Science (and Humor) Thrive at EPA

By Eleanor Siegel

Scientific research data were reported with considerable precision and occasional humor at the Eastern Psychological Association's 61st annual meeting this March. More than 2000 psychologists spent three days in Philadelphia, meeting colleagues, hearing research presentations, watching awards ceremonies, sitting in on symposia, and reading and discussing any one of 278 posters. The conference acquired a humorous note when EPA historian, Ludy Benjamin (Texas A & M University), delivered his farewell address to a jam-packed audience.

Selecting which ones of the 269 conference presentations to attend was difficult. Among the abundance of research reports were talks by A. Charles Catania, Doris Aaronson, Nancy Cantor, Philip Johnson-Laird, Mortimer Mishkin and Randolph Blake.

Catania (University of Maryland, Baltimore County) addressed The Significance of Nonhuman Research and the Analysis of Human Behavior. His speech incorporated a new development. "I am pleased to report that after closure of more than three years, this past week I began running pigeons in my lab again. My talk is a celebration."

Catania's lab closed in January '87 to get in line with animal housing guidelines, and was then slated to reopen within eight months. Obviously delighted he is "back in business again," Catania said he will not abandon human research.

In his speech, Catania stressed the need for animal studies, and warned: "Besides the other freedoms we value, we should be careful we don't lose sight of the freedom of inquiry, the freedom to pursue and ask questions that will be relevant to the future of life on this planet."

The costs of remodelling animal laboratories are changing psychology departments. "We must recognize that animal research is in a precarious situation in psychology because of the substantial costs." Experiments today, on non-humans are becoming so rare, said Catania, that in his department now, "about the only way students get exposed to non human behavior research is through lectures or by helping a faculty member with his lab activities."

"Human experimental psychology is becoming more and more a course in statistics methods and designs without subject matter content; one loss is the animal behavior component."

At times the animal welfare guidelines, said Catania, produce "strange results." Catania recounted the story of a college whose professors researching snakes' behavior (Continued on page 3)
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The APS 10K

James L. McGaugh

Most of us no doubt know the song, "Give me some “people” who are stout-hearted “people”, who will fight for the rights... etc., and I’ll soon give you ten thousand more..." That might well have been the proper campaign song for the group of pioneers who created the Assembly for Scientific and Applied Psychologists (ASAP) and who subsequently founded the American Psychological Society. Five thousand was the approximate APS membership at the time of our first convention in Alexandria, Virginia. The song might also have been sung at that convention, for now, just one year later, APS membership is approximately ten thousand!

This is a remarkable achievement for an organization that is less than two years old. But, other accomplishments of APS in this brief period are no less remarkable. The APS office in Washington, DC, which was established only a few months ago now publishes the Observer, performs all responsibilities formerly handled by the Logistics Office, and has made its presence known in Washington. APS has sponsored the second Summit Meeting and has begun to plan the third APS Convention. Committees of the APS (which are few in number and small in size) have worked effectively to deal with important matters such as publications, membership, graduate education insurance and scientific honors. And, several issues of our journal, Psychological Science, have now been published. All of these activities have been stimulated by the work of a dedicated and enthusiastic (but, again, small) APS Board.

My guess is that many psychological scientists have been watching the development of APS to see whether it is “for real.” Well, APS is clearly “for real.” APS is not only viable, it is now a major scientific organization. Our rapid growth and our many achievements give us every reason to expect that “...we’ll soon have ten thousand more!”

The Observer is Moving Again

The APS Observer is moving again, this time to its permanent home at APS Headquarters in Washington. Beginning with the July issue K. Lee Herring will be editing the Observer. Lee can be reached at 1511 K Street, N.W., Suite 345, Washington, DC 20005, (202) 783-2083.
kept live mice to feed the snakes. New legal guidelines specified the college could not house two different species in an area where they share the same air supply. The department built a separate air control room for the mice. Now the two species shared the same air supply just briefly before the snakes were fed.

Newly legislated demands mean universities face new choices and new questions, particularly when faculty members move, noted Catania. Should the university close an expensive animal facility and open one less financially straining to the department? Catania asked whether the computer is the best model for studying human behavior, "or should we look at human behavior in the Darwinian view of species, and consider the continuity between other kinds of organisms and behavior of humans."
The Darwinian view "is controversial in psychology even though the Darwinian view dominates contemporary biology," said Catania.

He closed on an optimistic note. "For those who sometimes worry about the status of animal and nonhuman research in psychology, let me remind you that Darwinian thinking went through an eclipse in the 1890s, and he too had trouble. But we in psychology who see continuity between other kinds of organisms and behavior of humans."

During the question and answer session, EPA president Doris Aaronson (New York University) asked Catania about differences in their vocabularies. "Why do you say reinforcement and I talk about feedback?" Catania said "reinforcement may not be as useful a term as it was at one time." He noted that some vocabulary differences appear because "isolated groups speak their own vocabulary."

"If we sit down together, we can get past vocabulary differences. My taxonomy is probably different from the one you come to a problem with; we need an acceptable notion that crosses the range and is reasonable."

Aaronson evidenced a deeper interest in words when she presented her research on Cognitive Linguistic and Developmental Factors in Reading.

"Some recent theories of linguistic competency focus only on the psychological correlates of linguistic attributes during reading. Often the literature reveals "conflicting results," perhaps because people code the linguistic attributes of the text differently depending upon cognitive task demands."

The general course of reading appears determined by cognitive strategies, said Aaronson, which are controlled by the subject, are learned, and possess a degree of flexibility. Three factors which determine how people encode verbal information during reading, she said, are: The linguistic properties of the text, the individual reader's ability, and the cognitive demands of the reading task. "A reader's memory span, vocabulary size and reasoning ability, thus, may interact with the cognitive demands of the reading task."

To study the possibility of interactions, Aaronson designed an experimental procedure to accommodate varying both the linguistic text attributes and the cognitive reading task demands. She sought to develop a reliable procedure to examine individual differences in reading patterns, even for particular sentences or specific subjects. Ultimately the design included a word-by-word reading procedure through which researchers asked subjects, both adults and fifth graders, 9 to 11 year old children, to view sentences, which were displayed on a computer screen one word at a time.

The subjects worked at self-paced, silent reading tasks, and they began trials by pressing a key, which signaled the computer to extinguish the preceding word, record the reading time, and display the next word in the center of the screen. Generally Aaronson used two types of tasks, each run with independent subject groups: The Immediate Recall task required either spoken or written recall of the sentence material; the Comprehension tasks required answers to true-false, or yes-no questions. The stimuli in the session were 80-100 sentences.

"We varied linguistic attributes such as number of words in a sentence, the number of major linguistic constituents, the grammatical categories of particular target words, their serial positions throughout the sentence, and the number of syntactic and semantic attributes."

In her research, Aaronson said adults provided evidence for her theory that "reading is not determined by linguistic structure, but by cognitive strategies determined by task demands." While children approximate adults strategies, they are neither as reliable, nor have they mastered the link between reading, and the cognitive demands of the reading task. With maturity, Aaronson said, children learn to discriminate among the task goals, and to differentiate their reading strategies accordingly.

While Aaronson looked at words and how people encode verbal infor-

(Continued on next page)
Johnson-Laird realized that at times, information during reading, Philip N. Johnson-Laird (Cambridge University, Princeton University) examined language and people’s ability to reason. Johnson-Laird introduced his talk on reasoning by rule or by model with an anecdote. “Several years ago, I was sitting on the tube train on Baker Street (London) and before the doors closed, a man ran on and asked me: Does this train go to Ickenham?” Johnson-Laird had examined the map and saw Ickenham roughly two stops before his own stop, Uxbridge. “I knew the train went to Uxbridge, and I acquired the information that if this train goes to Uxbridge, it goes to Ickenham, and so I replied yes.” But just as the doors clamped shut, Johnson-Laird realized that at times, some trains pass certain stops. “I comforted myself with following deduction: The guy asked me whether the train went there, he didn’t ask me if it stopped there.”

Bringing his audience right into his topic, Johnson-Laird continued: “The question: How did I make that particular deduction?” One answer, widely accepted in psychology, is that Johnson-Laird based his deduction on “old rules of inference.” But Johnson-Laird said that in his work, he found a large effect of “content on how people reason.”

His skepticism of the formal rule theory led him to an alternative theory, which he described to EPA members. Instead of formal rules, people base their reasoning on a knowledge of world, and a knowledge of the meaning of language in order to imagine the state of affairs that the premise describes, he said.

“One main assumption of this theory is that the more different states of affairs, the more different mental models we have to hold in mind, and the harder the task.” To test that theory, Johnson-Laird ran an experiment designed with a colleague. “The results: Where people had just one model, 70 percent reach the correct conclusion; where people had multiple models, 46 percent reached the correct conclusion.”

Johnson-Laird argues that when people reason deductively, they don’t follow formal rules, but they imagine the state of affairs, and if they cannot reach a concrete conclusion, they search for counter examples.

Reaching beyond deductive inference, Johnson-Laird concluded that: “1. The greater the number of explicit models that subjects tend to construct, the harder the inferential task will be for them; 2. Upon examining systematically wrong conclusions, one sees they consist of conclusions that correspond to a subset of possible models.” That last point, noted Johnson-Laird, is “particularly important because it is really difficult to see how you can make that prediction in face of rule theories.”

Just as Laird was skeptical of the “old rules,” Nancy E. Cantor (University of Michigan) expressed skepticism about the negative effects of conflict. While the negative effect literature grows, Cantor suggested life task data points to conflict as a natural part of motivational life, and what working on tasks is all about.

Cantor’s invited address offered aspects of life task analysis from her studies of how women at different ages pursue intimacy and close relationships, among their other task pursuits. She conducted one study among 50 sorority women at the University of Michigan. In terms of conflict, Cantor said that data suggests “task conflict has some positive correlates if you feel that you are actively working on the task.” People who lack an avenue for working on a central task may find task conflict a debilitating influence, said Cantor. “Task conflict can also create new issues of task balancing,” which require attention and adjustment.

To impose a longitudinal component onto the college students’ study, Cantor turned to secondary data analyses drawn from Abby Stewart’s study on women 15 and 22 years after college graduation. Steward asked 55 women; If you could do anything you wish in the next 10 years, what would you do?

The data reflected shifting life tasks. Searching for a precipitant of a shifting task focus over time, Cantor hypothesized people vary their tasks in order to commit attention to aspects of their lives, which most need rejuvenation. “Whatever life task an individual focuses on at a particular time, involves a price, and the individual tries to redress that imbalance at some point.”

Researchers studying the daily life experience, Cantor said, find life tasks a useful unit of analysis, partly because the data support the assumption that setting life tasks “mirrors in some sensitive ways the changing life contexts from which multiple motivations emerge.”

Most of the addresses at the conference were straightforward speeches, but Randolph Blake, chair of the psychology department at Vanderbilt University, engaged his audience with a combination of enthusiasm, slides, and even red and green cardboard stereo eyeglasses to illustrate his experiments in binocular perception. Blake spoke about the psycho-anatomy of human vision. He described the processing stages during vision. This kind of research, is not an invasive procedure, but is a set of strategies involving perceptual techniques to learn about the processing of visual information.

Blake explained that in vision, “we can accurately specify stimulus, we
can describe the physics of vision, or motion vectors or conscious percepts that are somehow related, but what interests me and others in the visual neuroscience area, are the intervening processes. How can you examine these intervening processes without cutting into the nervous system and manipulating it?” Blake does this by using perceptual phenomenon, psychophysical techniques, and inferential strategies. Using these techniques in the lab, he learns about the sequence of processing the events underlying visual perception.

Such experiments may prove potentially “useful to the neurophysiologist who wants to measure the actual brain activity directly responsible for complex motion, for example,” said Blake. The work gives the neurophysiologist a guide for where to look in the processing stream, and his “psychophysical map can overlay the neuroanatomical chart that neuroanatomists are developing.”

During the conference, EPA members benefitted from research reports about varying studies including some areas in which the speaker has stalked the question for decades.

One such scientist is Mortimer Mishkin, who has spent decades tracking answers to the question of how the primate brain works in memory. Mishkin, the Chief of the Laboratory of Neuropsychology at the National Institute of Mental Health, spoke about the anatomy of memory, specifically about two kinds of memory: explicit and implicit. Explicit memory or the processes of recognition and recall “may depend on the interaction between the cortex and the limbic system.” Mishkin says the type of memory he calls “habit formation, or implicit memory,” appears to depend upon the interaction between the cortex and basal ganglia.

The research is yielding data with evidence for the hypothesis that “there may be two very different neurosystems underlying two different kinds of memory formation,” said Mishkin.

While the conference ran smoothly, some glitches occurred. In one instance a speaker did not appear. The moderator, Michael Palij (New York University) covered smoothly. “If he isn’t here in five minutes,” Palij told the audience, “I will tell you what I think he was going to speak about.” Five minutes passed, and the well-prepared Palij tendered a succinct summary on the research.

Personal comments marked the awards presentations to Doris Aaron-son for her term of office as EPA president this year; to Murray Benimoff (Glassboro State College) for 20 years of service to the regional association, and to Ludy Benjamin for a nine-year stint as EPA historian.

Benjamin struck a light note when he poked fun at the psychologists, and they loved it. Benjamin’s satiric speech commemorated the centennial of the 1400-page Principles of Psychology textbook by William James. Professors, according to Benjamin’s witty explanation, rebuked James for such a lengthy text, which they said cost too much ($3.75 for two volumes) — and worse — did not include “prepared test items, a comprehensible graphics program, an ancillary package, or stereoscopic slides.”

The conference ended with EPA members reiterating a commitment to build a critical mass of members within the next three years, to modify membership requirements so that other organizations can join, and to approve affiliation with Federation. The newly elected EPA president for 1991 is Linda Bartoshuk (John B. Pierce Foundation).
Psi Chi Members
Find Regionals a Learning Experience

By Eleanor Siegel

Jody Skale, a student at Trenton State College, seemed quite at home presenting a paper before her peers, all members of Psi Chi who attended the Eastern Psychological Association’s conference in March. Skale’s explained her research, which explored whether In TV Commercials, Are Male Narrators Really More Effective?

The product Skale used was a “new” brand of soup, and the manipulated variable was the narrator’s gender. The results in Skale’s study contradict Madison Avenue’s view that men are more effective as narrators. Men, said Skale, were equally persuaded by both female and male narrators while women perceived women as more convincing. In the future, other experiments, agreed Skale, could include other products, and different voices.

The questions arising from the audience were helpful — and sympathetic, especially since many were presenting papers for the first time at EPA.

Leslie Ten Broeck, from Moravian College, Pennsylvania where she is studying psychology at the undergraduate level, said EPA was the first psychology conference she had ever attended. Ten Broeck presented a paper entitled: Auditory Discrimination in Pigeons. “I was a little overwhelmed,” she admitted, adding she enjoyed the presentation and found it good practice for her upcoming research exams. “Everyone was helpful. A lot of information was presented, and the moderator helped put everyone at ease.”

Another presenter was Molly Weber, also from Moravian College where she studies psychology at the undergraduate level, with a double major in psychology and graphic advertising design. Weber’s paper was entitled: The Use of the Just World Hypothesis When Making Attributions about AIDS Victims. “I really enjoyed having the chance to talk about the subject that I am so interested in with other people. I found the audience friendly, interested and they asked relevant questions. It was great practice for the finals at the end of the year, and for me personally a help to speak in front of the group, something I will have to do for many years probably.”

Murray Benimoff, EPA executive officer, said that people are attached to the regionals because for many this is the first time they speak publicly. “They launch their professional life in the regionals,” says Benimoff, “and they never forget the experience. They recall the instance in detail.” To substantiate his remarks, Benimoff recounted his own first experience presenting a paper at a regional conference. “I was so nervous, I breathed heavily into the mike, and the audience was laughing. I didn’t realize what was so funny until later.” But like all such incidents that occur at the beginning, the experience became a favorite story to recount. Despite the anxiety provoked in the first speaking experience, Benimoff says, “the event causes an emotional bonding with the regional, and these conferences take on a more personal meaning.”

The students also learn that regionals are important, said Benimoff. “Presentations are diligently serious and scientific. Science and the pursuit of science is the order of the day.”
After Six Months We Knew APS Would Be Viable, Logan Wright Says in Phasing Out Temporary HQ

by Don Kent

OBSERVER STAFF

NORMAN, OKLAHOMA — Now Logan Wright can take back his 320-acre ranch. APS’s start-up office here will close at the end of May. In fact, most of its operations shifted to the APS downtown Washington headquarters over the past year.

As the last part of the move takes place, bedrooms here that served as offices, and bathtubs that held society records can be restored to their original functions.

Looking back to APS’s beginnings in August 1988, Logan said:

“It was hard to get started. You had to move one person at a time. It was a nickel and dime process. There were no large blocks of members. We had to go one member at a time from zero members to the number that was sufficient for a viable organization.”

“We’re beyond the point of any question about our viability now, nearing 10,000 members. But at that time there was not only no way to sign up blocks of members, there were no resources.”

Like Leaving Home

“Leaving APA was like leaving your childhood home and not being able to take your furniture with you… So without publications, money or staff we started with zero resources and zero capital, and at $75 a member we had to raise as much money as we could and contact people to recruit more members.”

APS Executive Director Alan Kraut credits Wright with a key role in developing APS in less than two years’ time into the strong organization it is today.

Kraut said, “Early on there was a lot of energy, a lot of emotion in support of APS. There were many academics and capable psychologists behind it. But there were not many who knew how to take an organization and make it grow. I think that without Logan’s organizational skills and strategic skills we could never be at the level we’re at today.”

Networking Was Key

How did it happen? What was the process?

Logan says the key to it all was a liaison contact system or, in short, networking.

“One at a time we got one person in each of the major departments of psychology around the United States and Canada and several other countries to agree to be a contact person. We have more than 700 of them.”

“They agreed to receive materials and distribute them to colleagues.”

“It was a rather steady gradient. After the first few weeks we started enlisting about a hundred members a week. By the end of 1988 we had enough members to have elections and a summit meeting in January 1989, and a really substantial convention in June. By that time we were able to offer a contract to Alan Kraut to be executive director.”

“Some time after the first six to nine months we were certain we were viable,” Wright said.

When Kraut came on board his Washington office took over everything except membership recruitment. Wright continued that and maintained the liaison system to keep them on track while Kraut was getting new products and operations under way.

“And now that they’re at a point where things in Washington are on an even keel, we’re phasing out here in Norman completely,” Wright said.

First Things First

What difference does Wright see now that APS is on the scene?

“APS assures that there will be an organization that has the traditional values of psychology at the top of its priority list, rather than somewhere down the line,” Wright said.

“It’s a kind of science/public interest insurance policy. It assures first rate lobbying and advocacy in the capital under Alan’s administration.”

“And it assures journals that will have scientific integrity.”

“There’s a need for an organization that puts a close tie to science and the public interest above everything else, and APS assures that.”

“I don’t think APS will ever be the largest or most powerful organization representing psychology. But I think it will continue to attract the cream of the scientific crop of psychology.”

In 100 Years

As for now, Wright said, “I consider it an honor to have been involved at this particular point and zeitgeist at which APS came into being — to observe it, participate in it, and more than anything else to have been able to associate with the people who were the start-up group of APS. They are the finest group of psychologists that I’ve ever been associated with. I look forward to additional years of association with them.”

As to future growth, Wright believes APS should be able to maintain its present rate of adding about 100 new members per week well into the future.

“Let’s see,” he said, “in a hundred years that will be…”
NAS sees stable labor market for behavioral scientists

By Don Kent

WASHINGTON — Job openings for new nonclinical psychologists are expected to be on a one-to-one basis in the 1990's — one job opening per new nonclinical psychology Ph.D. — the Congressionally-mandated Biomedical and Behavioral Research Personnel (BBRP) report states.

The labor market for nonclinical psychologists moved from "excess supply in the 1970's to approximate balance in the 1980's (and) this balance is projected to continue into the 1990's," the BBRP report said. Based on such projections, the report makes recommendations for the numbers of trainees that should be funded by the National Institutes of Health and the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration over the next five years.

But in making job market projections and recommendations for the numbers of trainees, the committee of the National Academy of Sciences pointed to a lack of clear data about the educational paths of behavioral scientists. It noted "leakages" of possibly up to 60 percent of students in the academic pipeline and little follow up to see how many eventually go into research.

To fill the information gap the committee recommended the NIH support broad new research into recruitment and retention throughout the academic pipeline for behavioral scientists, with particular attention to women and minorities. It also recommended extensive surveys of former trainees to determine their career outcomes and to evaluate their training.

The report foresees a "fairly stable" labor market for behavioral scientists through 1995 and recommends that National Research Service Award training positions for behavioral scientists be maintained at current levels of 920 full-time positions per year through 1995. Five hundred positions would be predoctoral and 420 postdoctoral under this recommendation.

There is potential for behavioral science demand growth to exceed the supply of new Ph.D.s in the post-1995 period, the report said, particularly if the number of degrees awarded continues to fall.

"There is a potential there for things to change," says Joe G. Baker of NAS/NRC who staffed the project, "and what the author's feel is that..."

"There are huge things that we don't know about the pipeline into psychology..."

when the next study comes along in two years it can take another look at the problem."

The current report notes the increasing importance of behaviorally-based health problems such as AIDS, drug and alcohol addiction, tobacco and cancer. It said that for this reason it is important to the nation's health that NIH/ADMHA continue to support behavioral science research and research training.

Meanwhile, the report does recommend increases, however, in biomedical sciences — from 8200 in 1990 to 9400 in 1995.

Congress mandates the studies under the National Research Service Award Act of 1974. The Act was passed at a time when the Nixon Administration was threatening to eliminate predoctoral training grants in the behavioral sciences, claiming that a surplus of Ph.D.s already existed in these fields.

Thereafter, the number of NSRA training positions in the behavioral sciences varied from 692 in 1978 to a low of 484 in 1981 and high of 1122 in 1982, to its present level in the 900's from 1985 onwards.

More significant than the numbers and projections, however, are the proposals for research that the committee has urged NIH to implement, according to the study's staff director, Robert McGinnis, professor of sociology at Cornell specializing in the demography of science. He has been involved in almost all previous NSRA studies.

"There are huge things that we don't know about the pipeline into psychology," McGinnis said. "There appear to be great inefficiencies at several points in the pipeline, particularly at graduate school. We absolutely lack clear numbers that can give us accurate figures of losses of students. Using the figures we have, it appears to us that losses in each cohort of entering graduate students of psychology is about 60 percent. Now that's a tremendous leakage."

"We are proposing that this research be picked up under the sponsorship of NIH. And my own view is that it probably should be done within the National Research Council."

"Suppose the leakage is what it seems — that we are losing 60 percent of the students," McGinnis said. "That would raise real questions about causes — is it inefficiencies in admissions, or in the education? Either way could lead to important changes in academic policies in psychology. It could also lead to the recruitment and production of Ph.D.s with higher research capabilities."

"That was a very close concern of the committee, with a special concern for taking a careful look at the losses..."
New but Familiar Faces:  
APS Fills Communications, Government Affairs Positions  
by Don Kent  
OBSERVER STAFF

WASHINGTON — Many members already know APS's new Director of Government Affairs and Director of Communications. They bring APS a wide range of experience and relationships in psychology and government policy fields.

Sarah Brookhart — the former Sarah Duffy — comes to the Government Affairs position after heading up a U.S. Congressmen's Washington office and a tour in Richmond as policy and budget manager with a Virginia State government agency. Earlier she was with the Association for the Advancement of Psychology and APA's science program through 1984, while getting her Master's in public administration from George Washington University.

“She's got a terrific background,” Executive Director Alan Kraut said of Brookhart. “We're going to make excellent use of her.”

Animal Research

Kraut said his first memories of Brookhart date back to 1981 when they spent a long weekend writing the first piece of congressional testimony in support of animal research that APA ever presented.

“It was just after the Silver Spring monkey break-in,” Kraut said. “We got a call on Friday afternoon saying we would be allowed to present testimony on Tuesday morning. Before that we had been pressing for psychology to present its case and had been consistently given a flat no. Finally, that Friday they said yes, and it meant putting our case together and presenting it in less than 72 hours. That testimony became the basis for APA's animal research position over the next nine years and continues to be our position here at APS.”

“My other memory is that it was really at Sarah's initiative that organized psychology began the effort aimed at getting NIH to focus more on health and behavior,” Kraut said. “It was in the reauthorization of the National Institutes of Health in 1982 that we first successfully got some permissive language that would allow behavioral and social scientists to sit on the advisory boards of NIH. Three years later when NIH was authorized again, we went back to Congress to tell them their permissive language didn't work — that even though they gave permission, NIH wasn't appointing any behavioral scientists. So Congress agreed with us and then made it mandatory.” Kraut said.

Observer Editor

Lee Herring becomes Director of Communications and editor of the Observer with the next issue. He has been editor of Science Agenda, a quarterly publication of the APA Science Directorate, and a Scientific/Legislative Affairs officer there since 1987. Earlier, he was an editor with PsycINFO and writer/researcher with two Washington science and technology research firms. He majored in psychology at Tulane, and did graduate studies in experimental psychology at the University of Georgia,

(continued on next page)
Familiar Faces
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and is a member of Phi Beta Kappa.

"Lee is a perfect match for what we need at APS," Kraut said. "His background is in scientific psychology, he has over a decade in writing and journalism, and he is an expert in the technology of communications and putting out publications. Most of all, I know his values are the values of APS."

A third new staff member is Pamela Ramey-McCray, administrative assistant, who has worked for Risk Science International, an environmental firm, and two Washington law firms. She works on databases for the convention and Psychological Science subscriptions and many other tasks.

Insider's Viewpoint

Brookhart says she brings APS an insider's point of view from her six years outside psychology, first with Congressman Peter Visclosky and later as a manager with the Virginia Water Control Board and with the Maryland Independent College and University Association.

"Since I've been in government and policy related positions, now I have an even clearer sense of how the process works. I can bring a new level of understanding to APS's advocacy efforts."

"I really hope that by establishing a better link between APS members and the people who make federal research funding policies that we're going to be able to assure a stable, long-term funding scenario."

Funding Agenda

"Part of the problem is that behavioral and social science researchers are working under a de facto agenda rather than a comprehensive plan by the federal agencies. That's one reason why we are trying to get more behavioral and psychological scientists in advisory positions, to get them to exert their influence."

"Our job is, number one, to make sure that there's a good level of funding for the agencies APS members rely on for grants, and then within those agencies to make sure our interests are well represented, that funds are distributed equitably and in proportion to the problems being addressed," Brookhart said.

"I've worked in the federal government, in the legislative branch and in state government, and I find I can have as much, if not more, influence working in a private association such as this."

Info Hub

Lee Herring's primary responsibility at the start is to take over the reins of the APS Observer from Virginia O'Leary, who is going to Indiana State University as chair of the psychology department.

"We want to make the Observer a hub for information from and about APS members and their work — that's one of my main objectives as editor."

He says he is "totally open to ideas, and wants to be sure to have news-type coverage of very basic work that is going on but doesn't necessarily have an obvious 'right-now' application, and also pieces on research areas that are particularly relevant to some major national issues such as drug abuse prevention, use of robotics, and all sorts of state-of-the-art applications and research. I'll be relying very much on members to call and send their information."

Money-Maker

Besides becoming a hub for members, the Observer is already a significant money-maker through advertising. Herring plans to push advertising assertively, to bolster APS's financial foundation.

"The ads are flowing in more easily as APS is seen as a respectable and prestigious highly focused audience of scientists — a real asset in attracting advertisers who want to reach academics and researchers in scientific psychology."

Herring sees ad revenues eventually providing from a quarter to a third of APS's operating funds.

He will be streamlining the production of the publication as well, through in-house desktop publishing equipment and software.

SCI Info

Much of Herring's new job relates to his career-long interest in modern modes of scientific communication.

Looking beyond his editorial responsibilities, he says, "I think it's imperative for APS to be an innovator in the area of scientific communication. We've got the expertise among our members in terms of knowledge of artificial intelligence and computer hardware and software. It's not enough anymore simply to make scientific information available on electronic databases."

"Researchers want to be able to screen the signal from the noise more efficiently than current systems allow. They have very discrete interests and want to be able to find the kinds of research they're interested in themselves."

"When fiber optics becomes common and you have more information pouring into your lab or home than the Library of Congress ever had in its history, what good does that do if you can't find some way to put a cap on the end of it and filter out information on your particular interests?"

"I think there is interest within the APS to work toward enhancing scientific information."
A Conversation with Claude Steele

By Don Kent

Claude Steele is professor of psychology at the University of Michigan. He was born in Chicago and did his undergraduate work at Hiram College. He got his Ph.D. in social psychology from Ohio State, then taught at the University of Utah for two years before moving to the University of Washington, where he taught for 14 years. Some of his most recent work has focused on academic underperformance among black and Hispanic students. He says it derives from earlier work on self-evaluation and self-affirmation processes. Psychologists studying identical twins may already know that he is one; his brother Shelby writes and produces television documentaries on minority topics.

Q: It's hard to think clearly about alcohol. How can anyone explain why alcohol sometimes provokes destructive behavior yet at other times it seems to make people more sociable or altruistic? Can psychological research help us understand the different roles alcohol plays in our lives?

A: I think so. There has been considerable research on the "socially significant effects" of alcohol, that is, its effects on social behaviors and affective states like anxiety and depression.

Q: For example?

A: Well, with regard to social behavior, some general statistics are worth noting first. Sixty-five percent of murders, 88 percent of knifeings, 65 percent of spouse beatings, and 55 percent of physical child abuse involve intoxicated participants.

Alcohol abuse is the most costly health problem in the United States today, both because of these destructive effects that come from drunken excess and because people get addicted to it. When you add the money it costs to deal with drunken excess (e.g., treating the victims of drunken driving and aggression) to the money it costs to treat alcohol addiction and related lost production, the ticket comes to some $117 billion a year.

Q: Quite a bundle of money...

A: The challenge in explaining alcohol's socially significant effects has been to account for the fact that it has such a vast variety of effects, and that it has any of these effects only irregularly.

Q: So we see...

A: Sometimes it makes people aggressive and sometimes it makes them friendly, sometimes it makes people helpful, sometimes it makes people take more risks, sometimes it lowers their anxiety and depression and sometimes it increases these reactions. It has a vast variety of effects. And, it has any of the effects only irregularly.

Q: Hard to sort out? Do the irregular effects fit any pattern? Are they explainable to any degree?

A: That's where the field is right now — trying to find out what is the story behind this variety and irregularity, what explains it.

First off, I think that the irregularity itself rules out certain commonly held types of explanations, for example, that alcohol pushes a special kind of button for each of these behaviors. If it pushed a special button for aggression, let us say, then every time people drank they should be more aggressive.

Q: But that's not the case.

A: Right. So that rules out that simple possibility. And it tends to shove people in the direction of a second explanation, that alcohol pushes a special button in some people, that there are special reactivities to alcohol for aggression, for example, that explain these effects. This explanation, though, has a difficult time explaining the irregularity of alcohol's effects on all people. The same person who got drunk on a certain occasion and committed a very violent crime may have gotten drunk every night in the week before that crime and done nothing.

Q: So now is the puzzle getting solved?

A: I couldn't claim that the field has resolved the whole puzzle or told the whole story of alcohol. That's certainly not the case. But there has been a considerable amount of research by behavioral scientists and I think it's fair to say that the accumulation has begun to produce some insights.

Q: What have you and your immediate colleagues done yourselves?

A: We have worked with the idea that a lot of these effects have come from alcohol's impairment of perception and thought, in particular its ability to produce what we call alcohol myopia.

Q: What do you mean by that term?

A: We mean that when people are intoxicated the range of their perception is reduced, their ability to engage in inferential thought is reduced, their time perspective is (continued on next page)
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Q: What kinds of things do you do
A: We get people to a state where we
recognize that there could be
terrible consequences — my
antagonist might hit me back, and
he's bigger than me, and so forth.
So I wouldn't do anything. Our
argument is that if I am intoxicated
in this conflictual situation, alcohol
myopia leaves me so that I can
understand and process the
immediate provoking cues — the
antagonism — but less able to
access the more remote inhibiting
cues. As a result, I become aggressive,
not because alcohol has
directly caused aggression —
pushed my aggression button —
but because it preempted the kind
of response conflict that would
have inhibited aggression.
Q: You don't see the consequences?
A: That's right.

Q: That lasts how long?
A: Four hours at least.

Q: What kinds of things do you do
when they're in that state?
A: Our research goes in two
directions. One looks at alcohol's
effects on social behavior — what it
does to cause drunken excess, for
example, or make people more
aggressive or more friendly. The
other branch of the research looks
at its effects on anxiety and
negative affective states. Most of
this last research I have done in
 collaboration with Robert Josephs.

Q: What about social behavior?
A: With regard to the phenomenon of
drunken excess our notion is pretty
simple: the myopia that alcohol
causes is likely to lead to excessive
behavior when, if I were sober, the
behavior would be conflictual —
conflictual in the sense that
immediate cues provoke the
behavior while somewhat more
remote cues inhibit it.

For example, if I were sober and
someone antagonized me, I might
really want to hit him. But I would

Q: How many drinks would that be?
A: Four or four and a half one-ounce
drinks in about an hour and a half.

Q: Are you looking at people who are
drunk, or some who may have had
just one or two drinks?
A: We get people to a state where we
know they've got a good case of
alcohol myopia, a blood level of
about .08.

Q: How many drinks would that be?
A: For me — I weigh about 180
pounds — that would be about
four or four and a half one-ounce
drinks in about an hour and a half.

Q: That lasts how long?
A: Four hours at least.

Q: What kinds of things do you do
when they're in that state?
A: Our research goes in two
directions. One looks at alcohol's
effects on social behavior — what it
does to cause drunken excess, for
example, or make people more
aggressive or more friendly. The
other branch of the research looks
at its effects on anxiety and
negative affective states. Most of
this last research I have done in
 collaboration with Robert Josephs.

Q: What about social behavior?
A: With regard to the phenomenon of
drunken excess our notion is pretty
simple: the myopia that alcohol
causes is likely to lead to excessive
behavior when, if I were sober, the
behavior would be conflictual —
conflictual in the sense that
immediate cues provoke the
behavior while somewhat more
remote cues inhibit it.

For example, if I were sober and
someone antagonized me, I might
really want to hit him. But I would

remoter cues — he may be less
successful at holding back.

Q: Your research has always used
external cues?
A: It's been external cues in the work
that we and other people in the
field have been doing. But it would
be intriguing to do this with
internal cues.

Q: So the point your research brings...
A: For one thing, it helps to explain
why alcohol sometimes makes a
response more extreme and
sometimes doesn't. It makes the
response more extreme by
diminishin the inhibiting side of a
response conflict. Outside of this
effect, alcohol seems to have no
power to make social behaviors
more extreme, no power to cause
drunken excess.

Q: No effect on behavior?
A: Alcohol will make someone more
aggressive if there is some cue
leading to aggression that — if the
person were sober — would be
inhibited. Outside of that kind of
conflict, alcohol is not going to
make a person more aggressive.

Q: Let's say I'm really mad at my
landlord...
A: And you meet him face to face at a
cocktail party.

Q: I'm cold sober at first, and I'd like
to tell him off.
A: His presence is the salient cue
provoking that impulse.

Q: But I hold back.
A: Because on further consideration
you realize you might embarrass
yourself or find yourself evicted.

Q: So I act civilized, until I've had
four or five drinks and then
whammo!...
A: The myopia that alcohol causes
reduces your appreciation of the
negative consequences of telling
him off. You lash into him.

Q: And next day my furniture is out
on the street.
A: Maybe. But now imagine meeting a
landlord you are not angry with, or
whose apartment you are about to
leave anyway, and you meet him at
the tail end of the party after
everyone else has left, with no one
to be embarrassed in front of. These situations would not involve an inhibition conflict — there is no salient cue provoking your anger, or else no consequences to inhibit your anger if you wanted to express it. In these situations you would behave pretty much the same way drunk or sober.

Q: You've surveyed a lot of research?
A: We looked at every test of alcohol's effect on some social behavior. We judged whether the behavior was under high or low inhibition conflict, and we found, as expected that alcohol had powerful effects under strong conflict and almost no effect under low conflict.

We also put this reasoning to experimental test by testing alcohol's effect on helping.

Q: I have a harder time visualizing the conflictual side of helping.
A: But altruism is extremely conflictual. If I see you bloodied in the street one side of me is tremendously compelled to help you. But I also realize that if I do I may get clobbered myself. That's conflict. Our point is that if I am intoxicated, and less appreciative of those inhibiting cues, I leap to your aid more readily than if I were sober. Now you may not want the help of a drunk ... I don't know about the quality of the help you'd get, but they're more likely to do it.

Q: Do you have a measure of that?
A: Yes, we set up laboratory experiments in which subjects engage in a very boring editorial task that we know they don't want to do. The subjects — half of them drunk and half of them sober — do it for a full half hour so they are good and pained by it, and at that point the experimenter pleads, "Oh, please, could you help me by doing some more?" At that moment we know they are in conflict. They would like to help the experimenter who has been very nice to them and who has just explained that her dissertation is on the line and she needs their help.

That's the immediate cue, her face right in front of theirs. "Please help." The sober subjects see her face and remember that that was the most boring thing they've ever done in their lives and don't want to do any more of it. But drunk subjects, who can't recall as well how much they disliked the task, help at two or three times the rate of sober subjects.

Q: You've published the study?
A: Yes, when it first came out people from companies would call me up and say, "Are you saying that alcohol actually helps people do boring work?"

Q: And of course you said yes.
A: Well, yes under these particular circumstances.

Q: And if instead the experimenter asks them to do something they enjoy doing?
A: There would be no conflict there — no conflicting inhibitions against doing the task — the sober subjects help the same as the drunk ones.

So in sum we have identified what we think are the primary conditions under which alcohol
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makes a response more extreme: whenever salient cues provoke a response that, if the person were sober, would be inhibited by remoter cues.

Q: You also say that alcohol lifts depressive feelings in some circumstances and that this effect can lead to alcohol addiction?
A: It can. Psychologists assume that alcohol addiction can begin by alcohol's doing something for the drinker that reinforces the drinking response and thus causes continued drinking. In time, as we use alcohol to get this effect a physiological tolerance builds up so that we need more alcohol to get the same effect and if we try to stop drinking we get uncomfortable withdrawal symptoms. That's the point at which the person is alcohol addicted. This is the behavioral paradigm of alcohol addiction.

Q: Have you found anything that undercuts that paradigm?
A: No. Most behavioral scientists work within this general paradigm — Alan Marlatt, Terry Wilson, Robert Levenson, to name a few. The $64,000 question within this paradigm is: What is it that alcohol does that's reinforcing for everybody? The first answer was that it reduces tension and anxiety. But as the field tested this idea it got confusing results. Sometimes alcohol reduced these negative states but sometimes it didn't. Sometimes it even increased them. Alcohol does not universally reduce tension.

We asked whether alcohol myopia might mediate some of this variation. Working from this idea, we proposed that alcohol might reduce the tension of psychological worry when the drinker is doing something. For example, if I am intoxicated while watching television, because of the myopia alcohol causes most of my perceptual and cognitive workspace will be taken up with the salient television show, leaving less capacity for worry and thereby reducing stress. So the two things together — the myopia that alcohol causes plus some salient activity like talking to friends or watching television or watching a ball game — will crowd out my worries and my tension goes down.

We suggest — Bob Josephs and I — that it is through this process that alcohol has its fabled tension reducing effect. People are usually doing something when they drink.

Q: But what if you remove the something they're doing, and then they're doing nothing but drinking?
A: Then the drinking can backfire. Their worries can become most salient.

"...drinking can backfire. Their worries can become most salient..."

Q: How do you conduct experiments in this area of influence on affective states?
A: The subjects drink either an alcohol or a placebo drink and when the blood alcohol level of the alcohol subjects reaches .08 the experimenter says, "In 15 minutes you have to make a speech about aspects of your body and appearance that you worry about." Then half of them engage in some activity and half of them do nothing. About eight minutes into this period of time they rate their anxiety levels. At that point we can see the effects of this upcoming stressor on those who are or are not intoxicated and those who are or are not doing something. The effects are very robust. Invariably when they are both intoxicated and doing something their anxiety goes down tremendously. You almost have to remind them that they have to give the speech. For those who have consumed alcohol but have not engaged in any activity, anxiety worsened compared to all other groups. A second round of experiments further supported the view that when the drinker is not distracted and stressful conditions are salient, alcohol increases psychological stress.

Q: How have you done anything with depression?
A: The first work we published was done with depression rather than anxiety. To induce depression subjects were given bad performance feedback on intellectual tasks. We got generally the same pattern of findings.

Q: Have you done anything with myopia paradigm?
A: It came out of the experiments and...
the literature on alcohol’s effect on thought and perception. Bob Josephs and I stewed around on how to characterize those effects, how to bring them together, and eventually came to this notion of myopia. The idea also helped bring these two lines of research together — alcohol’s effects of social behavior and on negative affective states.

Q: That began to bud at about what time?
A: Some 10 years ago. I happened to read a Nature magazine article by Geoffrey Gray in which he described alcohol’s effects on rats. The intriguing thing was that he found alcohol-impaired rats learning only in conflict paradigms. But in direct reinforcement paradigms alcohol had no effect — drunk rats learned as well as sober rats. But whenever the drunk rats had to hold back a response that they wanted to do, they were terrible at it. For example, let’s say a hungry rat is trained to run down an alley to get food, and pretty soon you start shocking it in the goalbox. This is a real conflict — the rat wants to go down the alley and eat, but he knows he’s going to get shocked there. Sober rats figure this out and stay a little bit shy of the goal area. But drunk rats plunge right ahead. They just can’t regulate conflict. They get an impulse and they’ve got to go with it. They can’t inhibit it.

That’s the experiment that got me excited, because I thought maybe that’s the same way alcohol effects human social behavior. So I remember running to the library and getting out every paper I could find on alcohol’s effects on social behavior, dividing them up into those experimental situations where there was strong conflict, versus little conflict, and tracking the size of alcohol’s effects — how much more excessive the drunk subjects were than the sober subjects. That’s where the meta-analysis began. It fit like a glove.

Q: It’s interesting to see what inspired your research.
A: I’ve been taking a lot of credit here, but actually I’ve had three very important collaborators in this work: Lillian Southwick Bensley, Barbara Critchlow Leigh, and Robert Josephs.

However, a lot of alcohol research today is looking at special reactivities of certain individuals. If you are looking for the dominant model in the broad scientific community that’s it.

Q: What’s your reaction to that?
A: My reaction is this work. There are really some quite general processes that we’ve been describing that are enough to lead anyone down the path to alcohol addiction. You can imagine a person who has some chronic anxieties or depression and begins to use alcohol in conjunction with the activity available to keep the anxiety at bay. The body naturally builds a tolerance to that toxin. The person needs to drink more to get that same effect, but the problems are still there. And pretty soon they are addicted to it. I think alcoholism can happen in this way.

And that’s a route to alcoholism that doesn’t involve specifying any particular reactivity to the drug. If there is anything particular about the person becoming addicted it’s the unresolved problems that make alcohol myopia in conjunction with activity a reinforcing experience.

Other behavioral scientists — Jay Hull, Robert Levenson, Kenneth Scher and Terry Wilson — have similar models. These are all people who as behavioral scientists take a broadened view toward the ways in which alcohol can be addictive.

I think that our work and the work of these other people starts to provide a viable alternative way of theorizing about how alcohol addiction comes to pass.

Q: How about Marlatt’s work on alcohol expectancies?
A: We were colleagues. That’s how I got into this work. I think he’s the father of this kind of approach. He certainly spawned my interest in the field and made me feel it was an important field to do research in. His work on expectancy effects is the kind of work that really appealed to social cognitive psychologists and showed them their field had a viable role in understanding alcohol and addiction.

Q: In conclusion, how about some personal advice on how to handle alcohol? People must come to you for that.
A: One useful generalization from our work and that of other behavioral scientists is that one can become susceptible to alcohol addiction not just through inherited, genetic predisposition — e.g., having an alcoholic father — but also through the general process we described, such as having a banked up set of unresolved problems and anxieties. That can be enough to make anyone drink and thus become vulnerable to alcohol addiction.

Q: Many people these days talk...
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Members of the American Psychological Society Student Caucus (APSSC) will hold a students' meeting during the June conference in Dallas to elect new officers, continue developing student chapters, and implement projects for the coming year. One priority will be organizing regional APS student conferences, to be held at the schools of chapters interested in hosting them.

In the March Student Notebook, it was announced that candidates for 1990-1991 APSSC Executive Council officers would be able to include brief platform statements to appear this month. Candidates are not limited to those who sent their platforms in time to appear here. Any of the Society’s student affiliates are welcome to run for the offices: President, Undergraduate Advocate (must be an undergraduate), Graduate Advocate (must be a graduate student), Editor, or Secretary-Treasurer. Other positions such as Historian, Mentorship Chair, and Regional Conference Chairs will be appointed by the President at the Dallas conference, subject to the Executive Council’s approval.

Students who want to be involved in APSSC activities are encouraged to attend the annual conference. Even those who cannot make it can contact any APSSC officers to discuss how they might participate. The 1989-1990 officers’ names and addresses have appeared in past editions of the Student Notebook, and the 1990-1991 officers will be announced in our next edition.

**Candidate Statements**

“I currently serve as the National Undergraduate Advocate for the Student Caucus. During my term in office I have had the pleasure of meeting and personally working with both fellow students on the APSSC Executive Council and members of the APS Board of Directors. Under my guidance since January, student chapters have been established in some two dozen colleges and universities around the country.

Over the next year, I foresee the Student Caucus establishing a significant national presence within APS, and continuing to grow as a single, representative voice for student advocacy. Our contribution, in terms of student recruitment and certainly in terms of a networking resource, is virtually unlimited in the coming months.

As students, it is our duty to take an active role within the Society; indeed, we are her future leaders.

I would appreciate your support for this office.

- **Kenn White**, Harvard University
  Candidate for Student Caucus President

“As the liaison between students and professional members of APS, I am dedicated to bringing the needs of students to the attention of the parent organization. In addition, I serve as recruiter for APS, not merely of student members, but of active interest and participation on the part of students. My personal skills as a speaker, tutor, and instructor, and experiences as Graduate Advocate of 1988-1989 provide me with the necessary qualifications for the challenging task. I enjoy being the medium through which connections are made between current and future professionals of APS, and look forward to continuing such service for APSSC in 1990-1991.”

- **Kathleen Morgan**, University of California at Davis
  Candidate for Graduate Advocate

“During the past year, I have been involved in the formation and development of the APS Student Caucus. My contributions have included participation in composing our charter, creating the Student Notebook entry in the Observer, writing guidelines for the APS student chapters, and hosting both the fall and winter Executive Council meetings, among other things. The student caucus has become very important. As it is only a year old, I feel that I could best serve the caucus during the upcoming, extremely busy year, by continuing as Editor. Our growth will be exponential, and some stability is necessary.”

- **Travis Langley**, Tulane University
  Candidate for Editor
Steele
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What is your reaction to that?
A: The term disease is problematic. I think of alcoholism as alcohol addiction. What I mean by that is people having a tolerance for alcohol. Once one has a tolerance for alcohol then one has to drink more of it to get the same kind of effects, if one stops drinking then one undergoes withdrawal symptoms, and so on.

This relationship that one can have with the drug alcohol can arise in a variety of ways.

Q: So it's wrong to think of it solely as a disease?
A: The danger is that people see it as a switch that is either on or off. If the switch is on I may get alcoholism because I've got the genetic predisposition, or the switch is off and I can drink with impunity and never get to be an alcoholic.

That's where the danger is — that's the mistake. People can well get addicted to alcohol without having any genetic predisposition whatsoever, through the general processes that psychologists describe: you return to drinking because it's reinforcing, you then build up a tolerance, and you need more to get the same kind of reinforcing effects. If you stop, withdrawal symptoms begin, and so on... a full-blown addiction takes place.

You are chained to the substance. And that can happen through a behavioral process with alcohol as the reinforcer.

ATTENTION
Graduate Students Interested in Mental Health Services Research:

The National Institute of Mental Health has agreed to host a special breakfast on Saturday, June 9, at the APS Convention in Dallas. The meeting is being held specifically for graduate students who are either interested in or who would like to know more about mental health services research, that is, research about the organization, delivery, or financing of mental health services. Exciting developments are underway in the area, and NIMH would like graduate students to know more about them in relation to their own research and career plans.

The breakfast will be underwritten by NIMH's Division of Biometry and Applied Sciences. A representative from the Division will be present to discuss NIMH research and training opportunities. Researchers now active in the area will also be present to give brief descriptions of their work and to respond to questions. The meeting will be chaired by Lee Sechrest of the University of Arizona.

If you are interested in attending, please call the APS Central Office (202-783-2077) or Bitnet us (APS 2 @ UMUC). We will provide you with the exact time and place, and will confirm a place for you.

APSSC—The Year in Review
It has been nearly a year since the first meeting of the APS Student Caucus in Alexandria, Virginia. We've come a long way—from a loose collection of students with a common affiliation to an organization with a mission, specific goals, leadership, and representation. Eighteen student chapters have been formed, and 25 schools are currently in the process of organizing chapters.

This year APSSC projects have been established to serve students specifically (e.g., the Travel Fund) and APS as a whole (e.g., the Job Bank).

We are currently working on a Student Opportunities Bank and a Mentorship Program. Looking into the future, I see such things as APSSC sponsored regional student conferences.

APSSC offers students the opportunity to get involved in activities which will directly affect their academic development and their future career development. I urge you to get involved at any level, whether that be once a year at the convention or all year long as an APSSC officer. We are the future of psychology and should start shaping that future now.

about alcoholism as a “disease.”

What is your reaction to that?
A: The term disease is problematic. I think of alcoholism as alcohol addiction. What I mean by that is people having a tolerance for alcohol. Once one has a tolerance for alcohol then one has to drink more of it to get the same kind of effects, if one stops drinking then one undergoes withdrawal symptoms, and so on.

This relationship that one can have with the drug alcohol can arise in a variety of ways.

But when the layman speaks of alcoholism as a “disease” he or she seems to be thinking of a genetic predisposition to get addicted to alcohol.

However, it is important to recognize that there are other very general processes by which you can get addicted to alcohol that have nothing to do with a genetic predisposition for it.

Q: So it's wrong to think of it solely as a disease?
A: The danger is that people see it as a switch that is either on or off. If the switch is on I may get alcoholism because I've got the genetic predisposition, or the switch is off and I can drink with impunity and never get to be an alcoholic.

That's where the danger is — that's the mistake. People can well get addicted to alcohol without having any genetic predisposition whatsoever, through the general processes that psychologists describe: you return to drinking because it's reinforcing, you then build up a tolerance, and you need more to get the same kind of reinforcing effects. If you stop, withdrawal symptoms begin, and so on... a full-blown addiction takes place.

You are chained to the substance. And that can happen through a behavioral process with alcohol as the reinforcer.
WASHINGTON — Psychologists’ research is not being supported by federal agencies on a par with its scientific merit or its role in addressing health and social concerns, APS Executive Director Alan Kraut told the U.S. Senate in early April.

He made this statement in testimony to the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Health and Human Services concerning the fiscal year (FY) 1991 appropriations of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration (ADAMHA) and the National Institutes of Health (NIH). The Appropriations Subcommittee is where the first and often most important level of deliberations occur on the annual budgets for federal research agencies.

Kraut urged that Congress “continue to insist that ADAMHA and NIH support behavioral and social science research in a way that reflects both the role these sciences play in addressing our nation’s health objectives, and the urgency with which those objectives should be pursued.”

Kraut also testified that the research training program at the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) “has diminished to a point where young investigators will be discouraged” from embarking on careers in substance abuse or mental health research.

Research Lags Despite Increased Need

In the past, behavioral and social
science research often was regarded as ancillary to biomedical research at these agencies. This situation is changing. However, Kraut told the Senate that at ADAMHA, “many research grants programs remain narrowly focused on the biomedical aspects” of mental health and substance abuse.

“We are concerned that mental health research is being shortchanged in the proposed budget, particularly in comparison to other areas of research,” he said.

At NIH, Kraut noted, funding of behavioral and social science research has lagged well behind its medical counterparts, despite strong Congressional support in recent years for disease prevention and health promotion activities and in particular, studies concerning the interaction of health and behavior.

This is also occurring, he added, despite increased recognition by other federal health policy makers concerning the “prominent role of behavioral and social factors” in improving health status. As an example, he noted that James O. Mason, Assistant Secretary of Health and Human Services, recently reported to Congress that of the more than 200 national objectives set forth for promoting health and preventing disease, “the areas of greatest difficulty had their roots in behavioral and social issues, not just biomedical ones, including such issues as teenage pregnancy, low birthweight and illicit drug use.”

The remainder of the APS statement is summarized below.

National Institute on Mental Health (NIMH) — NIMH recently reorganized its Basic Science Division to include a greater emphasis on brain and behavioral research. APS is asking Congress to support the new Basic Brain and Behavioral Research Division by providing adequate resources to the division and by ensuring that the distribution of funds within the division is spread appropriately among the core research disciplines.

National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) — APS recommended funding of numerous important initiatives involving behavioral and social science research in understanding and preventing health and developmental problems in children. These included preventable injuries, learning disabilities, day care, behavior and biology, normative research on ethnic minority children, and child maltreatment.

National Institute on Aging — The Committee’s attention also was directed to several breakthroughs in aging, health and behavior, particularly the role of behavioral interventions in prolonging the healthy and productive lives of older people. APS’s testimony noted that as the proportion of the U.S. population age 65 and over continues to grow, normative research is needed in order to develop assessment techniques for older adults; memory research is needed to enhance the older person’s self-care and independent living abilities; social support research is needed to improve health and effective functioning; and Alzheimer’s Disease research should be expanded to include investigations of the burden of care faced by the families of Alzheimer’s.

National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute (NHLBI) — APS is asking Congress to ensure that the NHLBI accelerates its efforts in studying the effect of lifestyle changes in achieving positive health results. Given the proven connections between smoking or poor diet and health risks, NHLBI should provide Congress with a plan to expand both basic and applied research aimed at developing appropriate interventions to decrease health risks due to these and other harmful behaviors.

The National Agenda: A Separate NSF Directorate for Behavioral and Social Sciences?

Should the National Science Foundation (NSF) be structured with a Directorate for the Behavioral and Social Sciences separate from the biological sciences? At this past winter’s APS Summit Meeting of Scientific Psychological Organizations in Tucson, Arizona, representatives of 65 scientific organizations overwhelmingly agreed that such a reorganization of NSF would be useful for the advancement of science. This same question also recently received a strongly affirmative answer from an ad hoc committee of NSF’s Biological, Behavioral and Social Sciences (BBS) Advisory Panel.

Why is this becoming a major issue? Well, there has been an explosion, in the last 15 years, of important accomplishments in the behavioral and social sciences, reported the BBS ad hoc committee. But “there is the perception that ... NSF is not well positioned to respond to the most important advances in these sciences,” the ad hoc committee’s report stated. In fact, NSF’s underfunding of these disciplines threatens their infrastructure; distorts advances... away from fundamental questions and the most important discoveries; and discourages new scholars and students, said Indiana University psychologist Linda Smith, Chair of the ad hoc committee. Smith delivered the eagerly anticipated report at the March 19-20 BBS panel meeting.

The six-member ad hoc committee recommended that — in view of NSF’s mandate to fulfill a leadership role in supporting basic science, the phenomenal growth in knowledge, and the potential for additional accomplishments, in the behavioral and social sciences — NSF gave
serious consideration to housing the behavioral and social sciences within a separate NSF directorate.

The ad hoc committee had been charged to examine the proposal — raised by Carnegie Mellon University psychologist Herbert Simon, in 1989, in testimony before the House committee that oversees NSF — to create a directorate-level organizational entity within NSF that would put the behavioral and social sciences on an organizational par with physical and mathematical sciences, computer and information sciences, geosciences, engineering, and biological sciences.

In addition, the ad hoc committee was expected to examine the recommendations of the 1989 National Academy of Sciences report, the Behavioral and Social Sciences: Achievements and Opportunities, which stressed that NSF funding resources should be radically increased for the behavioral and social science disciplines in order to correct past cuts, realize the opportunities for new knowledge, and secure the research infrastructure for future generations. While the ad hoc committee agreed with the NAS report, Smith emphasized that the primary reason to provide additional support to the behavioral and social sciences is to take advantage of the fact that these disciplines are rapidly moving forward and are demonstrating particular promise in interdisciplinary areas.

In a preliminary letter sent to Smith in February, APS Executive Director Alan Kraut emphasized the importance of the NAS report recommendations as a starting point in establishing a “level playing field,” a concept that Congress seems to have taken to heart in its numerous reports on NSF. Kraut’s letter also expressed the sentiment of APS Summit participants regarding the proposal for a separate NSF directorate, which Kraut also relayed directly to the BBS Advisory Panel during its March meeting. He pointed out that behavioral science advocates are hearing positive inquiries from congressional sources regarding the merit of behavioral and social basic research (e.g., “Forget high-tech robotics, what can I tell the employers in my district about how to get their workers to show up on Fridays and Mondays?”; “How do kids learn about math and science?”).

BBS Advisory Panel members heard presentations by NSF staff on current and potential cutting-edge interdisciplinary research integrating the behavioral and social sciences with computational, computer, and cognitive sciences, and transnational and global environmental change research. National Institute of Mental Health Deputy Director, Alan Leshner, also attended the meeting and emphasized the importance of the public attention garnered for the nation’s basic science enterprise by the “Decade of the Brain” (See APS Observer, Jan. 1990) national initiative.

A quiet, but clear, message in these presentations was the extent to which behavioral and social sciences have become so strongly linked to a number of disciplines aside from biology. The diversity and breadth of research within the behavioral and social sciences also were eloquently described by Smith, sociologist Barbara Heyns, and NSF staff.

Emerging from the BBS Panel meeting was the sense that to the extent that behavioral and social sciences are benefiting from, and “driving,” other sciences — in terms of methodology, paradigms, research design, and findings — they are forgoing a certain integration with many more key areas of research than biology alone. In terms of what is best for the advancement of basic science in general, the question arises as to whether biologists should continue to have sole sovereignty over these sciences within the NSF bureaucracy. Such a wresting of behavioral and social sciences from the tired grip of biology could allow the dynamic nature of scientific discovery to progress more naturally and efficiently. Sole “proprietorship” of the behavioral and social sciences by biologists may no longer be in the best interest of the current-day, rapidly advancing nature of basic science.

During its discussion of scientists’ attitudinal and practical barriers to multidisciplinary research (e.g., the insufficient cross-disciplinary knowledge of grant reviewers, the tendency to fund “safe” research), the BBS Advisory Panel came within a hair’s width of stating that there must be a substantial reduction of the barriers to integrating behavioral and social science with non-biological disciplines.

A key message of the ad hoc committee was that NSF has lost substantial credibility as the guardian of national basic science enterprise and that the growing discontent in the behavioral and social sciences communities, in particular, contributes to a perception among many that NSF has engaged in a policy of “benign neglect,” at best, and in “deliberate neglect,” at worst. The committee’s report actually would be considered rather conservative by many, hinted Smith.

Among the final recommendations of the ad hoc committee is that a broader based committee be convened to study more in depth the issues addressed by the ad hoc committee. Mary Clutter, Assistant Director of BBS, agreed that the results of the one-day meeting deserve additional attention by a larger committee. She indicated that “we can become complacent in our jobs... but we want this kind of input” and that NSF needs to learn what steps can be taken to “remedy this climate.” Clutter also intimated that she did not think there would be a receptive audience within the upper ranks of NSF and among members of the National Science Board (the policy-governing body of NSF) for the separate directorate proposal. Heyns reminded the group that an entire group feels disenfranchised by NSF’s treatment of these
disciplines and that this group needs a greater voice at the policy levels where an impact can be had.

The next meeting of the BBS Advisory Panel will be in October or early November, 1990. Clutter indicated that a committee must be convened to look at the entire BBS Directorate organization in relation to where science is going.

The APS Observer will continue to monitor developments.

In addition to the Chair, members of the ad hoc Subcommittee on Behavioral and Social Science Opportunities included: Clifford C. Clogg, Department of Sociology, Pennsylvania State Univ.; James Gibson, Dept. of Political Science, University of Houston; Barbara Heyns, Dept. of Sociology, New York Univ. - New York City; Douglas Medin, Dept. of Psychology, Univ. of Michigan; William Greenough, Beckman Institute, Univ. of Illinois - Urbana-Champaign.

"But Senator...": Tales from Inside the Beltway

WASHINGTON — There are few times in the federal budget process when the private thoughts of a Senator are revealed. Recently, we had a rare glimpse into the thinking of Senator Tom Harkin (D-IA), chair of the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee that funds the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). Senator Harkin has become one of the most vocal supporters of psychology in Congress, and he is one of a handful of powerful individuals who influence the funding process — which agencies will get how much money and for what.

What follows is a portion of a "for the record" exchange between Senator Harkin and Frederick Goodwin, Administrator of the umbrella agency that houses NIMH, during the Subcommittee's hearing on the FY 1991 budget for NIMH.

These appearances typically begin with a formal agency statement. Once formalities are out of the way, an informal question and answer session begins that gets at the real issues. And after the appearance, there are follow-up questions to the agency official submitted "for the record" for written answers that give a feel for topics uppermost in the Committee's thinking and how the agency will deal with them.

Here are those sections most relevant to psychological research and training.

BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH

Harkin: Dr. Goodwin, your budget justification notes the major issues of concern to the House and Senate Subcommittees, and is supposed to outline ADAMHA's (the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration) response to those concerns.

Yet, I note your budget justification ignores all the Senate report language on behavioral research. That language cities reports issued in the last year by the National Academy of Sciences and others recommending that NIMH spend more on behavioral and social science research and training. For example, National Academy of Sciences reports call on ADAMHA to devote $80,000,000 more per year to behavioral and social science, which is ripe for major breakthroughs, and to commit significant additional funds to study psychological, behavioral, and social interventions aimed at stemming the AIDS epidemic.

The Committee also directed the Director of NIMH to report back to us on plans to increase the behavioral and psychological presence at NIMH. What can you report?

Goodwin: NIMH continues to meet its responsibility as the focal point for Federal Government social and behavioral research in the mental illnesses. NIMH is finalizing a thorough report on "Behavioral and Social Science Research at NIMH" in response to the request contained in the FY 1990 Appropriations Committee Bill Report which will be available shortly.

Whatever their fundamental causes, mental illnesses manifest themselves as disorders of behavior. The growth of the basic brain sciences in the Institute's research program is only part of the coordinated effort to address mental illnesses. In fact, from FY 1984 through FY 1989, funding for research with a primary behavioral or social science focus has increased 106 percent. Major NIMH research programs have been initiated anticipating the findings of the National Academy of Sciences and other studies and more are being implemented or developed to respond to external and internal recommendations.

NIMH is the focal point within the Public Health Service for AIDS research both on behavior and its psychological and psychosocial determinants, and on primary prevention to modify high risk sexual behaviors. The Institute has undertaken a series of activities to foster programs of basic and applied social and behav-

(Continued on next page)
ioral research relevant to HIV infection and AIDS. In FY 1989, slightly more than half of the grants in the NIMH AIDS program were behavioral research projects. The FY 1991 NIMH AIDS budgets continue this level of support for behavioral research.

Behavioral sciences research figures prominently in several major Institute-wide initiatives: childhood and adolescent disorders; Alzheimer’s disease and other disorders of aging; the Schizophrenia and Long-term Care Plans; homeless severely mentally ill adults and homeless families with children who are at risk of severe emotional disturbance; suicide and suicidal behaviors; minority mental health; rural mental health; and HIV/AIDS programs. In addition, NIMH prevention activities, both research and the precedent-setting D/ART (Depression Awareness Recognition and Treatment) program are components of the behavioral agenda.

The Administration’s FY 1991 budget provides funds to increase the research programs of NIMH. Behavioral and psychological research, as an integral part of the Institute’s programs, will continue to grow.

BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH TRAINING

Harkin: In last year’s report, the Committee mentioned three official reports recommending the NIMH spend more on behavioral and social science research and training. The Committee especially noted that one of these reports attributed recent losses of young NIMH investigators to fewer psychologists and social scientists. Briefly explain what NIMH intends to do about this problem: For example, what new programs aimed at increasing a behavioral and psychological presence at NIMH will be initiated?

Goodwin: A recent report to Congress and two reports by the National Academy of Sciences point out the immediate need to enhance the role of the behavioral and social sciences in the study of mental illness. These reports complement the efforts of NIMH to strengthen its programs in these areas. The National Academy of Sciences’ report notes that federal support for the behavioral and social sciences was 25 percent lower in 1987, in constant dollars, than support provided in 1972. Despite the declining Federal role, NIMH increased its support for research in these areas from $26.1 million in FY 1984 to $53.8 million in FY 1989.

NIMH has many ongoing programs and future plans to meet the need expressed by Congress, and to take advantage of the scientific opportunities in the behavioral and social sciences. In January of 1989, the NIMH Extramural Science Advisory Board undertook an assessment of behavioral sciences research supported by the Institute and attested to the importance of strengthening the Institute’s basic research programs in cognitive science; behavioral genetics; biopsychology, including animal models; personality, emotional and social processes; and longitudinal studies of behavioral process. In addition to current programs there are emerging opportunities for the behavioral and social sciences in recently implemented major NIMH initiatives; for example, in schizophrenia, child and adolescent mental health, AIDS prevention, and many other areas.

To facilitate an enhanced presence of the behavioral and social sciences in these major initiatives, NIMH is restructuring its Division of Basic Sciences. The new Division will be called the “Division of Basic Brain and Behavioral Sciences”. This new organization will ensure that behavioral concerns will be an integral part of the focus in future research and will broaden the scope of behavioral science research at NIMH. This newly structured Division will not only enhance our efforts in the behavioral sciences, but it will also foster the multidisciplinary research needed to fully understand the complexities of human behavior.

To ensure the success of these programs, NIMH intends to implement recommendations contained in the ADAMHA report on the shortage of young principal investigators, particularly in the behavioral and social sciences. These recommendations call for the NIMH to continue to educate the scientific and academic communities about NIMH-supported research, career development, and research training opportunities. NIMH will also continue the recently implemented program to provide postdoctoral fellowships for students in combined M.D./Ph.D. programs to increase the number of researchers. To increase awareness about the problems and importance of the behavioral and social sciences NIMH will work with other government agencies involved in science education. The Institute will explore areas in which it can cooperate with the private sector.

SUICIDE INITIATIVE

Harkin: We now know that certain stressful parts of the lifespan...
place people at a higher risk of suicide, including adolescence, the death of a spouse, entering a nursing home, losing a farm, and so on. A study of adolescents in rural Minnesota communities at the height of the farm crisis showed the rate of suicide attempts to be 15 times higher than the national average. Our concern over suicide led us to direct ADAMHA to devote at least $1 million to suicide prevention demonstrations in FY 1990.

ADAMHA's suicide research plan includes studies on biological risk factors, developmental psychopathology, epidemiology, and more areas. What I don't see, however, is a tie-in with other factors that may contribute to suicide, such as the traumatic life events I mentioned.

Don't these areas deserve your full attention, too?

Goodwin: The NIMH is currently devoting full attention to all potential risk factors for suicide. Existing research has identified a number of potential risk factors for suicide, including traumatic life events and transitions. Unfortunately, the quality and reliability of the data on risk factors varies considerably, and often must be considered preliminary in nature. The NIMH Program Announcement inviting Studies of Suicide and Suicidal Behavior therefore encourages systematic research in order to improve our understanding of the etiology of suicide, rigorously characterize high risk groups, and identify potential protective factors.

(Continued next page)

APS Job Bank/Job Placement Center
Information

The APS Student Caucus (APSSC) will be operating the official Job Bank/Job Placement Center at the annual convention. The Job Bank will display separate listings of positions and applicants in three job classes: Academic, Clinical/Counseling, and Industrial/Other. The Job Placement Center is a convenient place for applicant/employer contacts and interviews.

Registration: Position Description forms and Applicant Information Forms are available in The Observer and with the convention registration materials. Pre-registration is encouraged and will be accepted until June 1. Participants may also register at the convention. There is a small fee to cover Job Bank expenses.

Employers: Complete a Position Description Form for each class in which you want your position to be listed. Include as much information as possible. Return forms with $25 fee to the APS Washington office.

Applicants: Complete an Applicant Information Form for each class in which you want to be listed. Also send 2 copies of your vita. The forms and vitae will be in different books, so it is not wise to forego completing the forms and refer employers to your vita. Send materials and $5 fee to the APS Washington Office.

Job Bank/Job Placement Center: The Job Bank will provide books containing the position description and applicant information for each of the three job classes. Employers may contact applicants and vice versa through the Job Bank Message Center.

Job Placement Center: Interviews may be scheduled in the Job Placement Center. Interview tables will be assigned by the Placement Center Coordinator on a first-come, first-served basis. Applicants will be directed to the appropriate table. Applicants are advised to bring additional copies of the vita for interviews.

Hours: Thursday, June 7 1:00 - 4:00 (Registration Only)  
Friday, June 8 9:00 - 5:00*  
Saturday, June 9 9:00 - 5:00*  
*The interview area may be open after hours.

For More Information: Contact Kathie Chwalisz, APSSC President, 361 Lindquist Center, The University of Iowa, Iowa City, IA 52242. Forms may be obtained from APSSC or the APS Washington Office, 1511 K Street NW, Suite 337, Washington, DC 20005.
Science Notes (continued)

Studies investigating the role of traumatic life events and life transitions are an integral component of the programs in epidemiology and developmental psychopathology.

The Suicide Program Announcement also encourages preventive intervention research focused on high risk groups. The NIMH has also developed a Request for Applications (RFA) for research demonstration projects aimed at the Prevention of Youth Suicide and Suicidal Behavior. This RFA encourages applications to demonstrate the efficacy of (a) interventions for suicide attempters in inpatient, outpatient, or emergency room settings, and (b) community and school based interventions for youth at high risk for suicide. The RFA is expected to be released this spring, with review of applications and funding in late FY 1990.

PREVENTION

Harkin: A recent GAO report says that, as of a year ago, the national goals, priorities and programs for prevention of mental disorders and research on stress-related disorders that are required under federal legislation had not been established. The report notes that the Office of the Deputy Director for Prevention and Special Studies at NIMH does not have the resources or authority to carry out the prevention policies mandated by the law.

This concerns me for two reasons: one, the NIMH is failing to carry out Congressional direction and follow the law; and two, that the new initiative in rural mental health research and prevention may be similarly hamstrung by a lack of commitment of adequate resources on your part.

What has ADAMHA done to correct these serious deficiencies in prevention?

Goodwin: The NIMH is carrying out the Congressional direction and following the law. As part of its prevention strategy, the Institute has established the Office of Prevention and Special Projects, the Prevention Research Branch which funds prevention research in the mental disorders, and Health and Behavior Research Branch, which funds research on stress related disorders. (The Health and Behavior Branch has been recently refocused and retitled as the Basic Prevention and Behavioral Medicine Research Branch.) While the two research branches fund the major prevention research activities of the Institute, there are other significant prevention and prevention-related activities across the entire spectrum of the Institute, ranging from basic biological and behavioral investigator-initiated research to programs which have already proven quite effective in educating and informing the public. The Office of the Deputy Director for Prevention and Special Projects is responsible for coordinating all these efforts across the Institute.

The Institute will sponsor a series of annual state-of-the-art scientific conferences concerned with prevention of mental illness. The first of these conferences is scheduled for June 1990. Its purpose is to conduct a formalized audit of the status of the prevention research field and the solidity of the scientific foundation upon which preventive intervention research is currently based. The conference will provide a careful assessment of the field’s status, research opportunities, and immediate and long term needs, including clinical and research training needs required to guide the Institute’s next generation of prevention research activities. This will provide the Deputy Director for Prevention and Special Projects with the substantive information base for establishing and updating national goals, priorities and programs for prevention of mental disorders.

Concerning rural mental health, the NIMH is establishing an Office of Rural Mental Health as directed by the Congress to focus on this issue.

AIDS FUNDING IN NIMH

Harkin: You indicate that the Aids research portfolio is equally balanced between behavior change and prevention on the one hand, and neuroscience on the other. It appears, however, through review of the NIMH justification, that while extramural research funds are balanced between neuroscience and behavioral research, virtually all of the intramural research activity is focused on neuroscience.

I don’t see a balance there. Please justify this discrepancy.

Goodwin: The balance between behavior change and prevention, on the one hand, and neuroscience on the other, is in the total NIMH research effort. In FY 1990, $21.95 million is estimated for biomedical and neuroscience research, compared to $28.12 million for behavioral research. In FY 1991, $23.93 million is requested for biomedical and neuroscience research (a 9 percent increase) compared to a $33.74 million request for behavioral research (an increase of almost 20 percent).

NIMH has been placing increased emphasis on the area of behavior change and prevention research in AIDS extramural research. The Intramural Research Program focuses primarily on neuroscience research.

Several initiatives are underway to expand AIDS prevention research efforts, including: (1) a cooperative agreement for a coordinated multisite, multi-population AIDS prevention trial, and (2) a meeting of NIMH-supported AIDS prevention researchers to recommend research priorities for AIDS prevention.

AIDS PREVENTION

Harkin: While ADAMHA assures Congress that it is one of the central priorities, it is spending less than half of its AIDS research dollars in this area. Of the 15 million dollar increase the Agency has asked for, only 31
percent is going to the category of activity devoted to prevention. How can ADAMHA assure me that it is doing everything to address the prevention agenda, that there are not major unmet needs, and that its spending priorities are not out of balance?

Goodwin: NIMH has been increasing emphasis on AIDS prevention research. Currently, approximately 56 percent of the NIMH AIDS basic science research effort focuses on behavioral research. Most of these projects are related to the development of AIDS prevention strategies.

Prevention is a high priority at NIDA (National Institute on Drug Abuse). Looking at the FY 1991 AIDS budget tables, it would appear that NIDA is proposing to spend $28,915,000 (or only 21 percent of its request) on the category Risk Assessment and Prevention. Within the Basic Science Research category, however and additional $82,371,000 is budgeted for Behavioral Research on the Prevention of High-Risk Behaviors. When these amounts are combined, the total budgeted for FY 1991 is $111,286,000, or 80 percent of NIDA's total request.

Almost 90 percent of NIAAA's (National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism) FY 1991 requested budget increase for HIV/AIDS is targeted to prevention. When these amounts are combined, the total requested for FY 1991 is $111,286,000, or 80 percent of NIDA's total request.

Advisory Board on Child Abuse and Neglect that research on child maltreatment is "chronically under-funded" and that this not only discourages new investigators from entering the field — it also is driving established researchers from the field.

Dr. Egeland, of the Institute of Child Development at the University of Minnesota, is the recipient of child abuse grants from the National Center on Child Abuse and Neglect (NCCAN) and the National Institute on Mental Health (NIMH). He told the Board that there has been a decline since the mid-1970's in federal funding for research on child maltreatment, despite the increased need for knowledge about the causes, prevalence and treatment of child abuse.

Attitude Problem

"We have an attitude problem," said Dr. Egeland. "Child abuse research is not highly regarded compared with other areas of research that focus on children."

And yet, he noted, public agencies and service providers are "making decisions that have life-long implications for the mistreated kids." In contrast to the extensive evaluation of medical services provided to these individuals, there is little empirical support for the decisions that are made about the other aspects of their lives, he said, calling this situation "outrageous."

Not a Priority

Dr. Egeland outlined some basic recommendations for the Board to improve federal support for child maltreatment research. First and foremost, he said, there has to be more money appropriated to the various federal agencies that support this kind of research.

The most important question, he said, is "why is money not available? Why isn't child maltreatment research a priority?"

Next, he said it is critical that research training funds be made available specifically for child abuse researchers, a field in which there is little if any funding for pre-or post-doctoral training. He suggested that the NIMH model of providing "seed money" for young investigators in the form of small grants and what are known as FIRST Awards would be most appropriate. More senior researchers would benefit from Career Development Awards.

Finally, in response to an inquiry from the Board, Egeland said that it doesn't matter which federal agency is designated to have responsibility for child maltreatment research, just that "leadership is urgently needed" in this area.

Report to be Issued

The U.S. Advisory Board received Dr. Egeland's testimony during a hearing on April 4, 1990, on research issues related to child maltreatment. The Board plans to briefly address the status of research on child maltreatment in its June, 1990 report to Secretary of Health and Human Services Louis Sullivan and to Congress. A more detailed analysis and recommendations will be issued subsequently.

Since last October, SRCD has been represented in Washington under a cooperative agreement with APS. The testimony described here is one outcome of that joint effort.
To the Editor:

While I agree that the Observer should represent the viewpoint of all APS members, I do not think that this should extend to the expression of false and deceptive statements. Judy Ann Bennett (January, 1990) has written that researcher Edward Taub was "...tried and found guilty on 17 counts of cruelty to animals." While it was true that Taub was initially convicted on these counts, all of those counts were later overturned, and extensive testimony has been given by other scientists in the area regarding the merit and conduct of Dr. Taub's research. In addition, the letter indicates that conditions in Taub's laboratory were judged "unspeakably cruel" by NIH, a statement for which I am unaware of any evidence whatsoever. Finally, the writer implies that much or most psychological research is cruel to animals—a statement that is quite simply untrue. It is equally untrue of animal research in general. Animal research, by psychologists and others, is regulated at all institutions that receive Federal support by Institutional Animal Care and Use Committees that approve individually all research protocols prior to the conduct of any animal experiment. These committees include non-scientists and community representatives as well as scientists. My knowledge of the workings of the IACUC here and of those at other institutions is that they are very careful to properly execute their charge, which includes the prevention of unnecessary pain and suffering of research animals.

As an animal researcher, I am personally committed to the welfare of my animal subjects, and I will repudiate any scientist whom I believe to be guilty of cruelty to research animals, because this behavior tarnishes all of us and because I believe scientists, like all people, have a responsibility to treat animals humanely. I should add that avoiding pain and stress in one's animal subjects is of obvious scientific merit as well—the psychiological and psychological consequences of stress are very likely to be disruptive to any experiment in which stress itself is not the object of study.

The letter that prompted mine illustrates one of the tactics of the members of the "animal rights" movement. While their common goal is the abolition of all animal use, including research, on the grounds that animals have rights equivalent to the rights of people, their daily tactics include lies and deception with regard to both the conduct and the value of animal research in addition to physical terrorism directed at animal researchers and those who speak out in support of animal research.

William T. Greenough, Ph.D.
University of Illinois

To the Editor:

First, please let me apologize for the form of this letter. I have recently returned from a trip to Prague, Warsaw, and Budapest, where I visited psychologists at academic and research institutions. One of the main purposes of my visits was to try to establish some new media for exchanging scientific information between Eastern European and American psychologists. My involvement with international communication among psychologists began in 1966 when I directed a survey of psychologists attending the International Congress of Psychologists in Moscow. During the course of this project we established good contacts with some psychologists in the USSR and several Eastern European countries. A system for exchanging scientific information between USSR-bloc and American psychologists was worked out. Unfortunately, it was not a success because much of the material sent by American psychologists never reached the persons to whom it was sent and the USSR-bloc psychologists were unable to send us works of much scientific importance. So the project was abandoned. Now, in light of the significant changes taking place in some of the Eastern European countries it appeared that there might be a possibility of opening genuine communication between psychologists in these countries and American psychologists. I am pleased to say that I believe that my trip holds promise of success in this respect.

Let me give you some of my general impressions common to each of the places and groups of psychologists I visited. First, they are deeply grateful that American psychologists are interested in their future welfare—they seem to view American psychology as the center of psychological knowledge, and they want to know more about what is being done in America.

Second, they are really poor—not only individually but also institutionally. (In Prague I was told by one psychologist that they hadn't seen Psychological Abstracts in five years because their institutions couldn't afford it. Sadly, much of the money available at some institutions was misused by the Party.) It will be some years before they will be able to subscribe to journals, purchase books, etc.; and they direly need help to get them through these next few years.

Third, there are differences among psychologists I visited with respect to their relationships with American psychology. I met some who had visited America, a few who maintained some contact with American psychologists, and some who on occasion receive books from America. (While in Warsaw a box of books arrived from a Canadian psychologist,
who, I gathered from the “review slips” still in some of the books, had collected and shipped books he and his colleagues had received for review. The opening of the box and examination of the books was like Xmas morning. I was impressed by how immediately and cheerfully plans were made for fair and public distribution of the books. In general, however, the research psychologists in these countries are without means for current involvement in keeping up with the research front of Western psychology. I found this particularly true for young faculty and advanced students. Part of the problem here is that the typical mentor-student relation encountered in America was practically eliminated by the political system. The younger scholars told me that the situation was that they (the youth) had not become Party members, whereas most of the “older” generation had done so simply to be able to pursue science, although they may not have been ideologically communists — it was practically a way of life. And, being Party members they got privileges, which in turn made it unnecessary for them to have to be extraordinary to survive. Since the 70’s the younger scholars eschewed the Party and pursued an independent style of life to survive. Since the 70’s the younger scholars eschewed the Party and pursued an independent style of life to survive. At my request I met several of the Party member directors and supervisors, most of whom I was told were on their way out. I was struck by their inadequate English compared to the fluent English of the non-Party young faculty I met. I was told, “Of course, they did not learn English as we did. They didn’t need to know the “international language” to get ahead. Whereas we needed to be reasonably fluent in English to know what was going on in the outside world, rather than rely on information being disseminated by the Party.” So it is the younger psychologists of these countries who need assistance most and who are most likely to benefit from any assistance we give.

Fourth, I should say something about the “old guard”. I sought the opportunity to meet with some of the “Party members” who were still hardliners. Most were sad; some were bitter. None seemed to understand why he was in such disgrace now. For some, communism was an idyllic vision. One explained to me how difficult it was for him to understand what had happened. He gave me this explanation. “Put yourself in the place of a faithful village priest on being informed that Pope John had been converted to Judaism. Well, Comrade Gorbachev has done just that to my generation.” One cannot help but have a little sympathy for such people who put their faith in the Communist dream and now find it “pie in the sky”. That some of these psychologists will continue to conduct research in the new, less ideological, environment seems likely. More importantly, their non-Party counterparts seem willing to help them adjust; so they too will probably have the opportunity to share the materials we send.

Fifth, psychologists in these countries want to inform American psychologists about their work, and get some feedback. They have published, but mostly in their native languages. I encountered instances where some psychologists had published in Western journals under a different name to avoid political problems. At each of the cities (Prague, Warsaw, and Budapest) I was able to arrange for one “contact” who would collect the following information from research colleagues who wish to exchange information with American psychologists: (1) name, title, institution, etc. (2) a brief description of his area of psychological specialty, (3) the names of American psychologists with whom he would like to have contact, and (4) two or three publications that would be most helpful. Some of these materials have now been sent to me and I am in the process of trying to get them distributed to the appropriate psychologists. I am writing you to ask that you examine the enclosed material from Eastern Europe, and if you think it possibly relevant send some related materials (preprints, reprints, journals, books, etc.) either to the European psychologists or to me (I will see that the materials are shipped). And, of course, if you think that it might be helpful, please send these materials to other appropriate psychologists. Further, if you have any suggestions as to how this process might be made effective, please write or call me (207-326-4157). And, thank you in advance for any help you may give in this matter.

William D. Garvey
Professor Emeritus
Johns Hopkins University

The APS Employment Bulletin will not be published in June.
The next issue members will receive will be
the July issue of the
APS Observer.