain and has spent a lot of time in northern Italy, where her mother lives.

She is a 1992 graduate of Boston University and received her bachelor’s degree in journalism with a concentration in political science. Her educational background and editorial experience will be a perfect fit for the Observer.
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our operations, while at the same time investing in research on computer hardware, software, and communications, as well as the application of networking in our programs. We have reinvented our internal processes continuously as the technology became more powerful.

At each step along the way, these changes can be related to research in the social sciences, research varying from the impact of linguistics on the development of computer language to the decision processes related to adopting new technologies. Unfortunately, little has been done to document the application of research, to quantify its effects, or to present a compelling narrative of the links among the various disciplines that have made these changes possible. These are not always easy tasks, but who should be more capable of tackling this problem than those of us trained in social sciences.

Members of the research community cannot count on others to make the case of the value of their work for them. It is incumbent on us to consider our research in terms of who uses it, how they use it, and the impact that it has on their lives. If we wish to remain a significant player in federal research, it is our responsibility to show that the contributions of basic research cannot be taken for granted and that they are relevant, important, and ubiquitous. This can be a tremendous opportunity for us.
House Republicans Aim to Restrict Research

Family privacy protection bill clears House

WASHINGTON, DC—A bill which threatens the ability of psychologists to conduct research on minors, the Family Privacy Protection Act of 1995 (H.R. 1271), passed the US House of Representatives in April by a vote of 418-7 and is currently pending action in the Senate.

The legislation, a component of the House Republican “Contract with America,” will require prior written consent from parents before minors can participate in any of several broad categories of research supported by the federal government, including investigations that examine: (1) parental political affiliations or beliefs; (2) mental or psychological problems; (3) sexual behavior or attitudes; (4) illegal, antisocial, or self-incriminating behavior; (5) appraisals of other individuals with whom the minor has a familial relationship; (6) relationships that are legally recognized as privileged, including those with lawyers, physicians, and members of the clergy; and (7) religious affiliations or beliefs.

Compromise Attempted

A compromise bill deleting the absolute requirement for written permission was drafted and unanimously accepted by the House Government Reform and Oversight Committee, but pressure from the House GOP leadership led to a reversal when it reached the House floor. An amendment offered by Rep. Mark Souder (R-IN), returned the word “written” to the bill, and the amendment passed by a vote of 379-46.

Lack of Experience

The House vote that so strongly supported the amendment reflects the tenor of the operating environment on Capitol Hill these days. For example, the issue is more complex than it may appear, and for members unfamiliar with current regulations, a vote for the amendment seemed reasonable on face value. Since committee and floor action was unusually swift, the opportunity for a more thoughtful debate or reconsideration of the impact of the bill was lost. Some legislators maintain an erroneous belief that asking minors questions about certain behaviors serves to encourage those behaviors, a belief not supported by research findings. Similarly, some members feel that research on “sensitive” topics is not in the purview of the federal government. Finally, the new House leadership is quite influential, and its power is evident in this vote.

Senate

At this writing, it appears the legislation will also be approved in the Senate. Last year, similar legislation introduced by Senator Charles Grassley (R-IA) passed as an amendment to a major education bill. The Grassley amendment was limited to Department of Education programs, while H.R. 1271 expands coverage to all federally sponsored research programs on minors. Given this precedent, Grassley’s senior position on the Governmental Affairs Committee, and the fact that Grassley is eager to see his legislation have an even broader scope, it is clear that it will be an uphill battle to defeat this legislation.

Coalition Responds

APS, in cooperation with a broad range of health, research, and children’s advocacy organizations, including the Society for Research on Child Development, has argued that this legislation is not in the best interest of families. The main points emphasized by this coalition include:

- Rigorous regulations already exist to protect the privacy of minors and their families;
- Studies show that only a small percentage of families—approximately one to four percent of parents—object to their children participating in research surveys;
- Because of the low response rate of parents in returning permission slips, an absolute mandate requiring written permission from parents will result in insufficient sample sizes, thereby invalidating research findings;
- Costs for research will increase substantially, which is likely to produce a chilling effect on research, and may be prohibitive in many instances;
- Data about children who engage in high risk behaviors will be especially difficult to obtain; and
- Families, educators, and policy makers will be at a tremendous disadvantage without scientific information about minors.

Despite the significant challenges to defeating this bill, APS and its allies have lobbied intensely for a hearing, which would provide an opportunity for members of the Senate to understand the harmful consequences this legislation will have for research efforts on minors. APS is also working with Hill staff and other social science organizations to draft an alternative bill that will reinforce protection for the privacy of families without creating unnecessary barriers to important research. S.P.
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He developed a passion for behavioral medicine and turned to research on behavioral treatment of chronic headache with some additional work in anxiety disorders.

While still a graduate student, Anderson worked with a then-new behavioral medicine group at the Duke University Medical Center.

He credits that experience and, specifically, three people with giving him a foundation in behavioral medicine: psychologists Frank Keefe and Richard Surwit, and internist Redford Williams. All are still at Duke, and, says Anderson, they have been extremely supportive of his move to Washington.

He adds that the Duke administration also has been helpful as he moved into the NIH position. Anderson comes to the OBSSR by way of an IPA (Intergovernmental Personnel Act) agreement, a common mechanism used to bring needed experts into specific government positions for extended periods.

Anderson’s dissertation was on cardiovascular and cortical reactivity in Type A and Type B individuals, conducted under the supervision of the late Russell Harter.

His interest in cardiovascular illness continued during his internship at Brown University School of Medicine, after which he returned to Duke to do his postdoc with Williams in psychophysiology and aging.

First Things First

One of Anderson’s first tasks will be to award $1.75 million for projects that have just missed the funding cut-off. But Anderson describes this as a kind of start-up or short-term activity, not the raison d’etre of the OBSSR.

“Clearly,” he said, “the most important thing we’ll be doing in terms of funding is working with each of the institutes to enhance their missions in behavioral and social science and help them respond to the opportunities....”

Anderson recognizes that this process will be different at each institute, depending on what he calls their “behavioral science maturity,” that is, their current degree of support for behavioral and social science research.

“We probably won’t see big changes over the short run” at institutes that already support a substantial amount of behavioral and social science, predicted Anderson. “At others, we hope to see greater movement because they do relatively less now.” He sees the fact that his office is part of the NIH director’s office as adding to his clout.

“Being situated there has a potentially greater impact,” he said.

Much to Offer

The current NIH director is Harold Varmus, a Nobel prize-winning molecular biologist who in the past has been known to express negative views about behavioral science.

Anderson is optimistic both about his access to Varmus and about Varmus’ openness to learning about behavioral and social science.

“I know about reports of his negative attitudes, but that has not been my experience,” says Anderson. “He does admit it’s not his area of expertise, and he sees part of my job as bringing him along in these areas.”

“In fact,” he continued, “we met recently to develop concrete plans for doing that. Dr. Varmus is very interested in our science, and he has given me the opportunity to show him what we’ve accomplished.”

According to Anderson, behavioral genetics is one area about which Varmus is enthusiastic. However, he said, “I plan to expose him to the whole range of research, from basic laboratory, to survey, to treatment outcomes. We have much to offer.”

Informing the Public

Anderson also plans to have OBSSR serve as a clearinghouse for information about behavioral and social science research. That will be a considerable undertaking, considering the breadth of the fields involved, but he makes it a point to learn about developments across a range of research topics.

“I love reading in areas of behavioral and social science that I’m not personally involved in,” said Anderson. “I’m constantly reading journals on topics in areas where I would never publish.”

It’s a good thing, since, as Anderson points out, “in this job, I have to immerse myself in a wide variety of areas to have a broad understanding of the field.” When questions arise about what is the best research in area X, I’ll be able to make referrals to the appropriate scientists or make an informed statement about the status of certain fields,” he added.

In this regard, Anderson wants to hear directly from researchers in the field. “The best thing to help me is to communicate what you do.” Work in areas with potential for high payoffs in terms of discoveries of treatments of mental or physical health is of special interest to him.

“I plan to be very proactive in working with the institute directors in proposing various initiatives,” said Anderson. “But I need to have the kind of information that tells me the directions fields are moving in and where the knowledge base is.”

He pointed out that “many institutes have already outlined recommendations for behavioral and social science research, although these are frequently not acted on. My job is to facilitate the implementation of what the community views as high priorities.”

Anderson also sees a tremendous need for publicizing important developments in behavioral and social science research in the media, to try to capture the same kind of public attention routinely.

See Anderson on page 24
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will occur in physics, chemistry, or mathematics, neither can we predict where the next breakthroughs will occur in psychology, economics, or any other discipline,” said Lane. “Maintaining strength in all scientific and engineering disciplines is our best insurance of being able to seize opportunities presented by new insights—wherever they occur.”

In a follow-up letter to Walker, Lane expressed even stronger opposition to the proposed elimination of the SBE directorate. “I have reviewed the record with respect to the creation of the directorate and I am convinced its establishment was a carefully considered matter which has served NSF and the science community well.” (Excerpted text appears on page 5.)

Former NSF Director Erich Bloch also wrote a strong letter to Walker, saying that “NSF-supported social and behavioral research are the textbook case for basic research—valuable work which the private sector cannot be expected to fund because of its high risk and broad benefit.” Writing in his capacity as Distinguished Fellow of the Council on Competitiveness, Bloch told Walker: “I applaud your hard work in the Budget Committee in protecting NSF in a very constrained budget. The social and behavioral sciences deserve the benefits of that protection.”

**Grouping for Support**

APS Executive Director Alan Kraut was one of the first to write to Walker. “I respectfully must inform you that it is an error to say that the NSF ‘wandered into’ the fields of social, behavioral and economic sciences just to be ‘politically correct’... Mr. Chairman, I assure you this sense of commitment [by NSF] is non-partisan, long-standing, and is present owing to the strength of the behavioral and social science that NSF supports.” APS also has worked on behalf of the directorate with representatives of other behavioral and social science organizations, particularly the Consortium of Social Science Associations, to develop strategies and meet jointly with congressional staff and NSF officials.

Several multi-disciplinary science organizations have joined the fray, acknowledging Walker’s efforts to preserve and even increase NSF’s budget as a whole, but objecting to the disparate treatment of behavioral and social science research. The American Association for the Advancement of Science (AAAS) wrote Walker that “we are deeply concerned by reports that the social, behavioral and economic sciences in NSF may not share in this growth. These disciplines are an integral part of the U.S. research and development enterprise, as important to the Nation’s future as physics, chemistry, engineering and biology.”

The Council of Scientific Society Presidents (CSSP, which includes APS) said it “strongly supports” NSF’s Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences (SBE) directorate and told Walker that “the plans and priorities of the SBE programs demonstrate exceptional leadership and deserve recognition.” The CSSP also said that Walker’s attack on behavioral and social science research is in stark contrast to his general support of science in debates over federal budget priorities, adding that “NSF has earned the confidence of the Nation and deserves the widest flexibility in its resource allocation.”

And the National Academy of Sciences’ (NAS) President Bruce Alberts has issued a strong public statement, “The Importance of Social and Behavioral Sciences to the Nation’s Well-Being.”

“The NAS strongly affirms that the social and behavioral sciences are important disciplines in which independent scholarship and basic research have made significant contributions to mankind’s store of knowledge and to the ability to meet critical societal challenges,” said Alberts. “The work of the National Research Council [the operating arm of the NAS] has repeatedly demonstrated the value of the insights that guild on fundamental research in the social and behavioral sciences.”

The Coalition for National Science Funding, in which APS participates as a member of the Steering Committee, echoed the sentiments of other groups when it asked Walker to uphold NSF’s autonomy in setting priorities, protesting that disparate treatment of behavioral and social science “would cut off research and education activities that are of genuine value to the nation.”

**Well Positioned**

Walker is in a position—to push his agenda for these or any science programs. He became chair of the House Science Committee and Vice Chair of the House Budget Committee when the Republicans became the majority party last fall. Both committees have enough jurisdiction over NSF, although in different ways, but neither has the last word on the annual budget of NSF—that’s handled by separate appropriations committees. The Science Committee authorizes NSF’s administrative structures and policies, and the House Budget Committee is responsible for establishing the overall amounts that the appropriations committees in the House can allocate.

Walker is one step removed from the actual appropriations process, but the combination of his two committee posts gives him significant power to implement his views on behavioral research.

Much of the national news coverage about congressional deficit reduction battles reflects the differences between the House Budget Committee, its counterpart in the U.S. Senate, and the Clinton Administration. Many of the differences center on what programs should be cut in the process of achieving a balanced federal budget. It appears that the NSF behavioral and social science research programs are a potential casualty of those battles, although many science programs at other agencies also are being targeted by the House.

The SBE proposal is part of the overall NSF authorizing legislation which must clear both the House and Senate. There is pressure for the overall bill to move fairly quickly through the legislative approval process because the existing authorizations for NSF have expired and technically, appropriations cannot be made for any programs that are not authorized. It is generally agreed that the best chances for defeating the SBE proposal will come in the Senate. APS has already begun working with supporters of behavioral and social science research on the Senate side.

**Walker the Talker**

Walker may be a familiar figure to some readers. He was one of the pit bull Republicans who took advantage of C-SPAN television coverage of congressional proceedings to make fiery speeches against Democrats while viewers watched unaware that the speeches were being made to an empty House chamber. Back then, as a member of the minority party, he could only “talk the talk.” These days, as a senior party leader, behavioral and social science researchers are seeing that he can “Walker the talk.”

**Sarah Brookhart**
CONVENTION FROM PAGE 1

scholars and researchers. And, this year’s larger number of poster session slots gave more students a chance to participate in the meeting.

the approximately 50 invited addresses and symposia and a high proportion of the 913 posters presented in the Sheraton New York Hotel, just a few steps off Broadway, combined basic and applied research and broadly integrated many subdisciplines of psychology in the investigations and perspectives being reported.

APS and Friends

And as in years past, the APS convention was not a conference of APS alone but a combined meeting of many psychology organizations. Eight other organizations clustered with APS for their meetings and symposia, Brewer noted, namely the Academy of Clinical Psychological Science, the American Association of Applied and Preventive Psychology, the American Board of Professional Neuropsychology, the APS Student Caucus, the Institute for Scientific Information, the honorary societies Psi Beta and Psi Chi, and the Society for Personality and Social Psychology.

The APS meeting was also a red-letter event for the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA), which Brewer said “has been the home of many psychological scientists.” To celebrate its 25th anniversary NIAAA held a symposium in the APS program, showcasing some of the research it is sponsoring, and topped off the occasion with a stunning reception.

National Media Coverage

Media coverage was swift and extensive. Just as the meeting began, USA Today spotlighted a poster presented by Laurie Rudman of the University of Minnesota-Minneapolis, and ABC TV’s Good Morning America interviewed her on its nationwide program. Her research examined the self-presentation styles of female job/promotion candidates and their effect on hiring/promotion recommendations following interviews with a male or female interviewer. “We successfully leveraged the New York City setting to obtain good media coverage of APS Convention presenters,” said Lee Herring, APS Director of Communications. “And it seems to have worked. Representatives from national media were swarming all over our presenters.” Herring said media interest and inquiries had never been so extensive as at this meeting.

In keeping with the conference theme of “Science in a Broadway,” almost all of the meeting that Brewer called attention to were the sold-out exhibit hall offering publications, software, and other products to convention attendees, and the special poster session exhibiting federal funding programs to help researchers navigate the grant funding maze.

Keynote speaker at the opening session was John Kihlstrom of Yale University, the new editor of Psychological Science, whom Brewer introduced as a psychological scientist whose “phenomenal career pattern” was recognized early on and who “hasn’t stopped since.” Kihlstrom’s presentation, “From the Subject’s Point of View: The Experiment as Conversation and Collaboration Between Investigator and Subject,” addressed some of the fundamental pitfalls in human subjects research as well as the lessons learned that make for a more rigorous science in the end. (Watch for the summary article in the September 1995 Observer.)

William James Award Winners

The APS annual awards ceremony concluded the opening session with presentation of the annual William James Fellow Award to three researchers: Harold Stevenson (winner of last year’s James McKeen Cattell Award) and Loren and Jean Chapman. Stevenson received the award for his contributions to learning theory and research in developmental psychology. Following is his award citation:

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

Edmonds has been an immensely productive developmental psychologist, making crucial conceptual and empirical contributions to our understanding of children’s learning. He developed a series of striking contributions through the experimental study of learning processes in children, with special focus upon the impact of social and tangible rewards, the effect of failure and/or anxiety, and visual (television, film) display learning. More recently, he has conducted groundbreaking cross-national research illuminating children’s cognitive development and school achievement in the framework of the particulars of the school, family, and cultural experience. In doing so, his colleagues and students have succeeded in overcoming extraordinary methodological and pragmatic barriers, generating unique and still accelerating treasure of rigorous data and compelling insights. These findings have spoken eloquently to crucial issues in the American K-12 educational system. In this realm, as well as in his leadership roles in the Bush Program on Child Development and Social Policy and a variety of national and international organizations, he has both insisted on and persuasively demonstrated the relevance of developmental sciences to public policy, and thus to the lives of children.

For decades of powerful contributions to the understanding of both the intrinsic processes and contextual shaping of children’s learning and school achievement, for his vital role in the evolution of cross-cultural studies in developmental psychology, and in forwarding the dialogue between developmental psychology and public policy, Edward B. Edmonds is recognized as a leader in psychological science.

June 29, 1995
Marilyn B. Brewer
APS President

The James McKeen Cattell Fellow Award was conferred jointly on Loren and Jean Chapman of the University of Wisconsin for their shared research and theoretical contributions on schizophrenic cognition, psychotic proneness, measurement of defects in left- or right-hemisphere functioning, and systematic errors that pervade normal thinking, for which they coined the term “illusory correlation.”

Emanuel Donchin, of the University of Illinois and Chair of the William James Fellow Award Committee, read the Chapman’s award citation and presented them with the award.

The American Psychological Society names Loren and Jean Chapman as William James Fellows in recognition of their distinguished achievements in psychological science.

Loren and Jean Chapman have changed the field of schizophrenia research and more recently influenced the research of many others. They have made seminal contributions to our understanding of how to design studies that test for differential deficit and distinguish it from generalized deficit. Using the methodological rigor which has now become virtually synonymous with their name, they embarked upon a long series of studies on different aspects of schizophrenic cognition. Much of their early data on this topic was summarized in Disordered Thought in Schizophrenia which has become a classic in the field. The Chapmans’ interest in thought disorder led to their research into a source of systematic errors in observational reports made by normal people. The Chapmans coined the term “illusory correlation” for this error. This idea has had enormous impact on many different subdisciplines of the behavioral sciences. The Chapmans have also pioneered in the study of the prediction of psychosis. Using scales they developed to measure difference aspects of psychotic proneness, they have empirically confirmed that subjects in their early twenties scoring highly on such scales are more likely to develop clinical psychosis later in life. This work has enormous theoretical and pragmatic significance and has influenced scores of young researchers who are examining various features of behavior, experience and physiology in individuals with deviant scores on these scales. These, along with many other marks of distinction too numerous to list, secure a very significant place in psychology for the work of the Chapmans. The field of psychopathology research has been irrevocably made better by their many distinguished contributions.

June 29, 1995
Marilyn B. Brewer
APS President

Martin Seligman’s research initially focused on what he called “learned helplessness,” or, declining motivation and increased depressive affect in animals subjected to consequences (of their behavior) that are not under their control. More recently he has applied the learned

SEE CONVENTION ON PAGE 20
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Beyond the Bell Curve

Record audience drawn to 1995 APS Convention Presidential symposium in New York

The reason Marilyn Brewer chose Herrnstein and Murray’s controversial best-selling book The Bell Curve as the focus of the Presidential Symposium at the APS Convention this year, she said, is because the book raised fundamental questions that psychology has asked since its very beginning. The symposium itself was titled “Beyond the Bell Curve: Genes, Intelligence and Achievement in Perspective.”

Four panelists whose research addresses questions raised by the book led the well-attended session. They later took questions and comments from the standing-room-only audience.

The Gist

Robert Plomin of the University of London pointed out that, contrary to the impression created by book reviews, the authors of The Bell Curve had little to say about genetics. Furthermore, what they did have to say about genetics was based largely on Arthur Jensen’s research on race and Richard Herrnstein’s research on class published more than 25 years ago, Plomin said.

Craig Ramey of the University of Alabama reported on several preschool intervention programs that dramatically altered cognitive abilities of socio-economically deprived preschoolers and, in another study, produced similar results with low birthweight infants. These recent studies contradict claims made by Herrnstein and Murray regarding the degree of malleability of such abilities through systematic interventions.

Sandra Scarr of the University of Virginia described how children create their own environments, partly based on genetic factors within themselves and the interactions of their behavior with the behavior and genetics of caretakers. As to race differences in cognition, it is an important social issue that we don’t really know much about but need to be investigating, she said.

Robert Sternberg suggested that if Herrnstein and Murray are correct in that there exists a “cognitive elite,” then it has been created not by any natural process but by both an overuse and misuse of psychological testing in the educational community.

Genetics Not the Focus; Not Static

Plomin emphasized that the authors The Bell Curve were “clearly saying that it matters little for their arguments whether there are genes involved at all.” The furor over the book should not induce psychologists therefore “to go backwards by rejecting genetic influences in psychology,” he said.

It is a misunderstanding to view genetics as a “non-developmental, static sort of thing,” Plomin said. Data are quite consist-
tion program, this was cut to 25 percent.

Ramey said "The Bell Curve advanced the argument that although interventions have been tried, they have been shown to be non-effective, and that therefore one should accept the fact that cognitive development is pretty much unchangeable. That's a thesis that is central to what follows in the rest of The Bell Curve and the policy recommendations of the book."

Ramey suggested the problem for Murray and Herrnstein may have been that these findings were hidden in "obscure places" where these two scholars couldn't find them—places such as Developmental Psychology, the American Psychologist, Intelligence, Pediatrics, and the Journal of the American Medical Association.

Complex Interaction

Scarr asked how it happens that parental IQ is a good predictor of child IQ. "We're inclined to say that it's genetic transmission. But then we realize that a mother's IQ is a good predictor of the kind of home environment she provides for her child, and that low IQ mothers provide less emotional support and less intellectual stimulation for their children than do higher IQ mothers." So, Scarr says, there is an inevitable confounding or correlation of the genetic background with the rearing environment characteristics, which, in part, are created by that biological endowment.

"We also know that children themselves affect how much stimulation they get by the degree to which they ask questions, are curious, or will sit still and let you read to them. The result of this complex set of processes needs to be disentangled before we understand how environment and genes work together. The point here is that people are not randomly sorted into their environments. They come with correlated packages of genes and environment," Scarr said.

Presenting data from a study that Murray and Herrnstein also focused on, Scarr displayed Binet and Wexler scores of black and interracial children adopted by white families in an upper Midwest area. The children were tested at an average age of seven when they scored an average of 106. That was about 20 points above the level of black children in that area, though not as high as scores of biological children of the white parents of the adopting families. When retested 11 years later, the scores of the adopted children had dropped, Scarr noted, but were not dramatically different from those of the biological offspring of the same families. However, those adopted children with one black and one white biological parent scored higher than those with two biological parents who were black. The scores of the 18-year-olds with two black biological parents had declined to the average of black children in the surrounding area, 89.4. Scarr said Murray and Herrnstein made much of this finding, which however is confounded by factors of early adoption versus later adoption. Children with two black parents tend to be placed later than those with one black and one white parent. But important subtleties of that sort were not discussed in The Bell Curve, she said.

Murray and Herrnstein said they didn't know why there are race differences and that they didn't take a position on this, acknowledging that it is probably a function of a mixture of genetic and environmental factors, Scarr said, adding, "I would assert, of course, that we really don't know. There is a lot to be learned about this, and we have been very afraid to ask questions in this area."

"I would urge you to make it possible to have a public discussion about race differences," Scarr said, "not because we want to do anything about it but because we want to understand. Because if we don't understand, there's not really anything at all we can do about it. These are important social issues. They have to be handled with great sensitivity. But I don't think that hiding our heads in the sand will help," Scarr concluded.

Quips on IQ and the Social Order

Sternberg's critique of the book focused largely on testing and its misuse. Persons with types of intelligence that don't match with testing requirements get very short shrift. He illustrated the following points with hilarious anecdotes: An IQ score is not all based on intelligence, and there is a lot more to intelligence than IQ. Intelligence can be taught, as shown by major gains in treated versus control groups. Tests measure only a small part of what is necessary for success in school and on the job. Task knowledge does not correlate with IQ, and IQ is not a good predictor of job success. Tests are being vastly overused in educational settings. For example, GRE scores predict nothing but first-year grades, he said.

Sternberg's most vigorous sally, however, was against the notion of a "cognitive elite."

"The argument is that there is this social order and that it is a natural result, a natural process like the cream sort of rising to the top. In other words, people such as CEOs, lawyers, professors, doctors have high IQs and they're at the top of the pecking order. And people who don't have high IQ are at the bottom, and they're on welfare or whatever.

"The alternate interpretation for this cognitive elite is that tests themselves create a social order.... So if you don't do well on the test you don't get into graduate school.

"Let's get it clear, this is something we are creating [with the tests]. It is not a natural process," Sternberg said.

In conversations that followed the symposium, Marilyn Brewer observed that the critiques of The Bell Curve presented in the symposium showed that one can reject many of the premises and implications of the book without rejecting the science.
Teaching Teachers And Vice Versa

Second annual APS teaching institute in New York

Have psychology professors and instructors got problems? More than a few. Mundane and major problems and all shades in between, according to the speakers and record numbers of participants at the second annual Institute on the Teaching of Psychology on the eve of the APS convention in New York, June 29.

At eight invited addresses, 28 participant idea exchanges, and almost 50 poster presentations, they had ample opportunity to hash out their problems.

Invited addresses provided information on specific topical areas, to bring teachers up to pace with emerging research findings. The idea exchange is a unique informal but structured opportunity to discuss specific topics with other teachers (e.g., how to encourage integrity in students).

Among the scores of issues presented and discussed at this year's institute were:

- How to fit the teaching of introductory psychology to students with learning and cognitive styles not well matched with the way psychology is usually taught.
- How to identify and perhaps deal more effectively with the implicit belief systems of students who prematurely give up on learning subjects—almost before they start—because they think they must not be very good at any subject at which they have to work hard.
- How to curb, prevent, and deal with cheating on tests and papers.
- What teachers should know about biorhythms and sleep problems not only of elderly persons but also of young students snoozing in mid-afternoon lectures.
- The merits of a new comprehensive paradigm emerging from evolutionary psychology and cognitive science to bridge the separate subdisciplines of psychology and thus to provide an integrated approach to teaching students about behavior.

Teaching Differently
Robert Sternberg of Yale University gave the opening address of the teaching institute, describing his "triarchic" theory of intelligence, called the STAT or Sternberg Triarchic Abilities Test.

It focuses on three ways of thinking: analytic, creative, and practical. An introductory psychology course has been developed using the same theoretical approach.

"We're using the same theory for instruction and assessment," Sternberg stressed. "You get away from the atheoretical notion of 'Let's give them an IQ test' when students are having problems.... You use a single theory across the board."

His course is a "standard introductory psychology course, very intense, 20 chapters in four weeks...given by Mahzarin Banaji."

Students are placed in separate afternoon sections for analytical thinking, creative thinking, practical thinking, or a standard college introductory course mode taught by graduate students and high school teachers.

The goal is to help students capitalize on their strengths and remediate and compensate in areas where they are not as good, Sternberg said.

Many students who would have been good psychologists were jumping ship after finding that introductory psychology courses didn't match their abilities and ways of thinking, Sternberg said. The triarchic approach avoids such pitfalls by recognizing that psychology requires strong analytic thinking, and strong creative (i.e., hypothetical) thinking, and practical thinking as well, he suggested.

Design Efficiency
Deborah Boehm-Davis of George Mason University talked about how psychology can be used to inform design of everyday objects from toothbrushes to cars. She said it's a field "where you really do see the benefits that derive from the work you have done."

She expressed hope that information on how human factors and ergo-

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE
Call for Nominations
EDITOR
Teaching Psychological Science

The Publications Committee of the American Psychological Society (Mark Appelbaum, Chair, Niall Bolger, Gerald Davison, Morton Ann Gernsbacher, Robert Krauss, Robert Kraut, Joseph Steinmetz) invites nominations for a four-year term for a founding Editor of the Society’s journal Teaching Psychological Science.

As described in the accompanying article, Teaching Psychological Science is a timely source of scholarly articles focused on teaching and spanning the entire spectrum of scientific psychology. The audience includes the members of APS engaged in educating tomorrow’s scientific psychologists and especially includes teachers of psychology from the high school level through college/university and postdoctoral levels.

Nominees must be members of APS and should be prepared to begin soliciting manuscripts in mid-1996. They should be especially capable in using the Internet. Send a complete curriculum vita and cover letter explaining the nominee’s qualifications. Self nominations are encouraged, as are nomination of members of underrepresented groups in psychology. Nominees are encouraged to submit a statement briefly discussing their ideas on the journal’s development.

Nominations should be sent by September 30, 1995, to:

Mark Appelbaum, Chair
APS Publications Committee
American Psychological Society
1010 Vermont Ave., NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005-4907

nomics are bringing psychology to design “will come to be included in more and more undergraduate programs, if not as an entire course, at least as a lecture or two.” She offered her audience resource lists of textbooks in the field containing many of the examples she cited in her lecture and invited psychologists to feel free to phone her for further information.

Understanding Sleep
Evelyn Satinoff of the University of Delaware described how the use of tiny temperature transmitters implanted in the peritoneal cavity of rats with just three stitches has revolutionized the study of sleep.

The mini-meters, introduced about 15 years ago, provide an ongoing picture of the animal’s circadian temperature rhythm at 10-minute intervals.

Temperature rhythms and sleep are highly correlated in rats, as they are in people, Satinoff said.

To gain greater understanding of the sleep problems of some elderly persons, much of Satinoff’s research has focused on very old rats, about 24 months old.

They tend to have flat, “messy” daily temperature rhythms, whereas young rats typically have distinct high and low periods in the 24-hour span.

More relevant to the classroom, however, is research on young adults showing that four o’clock in the afternoon is when students have the most difficulty staying awake.

This is also the hour when most departmental talks and colloquia are given, Satinoff said. In spite of her enlightenment by this finding, she does become agitated by students who fall asleep in departmental lectures and colloquia, often scheduled at that hour.

Cognitive Therapy Advances
Martin Seligman offered the participants a view into five cognitive therapy projects now under way for the prevention of anxiety in children. The children get training in how to avoid what Seligman called “what-will-happen-next thoughts” and in social skill exercises.

Seligman’s social skill exercises help children identify “hot thoughts” and replace them with “cool thoughts.” Hot thoughts make you act without first thinking, but cool thoughts bring emotions under control.

Learning Approach
Carol S. Dweck of Columbia University in her closing plenary address to the teaching institute focused on two implicit theories of intelligence that students often bring to college. Which of the two modes students buy into has profound effects on their college careers.

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE
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and life beyond campus, Dweck said.

The *entity theory* adopted by some students is mainly concerned with achieving good performance and creating an impression of ability.

Students who buy into this theory see a strong negative relationship between effort and ability. "If you have to work hard at it, you must not be good at it," is the gist of their thinking, Dweck said.

The *implicit theory* adopted by others is mastery-oriented. The goal of this theory is learning. The students who adopt it believe that effort turns ability on, Dweck said.

Entity theory students tend to lapse into ineffective strategies and have negative affect in the face of failure, Dweck said.

**Student Integrity**

At the "Honesty/Cheating" table of the first Participant Idea Exchange session it was hard to apply APS President Marilynn Brewer's recommendation to "tablehop the way you would at a New York deli." It was standing room only.

"Cheating is not just dishonest. It's beyond that. It destroys the pleasure of intellectual achievement," said Lenore Szuchman of Barry University, a co-sponsor of the round-table discussion.

Kenneth Sumner of Dowling College, another co-sponsor, said, "I give my students a paper with pointers setting out what I expect from them. And I keep revising it as new problems come up."

"You know what I think we're doing?" said Carolyn Sobel of Hofstra University. "All of us, we're address-

One of the nearly 30 Participant Idea Exchange round-tables where specific classroom and teaching topics were discussed.

ing the specifics in class but I think the problem is very much more general than that. There's a whole different culture and attitude now, an attitude that 'if I want to get somewhere, I've got to think of the larger picture, and I'm just going to run the [traffic] light.'"

Szuchman responded, "We have a big role in creating culture in universities. It seems to me we do get the results, but it's very late in the process when we get them."

"To some extent I agree with you, but I also think there are some kids that do respond and so all we can do is the best job we can," said Richard Pastore of SUNY-Binghamton. "There are some kids who have these kinds of values and some

Kenneth Sumner and Lenore Szuchman discuss student honesty-related issues.

who don't. But there's a big middle group that we can influence. If you can give a sense of what intellectual honesty is to just two people in your class, I think you've made a big difference."

The teaching institute program was developed and chaired by Douglas Bernstein of the University of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign.

---

**CONVENTION FROM PAGE 15**

helplessness paradigm to depressed children and adults, suggesting that their depressive symptoms dissipate as they learn to exert progressively greater control over their environments.

Both Edwards and Seligman demonstrated "the seamless connection between basic and applied research," said Brewer in presenting the awards.

**The American Psychological Society**

**James McKeen Cattell Fellow**

The American Psychological Society names Martin E. P. Seligman as a James McKeen Cattell Fellow in recognition of his creative pursuit of the ramifications of learned helplessness.

Seligman discovered this phenomenon in the animal laboratory when animals exposed to uncontrollable situations became unmotivated to learn. He not only examined the physiological and experiential basis for this syndrome, but also recognized its implications for the origins of successful and unsuccessful coping patterns, for health and illness, for behavior and beliefs, and for individuals and the societies in which they live. If helplessness could be prevented and cured by acquiring a more flexible and optimistic belief system. These insights led to a rigorous and wide ranging line of empirical research.

Because his theoretical analyses and empirical work bridge the laboratory, the clinic, the nursery, and the work place, they touch every facet of psychology. Thus his scientific career exemplifies the accomplishments the James McKeen Cattell Fellow Award was designed to recognize.

**Stan Schneider Honored**

A citation for Stanley Schneider was also presented by Brewer, who characterized him as "a very special friend of APS who recently retired after 33 years of dedicated service at the National Institute of Mental Health." (See the May/June 1995 Observer.) She said that "Stan spent the first two-thirds of his career focusing on the training of psychologists, working particularly to support the entire spectrum of psychological science and stimulate areas of psychology such as community and environmental and health psychology. Stan has become one of the staunchest advocates of our shared mission and many of us are benefitting

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE
from the innovative programs that Stan was responsible for.”

**Cognitive Science Award**

The annual $1,000 Shahin Hashtroudi prize for graduate research in cognitive approaches to human memory was presented to Doug Rohrer of George Washington University. He received the award from Marcia Johnson of Princeton University, Chair of the Hashtroudi Memorial Foundation award committee. Rohrer received the award for his work at the University of California-San Diego on retrieval processes in episodic and semantic memory, exploring the nature of the semantic deficit in Alzheimer’s disease patients. The Foundation and award was established in memory of Shahin Hashtroudi of George Washington University who was killed in a robbery in 1992.

**Program Organizers**

As the 1995 convention concluded, the *Observer* asked the program committee co-chairs what they had tried to achieve as they selected the presenters and program content this year.

“We asked presenters to package their ideas in a manner that appeals to a diverse group of psychologists,” said Co-Chair Denise Park, who will move from the University of Georgia to the University of Michigan in late July. “So, in fact, the conference offers psychologists a very good way to get a total immersion course in lots of different areas of psychology in a way that is accessible and comprehensible to them.

“And the presentations are never narrow, a weakness of psychology conferences in years gone by. Even if it was one individual giving an invited address, he or she was drawing heavily from many domains of psychology,” Park said.

**Posters Are Key**

Convention Co-Chair Mahzarin Banaji believed the posters were the most successful part of the convention this year. There were 25 percent more poster presentations than last year, and they were highly diverse in subject range, and most were very substantial.

“Just walking through the posters—

read in the journals or heard at previous talks. That is the purpose of talks, but the posters really do serve a very different function. They show you up close what it’s like to be in the trenches, how it feels to be in the middle of the action, where it’s happening.”

Poster presenters ranged from students to leading research authorities. For example, Dorothy and Jerome Singer, co-directors of the Yale University Family Television Resource and Consultation Center, and their colleagues presented a study of the impact on children TV viewers of the popular “Barney” program.

**Business at APS**

Capping the final day of the conference was the annual APS Business Meeting, which included the Treasurer’s report on the Society’s financial status. APS derives about 60 percent of its operating budget from dues, about 12 percent from advertising in the *Observer*, and about 8 percent on the annual convention, spending on advertising. A $5-increase in full member dues and $3-increase in student dues was approved by the board of directors, the first increase in two years.

APS Executive Director Alan Kraut said, “The Society continues to run pretty efficiently. The APS motto, coined by Past-President Jim McGaugh, still applies to our operations: ‘lean and nice.’ We still have a very small full-time staff [10 total], and board and committee expenses are still well under 2 percent of the total budget.” D.K.
Take Nothing for Granted in 1990s

Nearly 20 program representatives provide advice on research support at APS Convention Federal Funding Poster Session

“Keep trying. We still have money. Somebody’s going to get funded. And it might as well be you.”

That’s the advice that Molly (Mary Ellen) Oliveri gave to psychologists who said they were wondering if it was worth trying this year for federal funding of their research, given the threatened cutbacks in federal funding.

The scene was the Federal Funding Poster Session at the June/July APS Convention in New York. Along with two colleagues, Oliveri, who represented the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) Neuroscience and Behavioral Science Division, was giving practical how-to advice to researchers in search of funding for their work. Hers was one of three NIMH divisions with exhibit booths at the special two-hour poster session.

“I’m not being flippant. Obtaining research support is still not an easy task,” Oliveri said. “But we do have money. And people who have good ideas should keep on trying.”

Sociocultural Influence on Mental Health

Sociocultural research is an area that Oliveri’s division is particularly interested in now. Broad-scale social influence on mental health is how she defines it.

“Sociocultural research is not new for us in the sense that it has never been fundable, but not much has been funded in the past, and we are trying to increase our attention to it now,” Oliveri said. As examples, she said proposals could focus on poverty experience, ethnic group experience, cross-cultural or cross national topics, or racial/ethnic prejudice and stigmatization—all in relation to mental health.”

Age of Uncertainty

Present uncertainties about funding levels of the various National Institutes of Health (NIH) should not deter researchers from submitting their proposals, Ronald Abeles emphasized. Abeles, who is the National Institute on Aging’s Associate Director for Behavioral and Social Research, chaired the special federal session.

Abeles spoke of the prospects for flat funding levels in the immediate future but said he couldn’t predict amounts or time-frames, as these depend on Congress and the President. But his basic advice was, “Act, don’t wait to submit your proposal.” October 1 is the next deadline for many research programs throughout NIH, and it takes a minimum of nine months to complete the grant evaluation and approval process.

Like the 20 other federal funding officials who were staffing the posters, Abeles was providing information on variety of research support areas in his institute and advising on appropriate grant mechanisms to pursue. The steps to take differ from person to person, depending on what stage of their research career the applicants are in and their particular area and the type of research grant they are aiming for.

Congressional Influence on Science

Herbert Lansdell, representing the Division of Fundamental Neurosciences of the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke, struck a note of optimism. “I pay attention to those members of Congress who say that scientific research is important and basic research is important because it produces results of great importance for the long term,” he said.

“And I think that applies to what NIH is doing. So I’m optimistic. Science research is not going to be stopped. The worst that could happen is that it be slowed down,” Lansdell said.

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE
Broadened Agenda at Drug Abuse Institute

At the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) poster, Jaylan Turkkan was advising people to watch the next issues of the NIH Guide for an announcement her institute will be making in short order on expanded research interests. Turkkan is chief of NIDA's Behavioral Science Research Branch, which she said is currently trying to fill major gaps in its research portfolio.

"The number one idea I am trying to get across to people is that NIDA is very interested in asking some basic science questions about drug abuse that do not necessarily involve using drug abusers in the research protocol or administering drugs of abuse in the research," Turkkan said.

"Stripping out those kinds of subjects and independent variables leaves you with basic behavioral research and basic neuroscience research. And, in the behavioral area you're asking questions about social process, learning process, cognitive process, basic questions about perception, and basic questions about how intransigent behavior gets developed to begin with. The behavior doesn't even have to be drug abuse behavior. And once it gets developed, what are the things that maintain such behavior, that make it difficult to diminish?" NIDA welcomes research proposals in these areas covered under this broadened NIDA initiative, she said.

Another area NIDA is very interested in developing, Turkkan said, is health behavior research. Drug abuse has hardly been investigated from this perspective, "though every time a drug abuser takes a drug it's with full knowledge they are damaging their health in one way or another," Turkkan said.

Improving the Odds

As to chances of getting a grant in today's budgetary climate, Turkkan says, "The more often you play, the higher the probability you will win. Every time you submit a grant, it receives a very high-quality review from experts in your field. That process helps you refine the research design of your studies and define the ideas you are going to propose."
ANDERSON FROM PAGE 12

received by breakthroughs in genetics and other sciences.

The public and policy-makers alike need to make the connection between behavioral and social research and health, said Anderson, not just in the usual areas like diet and smoking, but also in areas like aggression and violence.

"People are dying from family violence, and homicide is the leading cause of death in some adolescent and young adult populations—these aren't health issues?" he asks, incredulously.

Definition of Success

Another initial task for Anderson is to develop an operating definition of behavioral and social science research, which will be used to estimate funding levels at each institute. The OBSSR is mandated by Congress to come up with a standard definition, because, in the past, NIH reported inflated estimates of its behavioral and social science enterprise.

Part of the problem was that estimates were based on definitions that varied from institute to institute, with some including inappropriate areas of science. Anderson is in the process of forming an advisory committee of outside experts and NIH scientists from a range of disciplines to help with this and other OBSSR activities, especially in the development of a strategic plan.

The behavioral and social sciences also need stronger ties with different segments of the research continuum—"better connections along the scientific pathway"—in Anderson's view. "How do we get data from animal research to more quickly influence basic human research? How can basic research with humans more quickly influence clinical research? And, how can clinical research more quickly influence policy and front-line treatment?"

"The biomedical community does a pretty good job" of making those connections, according to Anderson, in large part because "they have pharmaceutical companies out there just waiting" for basic research to be converted. "We don't have analogous enterprises in the behavioral and social science domain. So we have to come up with creative and different ways of moving information along the pathway."

Anderson sees a potential role for OBSSR in addressing this issue.

"Our budget is small, but it won't cost a lot to scour the literature in different areas, to be able to say 'this is what has been found in animal research that has implications for human research,' or 'this is what has been found in laboratory or epidemiological studies with humans that has clinical implications,' and so on. "This is one way to work closely with the institutes and scientific community to develop research agendas, to come up with specific kinds of programs. But this is the kind of thing my office can do directly," he says.

Recognizing Basic Research

Right now, said Anderson, both the public and many traditional biomedical researchers don't recognize the role of basic behavioral and social research in improving health. "They have a laundry list," he said, and to them "behavior only means smoking, exercise, diet, effects of alcohol."

This ignores "the basic behavioral research that led to our knowledge of those things, such as work in learning, motivation, emotion, and social influences," he said. "Those are the kinds of things that haven't worked their way into the NIH culture." Sarah Brookhart

Miss the Convention? Buy the Soundtrack!

If you couldn’t attend the recent APS Convention in New York City or even if you missed only a few key sessions, our audiotapes could be just the ticket! The Keynote Address, the Presidential Symposium on the Bell Curve, the Bring-the-Family Address and select Teaching Institute preconference talks, addresses and symposias are available on high-quality and affordable audio cassettes. Audiotapes are just $9 each plus shipping and handling, with discounts available when purchasing twelve or more tapes.

Reinforce What You Learned & Hear What You Missed!

To receive a complete listing of available audiotapes or to place an order, please contact

Nationwide Recording Services, Inc.
8500 North Stemmons, Suite 3060
Dallas, Texas 75247
Telephone: 214-638-8273
Fax: 214-638-0954
Russian Psychology - III

It's the best of times and worst of times for psychology in Russia today. "We have very good and very bad conditions for psychological science," said Andrey V. Bruslinsky, director of the Russian Institute of Psychology. "We have freedom now in our thinking, our political movements, our scientific activity and creativeness."

"After the failed coup of August 1991, the official communist ideology of this country was liquidated, so now there are no ideological or political pressures on us—but we have very great financial difficulties."

Capturing the essence of conditions in Russia, Bruslinsky summarized, "Before we had money but no freedom. Now we have freedom but no money."

The Institute gets some support, though, from the National Humanitarian Foundation and two other Russian foundations. Additional outside funding is generated through joint grants with French, German, and American researchers, including a post-traumatic stress syndrome program linked with APS Charter Member Scott Orr and others at Harvard Medical School. But, the largest source of funding for Russian scientists—the $100-million International Science Foundation—is expected to run dry by December 1995. Meanwhile, Science magazine recently reported that a $20-million fund was jointly established by the United States and Russian governments and financier George Soros to promote joint research between American and Russian scientists.

But no amount of outside help seems likely to resolve the basic financial crisis facing the Institute of Psychology and the other 260 or so scientific institutions within the Russian Academy of Sciences. Funding for research and salaries is currently estimated at no more than 10 percent of the level enjoyed under the Soviet Academy of Science—the chief coordinating body for scientific research within the Soviet Union. "Now, due to the social changes in Russia, we have a tragic, catastrophic situation with basic research in psychology," said Vladimir N. Druzhinin, deputy director of the Institute. "But nobody is paying any attention to it. We have no money, no equipment. Highly qualified scientists and professors receive minimum pay. We had a highly developed school of perception with Boris Lomov, Lev Vekker—who is now in America—and others. Now, unfortunately, this tradition is degenerating. Some islands of excellent psychological research still exist, but the question is more general: Can we stop the degeneration of Russian Science as a whole?"

Before we had money but no freedom. Now we have freedom but no money.

ANDREY V. BRUSHLINSKY
RUSSIAN INSTITUTE OF PSYCHOLOGY

An indication of the Institute's resilience and growth is its new journal, Foreign Psychology, edited by Tatiana Ushakova, head of the Institute's speech psychology and psycholinguistics laboratory. Foreign Psychology presents a core theme in each twice-yearly issue with articles from psychologists from five or six different countries, translated into Russian, with abstracts in English and other languages.

Asked how she deals with the obstacles facing researchers in Russia today, Ushakova replied: "I will continue to do this in spite of all the difficulties. It's what I love. I cannot live any other way. I face difficult conditions everywhere, in my research, with my journal. But I continue because it is so important to me. Of course my energy is not endless—I may have to stop some day. But I don't even think of that problem. I just keep going."

New Society
Another sign of new life in Russian psychology is the founding of the Russian Psychological Association last year.

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE
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Russia had been without such an association since the collapse of the Soviet Union in 1991. The new society will have a significant role linking psychology departments, institutes, and research centers, some of them new, throughout Russia, predicted its new president, E. V. Klimov, in an interview with the Observer at the Department of Psychology at Moscow State University.

A leading figure in the psychology of work, Klimov is dean of the department. He noted that psychology teaching and research have been expanding significantly as the transformation of Russia proceeds, with new psychology centers and facilities at Perm, Yaroslav, Kazan, Kursk, Novosibirsk, and other sites.

But to keep the upward pace moving, Druzhinin suggests that new ideas—not imported ones—are what psychological science needs today. In science, tradition can degenerate into a cult that spends its energies fighting to overwhelm its competitors, he said.

Points of growth tend to show up not in tradition but in mutations, in new things that appear in the minds of scientists, he said. What is most important is to watch for those who initiate new ideas for new problems and to counteract those who lean on traditions, he said.

Work is now being done in Russia that responds to Druzhinin’s imperatives in the areas of personality, individuality, individual differences, and ecological psychology, he said. Another important body of new work is in constructs dealing with purposes and goals. The constructs have been developed by young psychologists at Moscow State University in the last few years, he said. They use psycholinguistic approaches to study personality structures dealing with sense, meaning, and goals.

Researchers now have the opportunity to work in subject areas that were forbidden under communism including ethnic/national conflicts in Russian society, alcohol and drug addiction and political psychology.

“We have begun to investigate the physiological roots of intelligence are the focus of the testing instrument developed by Vladimir Russaloff.

Remuneration

At Moscow State and the Institute, psychological researchers said their excitement over new research opportunities was mingled with constant concern over the hardships of work and lack of funding available. Research funding and salaries for Russian academic and research psychologists have shrunk to the disappearing point for many professors and for the Institute’s members and staff as inflation continues—at a rate of 200 percent over the past 12 months. Senior researchers at the Institute said their monthly salaries are around $40 a month. Some hold two or three additional jobs in order to survive—tutoring, teaching, consulting in public or private sectors. Others look abroad for work or are abroad already.

Vera Koltzova collects the archives on psychologists banned during Stalinism as part of her work as head of the History Laboratory of the Institute.

At least 10 of the Institute’s psychologists are in the United States, Brushlinsky said. Some are abroad on exchange programs, while others live in the United States more or less permanently. Other staff are in France, Germany, Sweden, and Switzerland. Projects are often delayed or shelved for lack of funds to cover research expenses. For example, Vladimir Russaloff said a cut-off of funding has stalled at midpoint his trials of a highly promising psychophysiological approach to measuring differences in intelligence, personality, memory and consciousness—a key project of his laboratory for the past six years.

Russaloff’s work is in differential psychophysiology, a field he identifies as a new science developed in Russia. It emerged from a Marxist ideology that denied individual differences could exist at all, except as a result of errors in education. Well-geared education was to create the New Soviet Man. Since differences obviously did exist and persist, however, and since the Soviet Union had an unusually well developed psychophysiological apparatus in operation—guided by Ivan Pavlov until his death in 1936—some Soviet scientists tried to explain individual differences by using psychophysiological principles and explanations.

From that time on, Russian psychologists have tended to search for physiological explanations underlying the predispositions, endowments, and prerequisites of intelligence that psychologists in the United States and elsewhere have identified, Russaloff pointed out.
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Reaching out to Western Science

Ambitious research plans and newfound political freedom have driven many Russians to reach out to western psychologists in research collaborations.

Colors and their semantic meanings are the focus of some of the research of Olga V. Safuanova in the perception laboratory of the Institute of Psychology. She visited the United States briefly in an exchange program led by APS Charter Member David Bishop at Lutheran College. But Safuanova also would like to exchange programs led by Olga V. Gibbs of Rutgers University, intrigued by her work on stabilizing the retinal image and visual adaptation, collaborated with her to test the idea that photoreceptors might encode relative intensities rather than absolute intensities.

On History, Trends

The notion of the history of psychology stretches much further in Russia than it commonly does in the United States. This is partly because Russian psychologists now are actively recovering suppressed research and other writings of scores of psychologists who were purged or prevented from publishing during the Communist era.

Vera Koltzova, who heads the institute's division of history of psychology, and Uri Oleinik, a senior scientist in that division, have saved and archived major bodies of work of more than 50 psychologists in this undertaking.

Economic pressures in Russia are driving one very dominant trend: the migration of scientists from research to clinical practice. Natalia Grasinina is a case in point. A former researcher at the Institute, she now is a psychotherapist, applying some of what she learned in her studies in the post-traumatic stress laboratory.

How Do Russian Psychologists Survive on $40 a Month?

Moscow today has the distinction of being one of the world's most expensive cities for foreigners to visit. Yet many Moscovites somehow survive on minuscule salaries. The Observer asked one of the world's leading authorities on Russia's economic transformation to shed light on the situation.

Anders Aslund, author of How Russia Became a Market Economy (Brookings Institution, 1995), was an economic counselor to the Russian government from 1991 to 1994 and is now a senior associate at the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace.

"What is being squeezed in Russia today is education and the health sector—and at the same time, of course, we must realize the GNP has fallen sharply—officially by 47 percent since 1990," Aslund told the Observer.

Aslund said the monthly salaries of $20 to $40 per month reported by psychologists "seem low but are possible." By comparison, the minimum monthly wage in Russia for June 1995 is $10.40 (52,000 rubles), the minimum pension for retirees of all types about twice the minimum wage. Estimated average monthly salary for all categories of work is about $90, he said. Underground economy earnings and gains from corruption and other illegal operations are not accounted for in official Russian government data that yields these data, however.

Being an institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences—

as is the case with the Institute of Psychology—adds to the problem, Aslund said. "The Academy of Sciences is extremely badly run," he said. "It needs to close down. It should give up doing research. There is no research whatever. But the Academy takes a passive attitude, relying more and more on the old guard who don't want any change. Therefore you have a tug of war between the government and the Academy."

Aslund added, "The average research institute is a joke. Most of the economic institutes in the Academy don't undertake research at all. What they used to do is (now) useless. They were dealing only with Marxist-Leninist things, nothing that economists would label economics." Psychologists, Aslund said, may have had the advantage of working on research issues more in the international mainstream.

In his book, Aslund points out that the government's main thrust is intended to make Russians adjust to market forces rather than extract resources from the state. About one-third of employment now is in government and two-thirds is private, Aslund said. About 46 percent of GNP in 1994 was government expenditure, and about 21 percent of GNP went into social expenditure, which is about the same rate as in Western countries, Aslund said.

So, how can someone survive on $30 or $40 a month? Aslund says they can't, "so they do consulting and work on the side at three or four jobs."**
How to Create a Good Exam

Catherine H. Renner
Michael J. Renner
West Chester University

While many students believe that exams solely exist to torture them or give the instructor a day off from teaching, the most obvious purpose is to assess the students’ retention and comprehension of the course material. A related purpose is to maintain institutional standards by requiring students to meet some minimum performance standard before giving them credit. These types of performance evaluations provide the basis for assigning grades.

This column will focus on some rules of thumb for creating a good examination, test, quiz, evaluation, or trial-by-fire. We will discuss topics such as the functions of exams, how exam creation has changed, planning a good exam, time requirements, specific tips about writing items, and the place of humor in exams.

Functions of Exams
A well-written exam serves several functions that support effective instruction. First, an exam can teach by prompting study and by reminding students of what they have learned. It can challenge students to use their new-found knowledge in ways that have practical or intellectual value. Second, students’ exam performance can provide instructors with diagnostic information about what the students did or did not comprehend. High-quality exams can fulfill these dual goals of instruction and evaluation, but poorly constructed exams may fulfill neither.

How Exam Creation Has Changed
As the demands on faculty members have increased (e.g., increased class size, teaching loads, and research expectations), instructors typically have come to rely more on outside sources for exam questions. Instructors may now have a collection of more publisher-supplied ancillary materials than they could possibly use in a single exam. But more work exists than simply picking items for your next test.

Planning a Good Exam

Planning a Good Exam
The first principle in writing an exam is to plan ahead. Before you begin, it is important to review your course objectives and identify important concepts, issues, and terms students should have learned. This allows you to match the emphasis in the exam to your ideas about what is most important. A common mistake is to skip the planning process. It’s tempting but unadvisable to simply begin writing or selecting questions.

If you want to encourage certain behaviors in your students, the first exam is critical; what students find when they arrive for the first exam can have a major impact on how they approach the rest of the course. Students use the first exam in a course to judge what the instructor really thinks is important for them to learn, and how hard they will need to work. Your first exam should make your expectations clear.
**Time requirements**

Even experienced instructors may write what they think is a great exam, only to discover that it is too long or too short. For multiple choice exams, a conservative estimate is to allow one minute per item. Nearly all students will finish well before this, but it will allow enough time for even the most thorough student. For short essays, 5-10 minutes per question should allow most students (who have some mastery of the material) enough time to prepare an answer. For longer essay items, estimating the time required is more difficult. One useful strategy is to assign point values to questions that are proportional to the amount of time you expect or want students to spend on the question, and then inform the students that you have done this by listing the points assigned to each question.

**Writing Good Multiple Choice Items**

It's a painful truth that a test-savvy student can often get a respectable grade on a poorly constructed multiple choice exam without having learned the course material. It's equally possible that a substandard exam will make a good student look bad. Whether you're writing your own items or choosing them from an item file, a good multiple choice exam should have several characteristics, which we'll summarize as Dos and Don'ts.

- **Do** remember that one of your goals is to make the student think. This means using a variety of question types, minimizing use of items requiring simple memorization, and asking yourself—for every question—"Why is it important that they know this?"
- **Do** read the questions through the students' eyes—make sure the answer key is correct and doesn’t contradict something you've told them or assigned for reading. Otherwise, students can reasonably argue that the question is unfair or that an incorrect answer is also correct.
- **Do** make sure that each response option is the correct answer approximately as often as each of the others, and that the correct answer is typically the same length as the distractors. Students quickly pick up on extraneous cues that can signal the correct answer.

- **Do** write each stem (the beginning of the question) as a complete question. The student should be able to write the answer to the question without reading the response options.
- **Do** rewrite poor test bank items that can be salvaged if a useful item will result.
- **Do** put items in order of the content in the textbook and your lectures. This provides a context for reading and understanding them. If you use multiple forms of an exam (same questions, different order) this may not be possible.
- **Don't** overuse questions that include "all of the above" or "none of the above" as keys or distractors, or that take the form "which of the following is not..." Students often expend so much effort decoding the syntax of the question that they lose track of the underlying concept.
- **Don't** write questions for which the correct answer is identified in another question. It makes little sense to ask for a definition of a term in one question if the stem of a neighboring question provides the definition.
- **Don't** use incorrect answers that are obvious fillers, or those that are grammatically or logically inconsistent with the stem. Eliminating these is a no-brainer for the student.
- **Don't** take all of your questions from the item file for your textbook, and don't randomly pick items from the test bank. The resulting exam may not cover the concepts you have emphasized and may not even fairly represent the material in the textbook.
- **Don't** worry about having five response options for your questions if you normally use four, or vice versa. If the distractors are of high quality it makes little difference.

**Writing Essay Items**

Essay exams can be fun if the questions are clearly stated and allow the students to stretch their understanding. Essays require students to think about material differently than multiple choice questions; students must recall information they have learned rather than simply recognize the correct answer. Research indicates that students study more efficiently for essay than for multiple choice exams.

But writing good essay questions is only half the job. It's important to prepare an answer key before you administrate the test. This is your opportunity to define the information you expect to see and the points you will assign to it, and decide beforehand whether you will deduct points for digressions, and so inform the students prior to the test. If a student digresses, point this out and apply your standards consistently.

In creating a good essay question, it is important that the question be specific enough that the prepared student can answer it to your satisfaction. There are key words in essay questions that signal the student how to structure their response. For example, 'compare' asks students to analyze the similarities and differences among concepts, whereas 'contrast' tells students to focus only on differences. 'Define' yields the meaning of a concept, and 'list' will elicit just that, a simple list. 'Discuss,' 'explain,' 'relate,' and 'interpret' all require the student to move beyond the description or definition of concepts to detail cause and effect present other opposing ideas. Using key words like these in an essay question will signal a specific task to the student. Reviewing the meaning of these key terms in class before the exam may help the student understand better what type of information a question is requesting.

It is tempting to include broad, all-encompassing questions as larger essay questions. However, if an essay question is too broad, the student may resort to the "memory dumping" strategy. This occurs for a number of reasons. First, the question itself may not be specific enough for the student to discriminate relevant from irrelevant information. Second, the student may not know the material well enough to determine what is and isn't relevant, and so writes down everything in hopes that something will count. Your having prepared an answer key before the test will help guide your grading to ferret...
out the information you seek and thereby discourage “memory dumping” in the long run. A student’s answer that incorporates large amounts of material, of which some aspects may only be tangentially relevant, may be well-informed and well-written, but may still not be a good answer to a particular question. If you assign full credit to this type of answer without informing the student that some aspects were irrelevant, he or she may come away believing that this type of response was what you wanted. Subsequent essay answers will become longer and less focused as the semester progresses.

- **The Use of Humor**

  Some students believe that humor in an exam helps them by breaking the tension and reminding them that it is not the Spanish Inquisition. For other students, humor in an exam breaks their concentration and distracts them.

  Try to structure your exams so that students can choose whether or not to deal with your attempts at comedy. For example, you might offer several essays or problems, one of which is supposed to be funny, and give students a choice of questions so they may choose to avoid the funny one. For multiple choice questions, you might tell students that option (e), when present, is never correct and may be ignored. Then, when you have an inspired pun or loose association to inflict upon your students, place it as option (e). This allows students who are distracted by humor to avoid it and preserves the 4-choice character of the exam.

**Conclusion**

Creating a good exam involves a pinch of science and a large scoop of art. If you are willing to combine your expertise in the content of psychology with compassion, alertness, and an ongoing effort to keep your goals for teaching in sight, you can develop the skill of creating challenging, fair, and interesting exams. This makes an exam an important part of the student’s learning experience, and can give you feedback for continually improving your teaching.

---
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**Recommended Readings**


**Catherine Hackett Renner** received her PhD in Experimental Psychology in 1985 from Ohio University. She has interests in the design and analysis of research studying judgment and decision making in applied settings.

**Michael J. Renner** received his PhD in Biological Psychology in 1984 from the University of California, Berkeley. He has interests in animal behavior and cognition, and studies curiosity in a variety of species in laboratories and zoos.
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Being a part of it... The 7th Annual APS Convention in New York

The theme of this year’s conference, “Science in a Broad Way,” was evident in the wide variety of cutting-edge research represented in over 850 posters.

Thought-stimulating symposia covering topics such as repressed memories, psychopathology, space perception, social judgment, marriage and the family, intelligence, and aging attracted many convention attendees. Additional invited addresses and debates rounded out the packed weekend schedule of events.

Other features of the conference included the second annual APS Institute on the Teaching of Psychology, which served as a special one-day preconference.

In addition, many publishers had book displays in the exhibit halls, along with several multi-media displays.

As an added feature to assist student conference attendees, the APSSC offered an orientation session titled “Navigating the APS Convention” to help students get the most out of the conference.

APSSC Election

Elections were held for students to serve on the 1995-96 Executive Council. A large number of student affiliates attended the meeting and voted in the new officers, some of whom are introduced below.

Look for introductions of additional officers in the September Student Notebook. The new officers and their addresses can be found in the APSSC Council box on the opposite page.

Taking in the City’s Sights

Many students took time to see some of New York’s most famous sights. The Statue of Liberty, The Empire State Building, The World Trade Center, Central Park, The United Nations, and Greenwich Village were among the many locations students enjoyed. And, hanging out in front of the marquis for The Late Show with David Letterman was a major highlight for some.

Endless night spots accommodated those who sought a night on the town, and a variety of eating establishments were available to please even the pickiest of eaters.

A lot of New York charm, however, was not found in the Irish Pubs or in the Lebanese restaurants. The city’s bright lights lit up the sky at night and revealed city streets teaming with artists, musicians, and a wide variety of remarkable sites.

See You Next Year

The 1995 convention was a huge success, and definitely a worthwhile experience for any student. If you haven’t already done so, be sure to make plans to be at next year’s meeting in San Francisco, June 29-July 2, 1996. See you there!

APSSC Announces First Small Grant Award Recipients

Winners of the first annual APSSC Small Grant Award were announced at this year’s APS convention. The small grant is a competitive funding source for student affiliates of APS.

All submissions that were received by APSSC were submitted for review by a panel of student judges. Submissions were judged on criteria such as overall quality, possible theoretical contribution, possibility of publication or conference presentation.

The four submissions that received the highest combined ratings were chosen to receive the small grant. The principal investigator of the chosen proposal received $250 to help conduct the proposed research.

More than 40 proposals were submitted for the Small Grant Award this year. The APSSC would like to thank all of the students who submitted proposals for this year’s Small Grant Award. In addition, the APSSC Executive Council would like to extend further congratulations to the 1995 Small Grant Award winners:

Jacqueline M. Curiel, University of Notre Dame
Shannon M. Hyland, University of Illinois-Chicago
Michelle Hebl, Dartmouth College
Tina Marie Avila, Claremont Graduate School
Ethnic Minority Concerns Committee Research Presentation

The Ethnic Minority Concerns Committee (EMCC) was established by the APS Student Caucus (APSSC) as a voice for the concerns of ethnic minority students such as African American, Asian, Latino, and Native American student affiliates of APS.

The committee's mission is to assist, coordinate, advocate, and recommend programs and policies on ethnic minority student issues as they relate to the APSSC and to the science of psychology in general.

EMCC seeks to form alliances with organizations that advance the interests of ethnic minority groups, encourage scholarly work on issues that enhance the understanding of ethnic minorities, and increase the involvement of ethnic minority students in the APSSC.

At this year's APS convention, a paper presentation was organized by the EMCC to present ethnic minority concerns within psychological research. In keeping with the committee's goals, research was presented that enhanced the understanding of ethnic minorities within psychology. Four papers were presented by APS student affiliates:

- **Robert Colson**, Trenton State College, *Ethnicity Matters*
- **Michael Jordan**, Loyola Univ. of Chicago, *Predictors of Job Satisfaction Among Minority and Non-Minority Employees in the Workplace*
- **Cynthia Monarrez**, Univ. of Michigan, *Culturally Focal Concerns and Emotions: Variation in Emotion Among Americans and Mexicans*
- **Rodolfo Mendoza-Denton**, Columbia Univ., *Evidence of Intuitive Interactionism in Stereotyping*

**Student Research Award Winners**

Every student who conducts research does so with the goal of making a significant contribution to the field of psychology. The APS Student Caucus has, therefore, designed a research competition to encourage and acknowledge outstanding student research. The goal is to issue the award to one undergraduate and three graduate students each year. The application procedure is simple and is explained in detail in the November issue of the *Observer*. APS student affiliates who are first author on a paper that they have submitted to the annual convention are eligible to apply.

The Executive Council of APSSC chose two graduate applicants to receive the research award this year. Each winner was awarded $250 and had the opportunity to present her work at the Student Research Symposium chaired by Elizabeth Loftus, University of Washington, at the seventh Annual APS Convention. The APSSC wishes to extend thanks to all who submitted applications and congratulations to the winners:

- **Laura E. Stevens** and **Susan T. Fiske**, Univ. of Massachusetts-Amherst, *Powerless People Form Motivated Impressions of Powerholders*, and

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

**Contact Information**

- **President**: Christopher D. Ratcliff, Department of Psychology, Texas Christian Univ., Fort Worth, TX 76129. Office: (817) 921-7414. Fax: (817) 921-7110. CRATCLIFF@TCU.EDU
- **Graduate Advocate**: Aram Packaiian, Univ. of Houston-Clear Lake, 2700 Bay Area Blvd., Box 198, Houston, TX 77058. Office: (713) 283-2560. APACKLAIAN@CL.UH.EDU
- **Undergraduate Advocate**: Karen Hoff, King College, 1350 King College Road, Bristol, TN 37620. Office: (615) 652-4859
- **Communications Director**: Mark Newsom, 1300 Elmwood Ave., Buffalo, NY 14222. Office: (716) 878-6701. Fax: (716) 878-6600
- **Volunteer Coordinator**: Nikki C. Scarberry, Department of Psychology, Texas Christian Univ., Fort Worth, TX 76129. Office: (817) 921-7414. Fax: (817) 921-7110. N.SCARBERRY@TCU.EDU

**Student Notebook Editor**

- **Susan Perry**, Department of Psychology, Kent State Univ., Kent, OH 44240. Office: (216) 672-2166. Fax: (216) 672-3786. SPERRY1@PHOENIX.KENT.EDU

**Past-President**

- **Stephen Fiore**, Department of Psychology, 601 Learning Research & Development Center, Univ. of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15260. SPFIORE@VMS.CIS.PITT.EDU
Meet Your 1995-96 APSSC Executive Council...

The newly elected members of the APSSC Executive Council would like to introduce themselves. Feel free to contact any of them to introduce yourself or discuss an issue regarding the Caucus. Watch for the next Observer, where you’ll meet the rest of the members of the Council.

President
Christopher Ratcliff

Christopher is currently in his fourth year at Texas Christian University in the general experimental program with an emphasis in Social Psychology. He is actively investigating the effects of different levels of typicality on the attitude-behavior relationship. His research focus has mainly concerned the amount of awareness that people give to typicality information.

Chris has been involved in the Student Caucus for about a year and a half. In that time, he has acted as the Volunteer Coordinator of the organization. He believes that it is important for students to be involved in the Student Caucus to promote the ideals of current students.

Chris’ goals for the organization are to increase participation from student affiliates in the Student Caucus and make the organization an integral part of student life.

Graduate Advocate
Aram Packlaian

Aram is a first year graduate student attending the University of Houston-Clear Lake. His academic goals are to earn a PhD in Industrial/Organizational Psychology, while earning an MBA in International Business. He believes that this will assist in accomplishing his research goals, which involve working with the international business community.

Regarding these goals, he states, “Our world is constantly shrinking and we must learn to work together for the betterment of humankind.” Last year he served as Undergraduate Advocate, assisting in the development of the mentorship and scholarship programs.

Undergraduate Advocate
Karen Hoff

Karen is a rising junior at King College, where she has been an active member in the college’s APS and Pi Chi chapters. Her long-term interests involve research using naturalistic observation of human-machine and human-document interaction to aid in the design of products and user manuals.

She presented a poster at this year’s convention, where she became interested in becoming involved in the Student Caucus. She is a recipient of a Mellon Foundation and Appalachian College Association summer research grant, which involves evaluating 300 articles from Developmental Psychology according to 40 features of research methodology.

As Undergraduate Advocate, Karen hopes to use this experience to contribute to clearer guidelines and goals in the student research competition.

Letters to the Editor

Republican Contract on Science

Dear Editor:

I thoroughly enjoyed the article (“Science and the Republican Congress”) in the May/June 1995 APS Observer. I have personally witnessed many examples of the truth of the arguments made in the article: e.g., Harry Harlow became a brain researcher because WARF, the Wisconsin Alumni Research Foundation and legatee of patents on vitamin D and Dicomarol, would fund “Biological Research” but not “Psychological Research.”

When Pat Meyer was the American Psychological Association’s liaison to the newly organized Society for Neuroscience, she was stifled from its board meetings, even though Neal Miller was the group’s president.

So much for unanimity and common cause in science. But perhaps peril for all will have a salubrious effect upon the haves, if the have-nots don’t waste time sitting back to enjoy the crimping of the haves’ style.

We need, as I tried to impress upon my students over the years, to remember that the enemy is nature, and not shrinks, Russians, deans, or some other psychology students.

Donald R. Meyer
Professor Emeritus
Ohio State University

The Editor welcomes your letters to the Editor

Submit typewritten letters of up to 300 words in paper form and, if possible, on computer diskette: DOS (5.25” or 3.5” diskette) or Macintosh (3.5” diskette). Indicate which word processor you used or, ideally, save as an ASCII or text file.
Obituaries

Personality Measurement Leader
Robert G. Bernreuter (1901-1995)

Not many psychologists achieve immortality through their doctoral dissertation. On the contrary, most of us would like to forget our first serious research effort; for too many of us, the doctoral dissertation is our last venture in research. Robert Bernreuter's thesis, the development of his Personality Inventory, earned him a place in personality measurement, a prominence that lasted for more than five decades. He gave psychologists a device that enabled them to assess four dimensions of personality using one set of self-report statements.

The items were written as questions to express experiences of respondents with respect to the problems of everyday living, for example,

42. Yes No? Do you get stage fright?
57. Yes No? Are you easily moved to tears?

The four scales were Neuroticism, Self-Sufficiency, Introversion, and Dominance. The scales proved to be highly reliable but also highly correlated. In fact, they yielded only one large factor and a minor one when they were subjected to an early application of factor analysis. Undaunted, Bernreuter named the new factors Self-Confidence and Sociability so that his test had six scales instead of four.

But, it should be noted that Bernreuter faced two problems self-report test makers still face: The tendency for the test-taker to say only favorable things about himself (i.e., response bias) and the problem of the culturally dated content of test items.

Response bias probably accounts for the high correlations, as great as .90, among his scales. But Bernreuter seems to have avoided the second problem by including items that are as relevant (both socially and personally) as items in current personality inventories. He never had to modify items that changing cultural and social values made unacceptable or irrelevant.

The Bernreuter Personality Inventory was used widely, especially in its first 15 years. And Bernreuter compiled a list of more than 450 references in which it was applied for a variety of purposes where personality factors were considered significant. This covered the interval up to 1947.

Robert Bernreuter was born in Tampico, Illinois, in 1901, and he died in State College, Pennsylvania, on June 15, 1995, one week after a severe heart attack. He was the son of a Methodist minister. He graduated from College of the Pacific in 1924 and enrolled as a graduate student under Lewis Terman at Stanford University. His graduate study was interrupted for two years when Bernreuter went to Hawaii to work as Porteus' assistant in studies of racial differences in ability among Hawaii's population.

He returned to Stanford to complete his work on his inventory and received his PhD in 1931. In the same year he made two commitments that were to last the remaining 64 years of his life. He married Shirley Buell of McAlester, Oklahoma, and he joined the faculty of Pennsylvania State College (now University). The Bernreuters raised one daughter, four grandchildren and one great granddaughter.

In 1931, the newly married couple moved to Pennsylvania State where his assignment was one-third grading correspondence courses, one-third teaching, and one-third establishing a psychoeducational clinic. It was with the clinic that he made his most significant contributions to applications of psychology to students' problems.

In 1936-1937 Bernreuter established a state-wide program of School Psychologists designed to bring psychological diagnostic and remedial services to grade schoolers in schools outside the major cities. This led to collaborative work with reading and speech and hearing specialists. Returning to the campus, he developed the clinic along somewhat similar lines, offering services to poorly performing or confused students. Graduate students learned to interview, test, diagnose, counsel, and refer. Bernreuter was given university-wide responsibilities culminating in appointment as Vice-President for Student Affairs. And although he retired in 1966, a program of testing and counseling of all incoming freshmen that bears his imprint continues to this day.

In World War II, Major Bernreuter spent two years in Washington in the Army Specialist Corps, and, promoted to Colonel, spent the next two years in the Far East as an operations analyst. He was one of the first Americans to enter Hiroshima after the Japanese surrender.

Bernreuter's interest in sports was long-standing. While an undergraduate at the College of the Pacific, Bernreuter had been a quarterback on the football team as well as a boxer and head cheerleader. At Penn State, he rarely missed a home football game, and he served as official timer of intercollegiate track meets and wrestling tournaments. He took up golf, achieving a low handicap. Fifteen years ago he established the Bernreuter Invitational Tournament to which colleagues in the Department of Psychology and other psychologists on campus were invited. Bob played until two years ago when he restricted his participation to the 19th hole.

At Penn State Bernreuter was a strong supporter of good will and cooperation among psychologists of different orientations. But, as long as he was in the department, and for years thereafter, he facilitated harmony, respect, and good scholarship. He established a climate in which students and colleagues were able to do their best.

George M. Guthrie
Professor Emeritus
Pennsylvania State University
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American Board of Professional Neuropsychology

Origins and Purpose
The American Board of Professional Neuropsychology (ABPN) was incorporated in the State of Georgia in June 1982, with Lawrence C. Hartlage as executive officer. ABPN recognizes and encourages the pursuit of excellence in the practice of clinical neuropsychology and the organization’s primary objective is the establishment of professional standards of expertise for the practice of clinical neuropsychology.

Membership Requirements
- Doctoral degree in psychology;
- Minimum of five years of professional experience in neuropsychology;
- Current licensure/certification to practice psychology in a state/province/territory;
- Minimum of 500 hours per year during the last five years providing neuropsychological services; and
- Involvement in approved formal continuing education in neuropsychology.

Background
ABPN was created by a group of clinical neuropsychologists in response to the growing need to formally assess competency in the practice of clinical neuropsychology for protection of the public regarding this young and expanding field. No other certification process existed at state or national levels at that time.

The original board members consisted of 21 practicing clinical neuropsychologists, each of whom already held the status of Diplomate from the American Board of Professional Psychology (ABPP) in preexisting fields such as Clinical Psychology, Counseling Psychology, or School Psychology, and had achieved national eminence through research and practice in the area of clinical neuropsychology.

Between 1982 and 1985, the ABPN evaluated competency through a review of academic and professional practice information and work samples submitted by an applicant and reviewed by at least three members of the board.

After a period of inactivity, ABPN was reorganized in 1991 and new by-laws were established. Since that time, the status for membership in ABPN is the Diplomate status obtained through examination. All prior Diplomate members of ABPN were offered the opportunity to undergo the newly established oral examination component of the revised ABPN Diplomate evaluation process.

Recognition by ABPN, through granting board certification and the Diplomate status in Neuropsychology, signifies to the public and to other health professionals a high level of competency in applied neuropsychology. The ABPN does not subscribe to any specific theoretical framework. While recognizing the importance and contribution of a graduate education in neuropsychology and subsequent specialty training, the ABPN believes that the critical element in the practice of professional neuropsychology is the application of that training to client issues and needs.

Contact:
Michael J. Raymond, PhD
Executive Director, ABPN
Director, Neuropsychological/Cognitive Services, Allied Services
John Heinz Institute of Rehabilitation Medicine
150 Mundy St.
PO Box 2096
Wilkes-Barre Township, PA 18702
Tel: 717-826-3800
Fax: 717-826-3898