Are the Books Stacked Against Psychology?

University Library Acquisitions Policies May Create Inconsistencies Across Disciplines

Does the typical university library allocate an appropriate sized budget to the acquisition of scientific psychology materials? Recent preliminary research conducted by Emanuel Donchin, Head and Professor of Psychology at the University of Illinois-Urbana Champaign, indicates the answer may be "no."

Following the collection of 1989/90 budget statistics from his own institution and based on similar data gathered by six other behavioral science departments, Donchin presented his findings at the March meeting of the Council of Graduate Departments of Psychology (COGDOP). Donchin urged COGDOP to develop a task force to follow up with a more

NSF Directorate Now Proposed in Senate

Task Force Recommendation Also Expected

The drive for improved federal funding of psychological science received a significant boost from the U.S. Senate, where Senator John F. Kerry is introducing the "Behavioral and Social Science Directorate Act" to establish a separate directorate for behavioral and social science research at the National Science Foundation (NSF).

Kerry, a second-term Democrat from Massachusetts, is a member of the Senate subcommittee that oversees NSF. Academic research is a particular priority in his home state. Kerry's legislation will provide behavioral and social science with a greater voice and visibility within NSF, in turn leading toward more stable financial support from the agency.

New Session, New Life

APS worked closely with Senator Kerry in the introduction of the legislation, which is seen as giving new life to the prospect of a separate directorate. It also adds to the growing pressure NSF is experiencing on a number of fronts.
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The Enduring APS Agenda

James L. McGaugh
President, APS

For the past two years I have been honored to serve as President of APS. Many of you have "become accustomed to my face," and some of you may even have read a few of my columns that have appeared in the Observer. In these columns I have repeatedly emphasized the importance of maintaining a highly focused APS agenda. In my final column I return to this central theme.

When APS celebrates its centennial in 2088, few of those present at the celebration are likely to have any sense of the forces that motivated the founding of the society. However, in preparing for that centennial, some of the organizers may turn to yellowed copies of the Observer to learn about the early days of APS. So, for those of you who are reading this in the year 2088 (as well as the present pioneers) I want to summarize the early — and, I hope, enduring — APS agenda.

APS was created to provide a scientific society whose sole purpose is to promote the interests of the broad spectrum of psychological science. The founders acted because they were convinced that existing societies did not serve that purpose in a focused and effective manner. The fact that the APS membership grew to 12,000 within the first three years following its creation clearly indicates that their belief was well founded.

In developing plans and policies, the first APS Board was guided by the principal assumption that all actions should be explicitly aimed at furthering the interests of psychological science. In a period of less than three years since its founding APS has established an office in Washington, DC; organized three conventions, established two journals (as well as the Observer), hosted three summit meetings of psychological organizations, and held two elections. APS has also been effective in influencing federal policies and actions affecting psychological science. APS has done all of this with the efforts of a small but enormously dedicated, talented, and effective APS central office staff, a few Board meetings (and many of those were conference calls), and even fewer committee meetings. We have substituted phone and fax for "frequent flyers." (Those of you reading this in 2088 may not understand these terms. It merely means that we have been, well, frugal.)

These are quite remarkable accomplishments for a young scientific organization. I very much hope that those of you reading this in 2088 now have a greater appreciation of the efforts of APS members and staff during the formative years of the society. I also fully expect that those present at the Centennial Convention will have much reason to celebrate the sustained success of APS in promoting the interests of psychological science.

And, if they have read this issue of the Observer, those at the Centennial celebration will know that the president who served from 1989 to 1991 was honored and pleased to have had the opportunity to work with the APS Board, the APS Washington office staff, and the many other pioneering members of APS, in setting the APS agenda.
In March, the Road Went Both Ways

Chairman Brown Tours Bonney Center

IRVINE, CALIFORNIA — U. S. Representative George E. Brown, Jr. (D-CA), saw first-hand how and where psychological science is conducted when he paid a visit to the Bonney Center for the Neurobiology of Learning and Memory (CNLM) at the Irvine campus of The University of California. What he learned there and his memory of the Center may well make a difference in the status of federal funding for behavioral and social science research.

George Knows Psychology

Brown just this year assumed the chair of the U.S. House of Representatives committee which oversees the National Science Foundation (NSF). He was an original cosponsor of legislation introduced in the last session at the request of APS to establish a separate directorate for behavioral and social sciences at NSF and has indicated that he continues to support the proposal.

Several members of the CNLM’s Department of Psychobiology met with Brown on March 28th. In addition, he saw experiments in progress, and discussed both the theoretical and practical applications of the Center’s work. The Bonney Center focuses on basic brain mechanisms, and, among other things, is internationally recognized for research investigating the neural changes underlying memory. Included in Brown’s tour were visits to the labs of APS members Norman Weinberger and Gary Lynch, both faculty at the Center.

“I think Representative Brown saw an aspect of psychological science that may serve to counteract the view some may have that psychological science is soft science. It was a delight to have him as a visitor to the Center,” said Center Director James L. McGaugh. “He was interested in all aspects of the work here and asked a lot of insightful and tough questions.”

U.S. Science Adviser Meets APS

WASHINGTON, DC — APS President James L. McGaugh and Executive Director Alan Kraut introduced APS to President Bush’s Science Adviser in early March.

The President’s Science Adviser, D. Allan Bromley, is head of the Office of Science and Technology Policy (OSTP) and as such is the senior science policy official in the federal government. In past Administrations, the OSTP has functioned in an advisory role without much clout. However, Bromley has been attempting to increase OSTP’s budget, scope of activity, and influence on U.S. science policy.

Also attending the meeting were two newly appointed OSTP officials: Associate Director for Life Sciences, Donald A. Henderson, most recently appointed; and Assistant Director Pierre Perrole, a political scientist on loan from the National Science Foundation (NSF) who is reportedly the first social scientist to join OSTP.

“It is clear that behavioral and social science research is not at the forefront of OSTP’s concerns,” said Kraut. “But it is equally clear that there is opportunity to work with them in improving federal policies affecting psychological research.

“Literally as well as symbolically, we were meeting in the shadow of the White House [in the Old Executive Office Building],” said Kraut. “That proximity to the highest power must be brought to bear on issues of concern to scientific psychology.”

Piece of Cake

The Old Executive Office Building is less well known to tourists than its famous neighbor at 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. But some of the most important decisions in government are made behind its stately, ornate wedding-cake facade. And it was in this setting that McGaugh conveyed to Bromley the nature of APS’s mission and the importance of psychological research.

He told Bromley that APS was a relatively new organization formed to provide focus and visibility for scientific psychology in Washington. Bromley and McGaugh also discussed funding of behavioral and social science at NSF. In previous accounts, Bromley has said that he is not convinced of the need for a separate behavioral science directorate at NSF but that he is willing to listen to the arguments.

See Irvine on Page 13

See OSTP on Page 22

May 1991
Animal Welfare Regulations Finalized

New Research Standards Require Exercise for Dogs, Well-being for Primates

WASHINGTON, DC — The Department of Agriculture (DOA) has issued its final regulations governing the care and use of animals in research. This completes a process which began when Congress added the Animal Welfare Act amendments to the “Food Security Act of 1985.”

In the interim, standards have been developed for rabbits, guinea pigs, hamsters, marine mammals and other warm-blooded animals regulated under the Act, which is enforced by the DOA Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS).

The new standards were published in the February 15, 1991, Federal Register. They were scheduled to go into effect on March 18, 1991, but researchers have until August 14, 1991, to develop and implement plans for the exercise of dogs and promotion of the psychological well-being of primates, two major requirements that were added by Congress to the previous animal welfare standards.

Dogs, Cats, and Primates

APHIS’s standards concerning most animals were generally not controversial and the agency issued uniform standards for their care. However, the rules for dogs, cats, and primates were more closely watched by both researchers and animal rights groups. There was substantial criticism from the animal rights community which objected to the broadness of the rules applying to these animals. In response, the agency said it wanted to provide sufficient flexibility “where variations in circumstances and animal behavior would make very specific standards less effective in promoting animal welfare.”

“A large number of commenters stated that requirements for exercise of dogs and social interaction of primates must be spelled out clearly,” said APHIS. “We consider the requirements ... to be set forth clearly in our proposal. It is clear what ends are to be achieved. However, we do not consider it in the best interests of individual animals, many with differing needs, to restrict all facilities to the same specific set of procedures in achieving those ends.”

APHIS’s initial proposed standards for dogs, cats, and primates — issued in August, 1990 — drew 12,000 comments, of which 10,000 were from the “general public” including humane societies and animal rights groups. Of the remaining comments, 1,500 were from researchers, and 500 were from dealers and exhibitors.

In its comments to APHIS concerning the regulations, APS said that “compared to earlier versions, these regulations allow greater flexibility for individual institutions, and increased professional judgment for those responsible for the care of animals in research. However, numerous concerns remain. Broadly, these include the undue economic burdens posed by some of the requirements; unrealistic schedules for compliance; obstacles to research design that would result from some provisions (i.e., social housing); and ambiguous requirements regarding security.”

In addition to these general concerns, APS specifically requested that a behavioral scientist, not a veterinarian, be responsible for determining “psychological well-being” of primates. “There is no rationale for this provision [requiring that a veterinarian determine psychological well-being], said APS in its comments to APHIS, “and we suggest that such a judgment is better made by a behavioral scientist, since it is behavioral scientists who conduct studies of well-being in animals and who have developed the techniques for their improvement. Therefore, we urge you to ... include consultation with a behavioral scientist.”

Although no direct response was received, APHIS addressed this issue after redrafting it slightly. “A small number of commenters suggested that behavioral scientists or animal psychologists may be more qualified than attending veterinarians to establish environment enhancement plans,” said APHIS. “Nothing in the proposed regulations prohibits consultation with other animal experts. On the contrary, we [APHIS] expect the attending veterinarian to carry out whatever consultation and professional research he or she deems necessary to adequately advise the facility.”

‘Psychological Well-Being’

The “psychological well-being” of primates is addressed largely in terms of the physical environment. APHIS states that a specific plan for each facility is necessary because there are no uniform standards in the regulations “due to the many variables affecting how best to achieve psychological well-being in different species and animals.” Following are excerpts from the APHIS statement regarding this portion of the animal welfare regulations:

"As we discussed in our proposal, what constitutes psychological well-being in each species and each primate does not lend itself to precise definition.... The psychological well-being of non-human primates involves a balance of several factors or areas of concern. This concept involves sufficient space for the animals; methods to stimulate the animals and occupy some of their time,

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE
Economic Impact

APHIS also indicated that it received a large number of letters concerning the negative economic impact of the new regulations, saying that “we are acutely aware of the potential regulatory costs or impacts of the revised standards on regulated entities and the economy. We also believe that the revisions included in our regulatory proposals, including this final rule, are necessary to meet our statutory obligations.”

Essentially sidestepping the issue, APHIS said the final rule represented the agency’s best attempt to minimize increased costs to labs while meeting its statutory requirements to increase “the level of welfare and benefits to regulated animals.”

Frederick A. King, director of the Yerkes Primate Research Center in Atlanta, said that the cost increases could be “devastating” for many research facilities, particularly because they are occurring at a time when federal infrastructure support for facilities and support services is declining.

“The regulations will require the purchase of new cages and other equipment, building of new housing and laboratory facilities, additional personnel for new labor intensive requirements, training programs, special supplies, and the like. Further, an enormous increase in researchers’ time will be taken up with new paperwork requirements,” he said.  

Both physically and mentally (i.e., environment enrichment); and methods of social interaction with other non-human primates or humans.

“The promotion of the psychological well-being of nonhuman primates is a critical component in our rewriting of the animal welfare regulations, and is one that we are specifically mandated to address under the Act. Statutorily, we have the responsibility and obligation to establish such provisions as we believe are necessary for a physical environment to promote the animals’ psychological well-being, but do not have the authority to interfere with actual research.”

APS Staff ‘Branches Out’

You have to figure that Pat Branch, APS’s latest staff addition, is tired of jokes about her last name. But as we have already discovered, her tolerance and polite patience keep her from stooping to respond. Those are just some of the ideal traits that this Capitol Hill veteran brings to the position as Assistant Director of Government Relations.

Ms. Branch comes to APS from the Washington office of Massachusetts Governor Michael S. Dukakis, where for the past eight years she served as a Senior Policy Analyst, dealing extensively with Congress on behalf of the Governor and the State of Massachusetts. Previously, Ms. Branch was Legislative Assistant to Representative Jonathan Bingham (D-NY) for 12 years.

There’s been a lot of adverse publicity recently about indirect costs at universities, and other negative publicity about science that we have to address, as well as the special issues for scientific psychology . . .

Pat Branch

‘Lean and Nice’

The hiring of an additional government relations staffer reflects the policy of the APS Board to, as President James McGaugh said in the January Board meeting, “build on the existing strengths of the Society” in representing scientific psychology in Washington. The Board also reaffirmed its goal to stay “lean and nice” (not just “lean and mean”) and to avoid becoming a large bureaucracy.

Because of her extensive legislative background, “Pat was able to hit the ground running” in representing APS, according to Sarah Brookhart, Director of Government Relations. “She has it all — a command of the legislative process, strong contacts on Capitol Hill, and the ability to establish a rapport with people in congressional offices.”

Frustrating Time for Science

Much of Branch’s work has been with the congressional committees that have jurisdiction over funding and authorization of programs that are of interest to scientific psychology. She notes that “we have a great deal of work ahead of us in convincing public policy makers how important behavioral and social science...
Spotlight on Research

Persuasion and Decision-making

by Eleanor Siegel

Nothing in life is more pervasive than persuasion. Nearly every social interaction between humans — and between members of many nonhuman primate species — has a strong element of persuasion. Knowledge about the psychological processes that affect people’s decision-making therefore carries tremendous positive potential.

Researchers like social psychologists Alice Eagly of Purdue University and Shelly Chaiken of New York University are attempting to understand persuasion. An heuristic-systematic model (HSM) for persuasion, developed by Chaiken, allows insight into the thought processes involved in making a decision. She has explored what conditions motivate careful and analytical thought versus reliance upon heuristics, simple decision rules people routinely rely upon (e.g., “experts can be trusted”). Chaiken’s model identifies explicit psychological principles for influencing decision-making, and it provides a framework for generating distinct predictions about persuasion.

Making Decisions Easily

Other dual process models such as the elaboration-likelihood model, developed by psychologists Richard Petty and John Cacioppo, contend that people use heuristics, or easy, superficial thinking techniques, until they are motivated — either by high stakes or accountability — to use more analytic strategies. These dual process models tend to view heuristic processing as the default thinking mode underlying decision-making. It is in action except when more systematic thinking is activated by motivating circumstances.

But Chaiken’s research provides evidence that systematic and heuristic processing often co-exist — at times one recedes into the background but is always available. “Chaiken’s work provides one of the more exciting recent models in the area of communication and persuasion,” says Mark P. Zanna, editor of Advances in Experimental Social Psychology. More analytical thinking, according to Chaiken’s research, reduces the judgmental effect of heuristics. As individuals admit information and integrate more facts to form their attitudes and decisions, the additional knowledge often opposes and thereby weakens reliance on their heuristic cues. Chaiken terms this process “the attenuation hypothesis.” This hypothesis has been supported by results in several experiments in which Chaiken and other researchers have manipulated subjects’ motivation, usually by leading them to believe their judgments were either highly important or not important.

Tough Choices

One important feature of the heuristic-systematic model is its “sufficiency principle.” The principle relates to a person’s actual and desired confidence levels when he/she makes a decision. Chaiken suggests the decision to think analytically or take a thinking short-cut is purposeful because people often wish to trade off between their desire to achieve valid conclusions and their desire to minimize analytic effort. They achieve balance by individually determining their “sufficiency threshold,” or their level of confidence. This is a personal decision influenced by many complex goals. The confidence level concept is useful because it recognizes “people can’t analyze every issue in front of them. They must limit their efforts and their primary goal is achieving a valid decision,” says Chaiken.

Thresholds fluctuate from person to person and situation to situation. Those who set higher thresholds demand more confidence in their decisions.

Chaiken, identifies and examines a class of variables called “motivators” — many of which are well-documented in social psychology and include situational variables such as task importance and personal relevance, individual differences in desire for control, and need for cognition — and she theorizes that they stimulate systematic processing because they “lead people to set higher sufficiency thresholds.” One strong motivator is accountability. And according to research by Philip Tetlock, it seems to cause greater caution and more integrative and complex thought, suggests Chaiken.

Psychologist Diane Mackie has applied Chaiken's model in her study of the effect of mood on one’s persuasibility. Mackie discovered that people who are in a good mood appear to rely less on systematic processing and to rely more on the heuristic mode.

Chaiken hopes to apply the HSM model in research examining how people make decisions about others in social contexts (e.g., the reliance on stereotypes) and whether additional information could directly or indirectly diminish the impact of heuristic cues.

While the results of social psychological research such as Chaiken’s may appear intuitive, the research also attempts to reveal the extent to which we as individual decision-makers rely upon less effortful modes of making decisions. This has important implications for our decision making — within the larger society concerning the major policy issues facing our nation. It also has implications for examining how advertising and economic issues affect our daily personal decisions and the decisions on which our legislators represent us. Social influence, in the largest sense, is what social life is about.
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thorough investigation, since the seven universities showed a range in allocations for psychology of only from 0.9 percent to 2 percent of the libraries’ total budgets.

“Psychology acquisitions accounted for just about 1 percent of our [library’s] budget” stated Donchin. Chemistry and geology, on the other hand, commanded about 12 percent and 4 percent of the budget, respectively. Maintaining that this was not an aberration, Donchin said that the tendency toward small purchases in psychology extends over the past 10 years. “The procurement pattern appears to reflect an allocation pattern that was established decades ago and that has remained stable because the annual allocation process operates primarily on the distribution of incremental funds ... to the various disciplines,” he concluded.

Circular Reasoning File

The preliminary findings indicate that for several “peer” institution libraries (i.e., ones with similar budgets) around the nation (e.g., University of Michigan, University of Texas-Austin, Indiana University) the situation may be similar to that at the University of Illinois.

Unfortunately, said Donchin, a cycle is established whereby each library justifies its relative allocations for different disciplines based on what other libraries are doing. In fact, the Illinois Vice Chancellor of Academic Affairs, Robert Burdahl, responded to Donchin’s initial findings by claiming that psychology has not received a disproportionately small share of library allocations, pointing to the peer institution statistics that show a similar share of resources devoted to psychology. Burdahl recently indicated that psychology does not necessarily have the resources it requires and that a standing faculty-library committee will begin investigating the issue this year in response to Donchin’s study.

The extent to which libraries may inappropriately depend on “outside” justification of their acquisition policies was clearly exemplified by the 1980 decision by the APA Psychological Abstracts (PA) service to discontinue coverage of books in PA because librarians were known to be using the PA citations as a basis for deciding on their own libraries’ acquisitions. The PA collection was not a systematic collection, however, and simply represented whatever publishers volunteered to send in for coverage in the printed and electronic PA database. While APA did not want to appear responsible for such decision making by librarians, the decision also was based on economics: systematic or reasonably representative coverage of the monograph literature in psychology was simply too expensive for APA.

Impact on Psychology

The significance of Donchin’s findings lies at the heart of scientific communication in general: if libraries allocate fewer and fewer funds to the acquisition of psychology materials, publishers receive fewer library orders for publications in psychology, and the demand for the production of such materials by psychology writers and editors is reduced. The downward intertwined spiral of demand and production could accelerate, leaving research psychology with a vastly weakened publishing and information resource infrastructure, needed to advance scientific communication. “[Publishers] sights must be limited by what they assume libraries will spend. The minuscule share our discipline has of the academic library budget determines both how easy it is for us to publish and ... the very cost of the material,” said Donchin.

Budget Cutting

“With the serious budget cuts going on now in some 30 states’ budgets, the problem becomes even more devastating to scientific psychology acquisitions,” according to Irwin Goldstein, President of COGDOP. “Across-the-board cuts in library budgets hit especially hard at disciplines whose total allocations are a small percentage of the overall library budget,” he explained. Across-the-board budget cutting also hits hard at library allocations to book and monograph acquisitions in general. This is because they constitute only 12 percent of university libraries’ operating budgets, according to an Association of Research Libraries report on 1989-90. Serials account for 18 percent.

Avoid Cooking the Books

Research conducted by Ellen Sutton, Psychology Subject Specialist at the University of Illinois behavioral science library, indicates that several other peer institutions are significantly ahead of Illinois (e.g., Yale, Columbia, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Princeton) in terms of allocations to psychology. A professional research librarian, Sutton indicated that “library resource allocation in psychology deserves a sophisticated and serious national analysis.” She also explained that there are several potential pitfalls in trying to conduct any analyses across this page

---

SEE BOOKS ON PAGE 12
Human Factors Research Spreads Its Wings

National Research Plan to Institutionalize Human Research

The Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) is starting to make psychological research grants directly, instead of including such work under contracts awarded for deliverable products. That step was authorized in November, and now the FAA is launching a 10-year plan to institutionalize "human-centered" research as a core part of all its activities, with a priority equal to that for engineering and systems development. Before adopting any major innovation or system the FAA will examine the human performance implications of that move. FAA expects this to mean a sizable increase in the amount of behavioral research it sponsors. It is already bringing more psychologists onto its staff, and it foresees more psychologists being needed throughout the network of manufacturers, systems developers, and suppliers who must meet FAA's higher human factors standards in the future.

Psychologist H. Clayton Foushee, FAA's chief scientific and technical advisor for human factors, outlined these thrusts of the FAA's National Plan for Aviation Human Factors and invited psychologists to contact his office for specifics on types of research that are to be sponsored — by the FAA, NASA, and the Defense Department — under the plan.

Nearly All Areas of Psychology Are of Interest

"The program is not just for human factors people — it touches every discipline of psychology," said Foushee who earned his PhD in social psychology — working on small group performance — under Janet Spence and Robert Helmreich at the University of Texas-Austin.

"People from areas such as perception, cognition, developmental psychology, engineering psychology, personality psychology (for areas of selection and training) are needed. Our needs are very broad. They cover almost every part of APS membership," he emphasized.

"What we are trying to do with human factors is different from what has been done in the past. We are not trying to create either an organization or chunk of money dedicated solely to human factors. Rather, we are trying to associate human factors with the development of every major project, and to roll it into a 10-year human performance framework. And that framework will allow outside organizations to know exactly what our priorities are, what research efforts we feel are necessary to solve the problems, and what the right contact points are," Foushee elaborated.

Getting the Details

Volume I of the plan, a 20-page overview, is available to all psychologists on request. Referring to the plan's 1,000-page Volume II, available to research laboratories and principal researchers, Foushee said, "What is unique here is that we specify not only the problems but also some level of detail on the research we think is necessary. We specify in detail our priorities, based on what we currently know, and what methodological approaches we think are necessary. So researchers can take that documentation and prepare grant proposals, rather than..."

See FAA on Page 22
Books from Page 10

several branches of the institution's libraries. For example, psychology materials are often appropriately housed in biomedical collections, social science collections, and elsewhere," said Kelly. These collections should be included in assessments of resources, she said.

Information Demand and Price

To the extent that library holdings should reflect the demand by library patrons and the acquisition costs, the low percentage of total library holdings in psychology relative to the other experimental sciences is particularly distressing to Donchin because psychology has one of the highest enrollments, and the cost of materials in psychology is not anywhere near the high end. In fact, data compiled by Kathryn Soupiet, Head of the Trinity University library Acquisitions Department, on college book prices for 1989 [Choice, March, 1990, p. 1092], shows even the highest priced titles in psychology are lower than those in aeronautics/astronomy, biology, botany, chemistry, earth science, engineering, computer science, and mathematics. Citing national cost figures from Choice indicating psychology ranks seventh among the disciplines in terms of cost of periodicals, Donchin complained that while psychology’s average 1990 price per annual subscription is $125.31, engineering, the sixth most expensive discipline, reported an average subscription price of $138.84. The difference hardly seems to warrant the large discrepancy (engineering receives ten times the budget of psychology) at Illinois, he said. Nearly every other experimental science discipline examined by Soupiet also had higher average U.S. prices for college books than did psychology.

Choosing Criteria for Evaluation

What should be the criteria for evaluating library collections and resource acquisition policies and practices? Obviously a 200,000-volume clinical psychology collection at a small four-year college with a primarily experimental psychology program would be inappropriate. So, while national statistics on averages and ranges of collection sizes would be a start, the local usage patterns and departmental needs of potential library patrons must be considered in evaluations.

Administrators may attempt to justify allocations on the basis of relative cost of resources in the various disciplines and relative levels of use by library users. On the latter point, psychology would probably come out way ahead of most other disciplines according to anecdotal and formal reports from reference librarians and library circulation administrators. Psychology materials are heavily used by patrons, in part because of the high enrollment mentioned by Donchin.

Psychology also wins in the cost factor (i.e., how many books can you buy per dollar expended?), as revealed in the national statistics cited above.

Inconsistent National Figures Hamper Analysis of Library Practices

The best hope for getting a handle on library practices in relation to allocations to various subject areas across institutions and across years may be the American Library Association’s National Shelflist Count (NSC), published approximately every four years. A compilation of summary statistics organized by type of institution (e.g., libraries having 1.1 million or more titles) and by LC subject classification, the NSC reports the numbers and percentages of volumes existing on the shelves of each of some 50 to 60 institutions. Psychology (LC category “BF”), for example, accounts for approximately 1.06 percent of the holdings for the largest research libraries examined in 1985. Statistics for 1989 reveal a similar percentage.

There are many limitations to this national data source, however. The introduction to each edition describes many of these in detail. One of the more salient problems is the voluntary nature of participation by universities, and because the participants change with each edition, comparisons of growth rates are impossible within institutions. In addition, only a small percentage of schools report their data electronically, reducing efficiency of data collection. The investment in the

Continued on Next Page
project is relatively small and informal considering the size of the task: the final tabulations fall upon a single volunteer working with very limited time and other resources, according to recommendations for change contained in the NSC document. Further, many libraries cannot be efficiently included in the analysis because they may use a classification system other than the LC system.

Sutton also pointed out that “some libraries intershelf their periodicals with their monographs. This would inflate the resource counts for those institutions.” And there is no distinction in such counts between old versus new monographs. Thus, while some schools’ collections may be impressive in size, their shelf counts will not reveal the relative currency of the collection.

Scope of Publications

Just how many relevant publications are there in psychology? Approximately 2,000 professional level (i.e., research and academic) books are published annually, according to estimates compiled by Marion Russell, longtime Manager of the PsycBooks program of the Psychological Abstracts office. This excludes the so-called “trade” or “consumer” books in psychology. This is in addition to some 1,100 English-language psychology-related serials publications. But, once again, these figures are based on subscriptions and what publishers volunteer to send in to the PsycBooks program.

Perhaps a strategy that combines a national analysis of library collections in psychology with a local analysis and establishes recommendations for standard approaches to such will yield appropriate assessments of the scope of any inequities. Methods for assessing the adequacy of local library resources are examined in various journals including Library Acquisitions: Practice & Theory.

COGDOP to Respond

Donchin maintained that because of the incestuous pattern of librarians justifying their allocations by the extent to which they are consistent with the national pattern, it is important that a national focus on the issue be initiated by the members of COGDOP. “COGDOP believes this to be a serious matter that deserves the attention of a task force investigation, and will appoint such a task force at the end of May, 1991,” according to Goldstein.

Donchin believes that at the root of the allocations problem is a “pattern that has never been changed even though there have been dramatic [changes] in the discipline.” “We need to gather data on library budgets in higher education to determine: the prevalence of the tendency to place psychology at the very bottom of the priority list, and the size and cost of the psychological research literature,” said Donchin. He also said it was important to assess how much of the problem derives from attitudes of the library profession in general and to work closely with librarians in order to change their possible stereotypes of psychology.

IRVINE FROM PAGE 3

George Knows Budget

Brown told McGaugh and others at the Center that he is holding President Bush to the Administration’s stated policy of doubling the NSF budget within five years. He also sets as a high priority the development of an overall science policy for the U.S.

George Knows APS

APS Executive Director Alan Kraut said that the scientific community is fortunate to have Representative Brown as chair of the House Science Committee. “He brings 27 years of experience and a terrific expertise to the position,” said Kraut.

Regarding psychology research, Kraut commented that “Chairman Brown for years has heard our concerns regarding federal support for behavioral and social science, but to my knowledge this is the first time he has actually seen the science being done first-hand.”

Seeing this research first-hand “is an impressive experience,” said Kraut, and he is confident that “both psychology and APS have benefited from Mr. Brown’s visit,” particularly if it results in a greater understanding in Congress of the relevance and importance of behavioral research. In a similar vein, McGaugh said it is reassuring to have “an excellent Congressman in a key position who understands, appreciates, and supports us.”

Rep. Brown (speaking) and Marta Brown (right) in discussion with James McGaugh and research colleague Ines Intromini-Collison at the Center for the Neurobiology of Learning and Memory.
More Highlights of the 1991 APS Convention

You’ve learned about some of the highlights of the upcoming convention — the keynote address, Friday evening “bring the family” address, Presidential Symposium, and other invited addresses and symposia. Well, here are a few more late-breaking highlights:

➤ Edwin Locke and Gary Latham discuss goal-setting in industrial psychology (Friday 8-9:20). Goal setting has implications for broad issues of human motivation. Ann Howard comments on the addresses in the context of conscious goals and subconscious motives.

➤ An enormously ambitious symposium on the engineering of human consciousness (Friday, 10:30-12:20) attempts to integrate recent trends in neuroscience, computer sciences, engineering, and philosophy to address the issue “What is consciousness?”

➤ An invited symposium on women’s health issues (Friday 12:30-2:20) features Judith Rodin (Stress, Dieting and Substance Abuse), Karen Matthews (Cardiovascular Disease), Jeannette Ickovics (AIDS), and Camille Wortman (Coping with Loss). Andy Baum will serve as chair and Jerome E. Singer as discussant.

➤ Peter Breggin, a noted and often controversial figure, presents an iconoclastic attack on the use and abuse of drugs in psychiatry (Saturday 8-9:50), to be followed by three commentaries by speakers with divergent viewpoints.

➤ A symposium on emotional contagion (Saturday 8-9:50) addresses a social phenomenon with a major physiological component: How does happiness or unhappiness spread from one person to another? Presenters are Michael Gazzaniga, John Cacioppo, Frank Bernieri, James Laird, and Chris Hsee.

➤ Modern methods including PET scans and neural network modelling shed new light on attention (Saturday 10-11:50). An all-star lineup of speakers includes Steven Petersen, Robert Desimone, George Mangun, and David LaBerge.

➤ Is the perception and appreciation of music culturally specific? Or do humans process music in certain “universal” ways? Hear about current research (Saturday 12-1:50).

➤ A symposium on interpersonal perception and memory in close relationships (Saturday 2-3:50) highlights a major intersection between social psychology, memory, and cognition. Perception of another person influences one’s relationship with that person, and establishing a close relationship alters what one remembers about that person.

➤ Stick around for Sunday morning (8-10:50): A three-hour Supersymposium on memory across the lifespan features seven noted researchers who will address the physiological and behavioral aspects of memory from infancy to old age, in humans and nonhumans.

➤ Also on Sunday morning (10-10:50), Stanley Sue addresses “Cultural Responsiveness and Psychotherapy,” discussing research on problems of providing services to ethnic minorities.

These are just a few of the highlights of the speakers program. Look over the complete program you’ve already received by now; every session will be a highlight in its own way. Meanwhile, there will be hundreds of posters on the most up-to-date research in all fields of psychology. And film sessions and publishers’ displays. In fact, you may have such a good time at the convention that you’ll hardly get a chance to enjoy Washington! Maybe you’d better plan to stay an extra day!
The American Association of Applied and Preventive Psychology (AAAPP), an affiliate of APS, will hold its first annual meeting immediately following the APS convention at the same hotel, the Sheraton Washington. The APS convention concludes at 12:00 noon on June 16th. The AAAPP meeting begins at 1:00pm the same day and ends at 4:00pm on June 17th.

The AAAPP convention will feature speakers such as George Albee (AAAPP’s first President) on prevention, Sandra Scarr on applied developmental research, Neil Schneiderman on AIDS research, Janet L. Wolfe on RET and women’s empowerment, and Michael Sperling on early attachment and intimate relationships. Sam Osipow will lead an all-star editors’ roundtable to discuss their plans for AAAPP’s new journal. Jeffrey Rubin will head a symposium on peace and conflict. Ursula Delworth will organize a panel on generic versus specialty training at the doctoral level, and that’s not all! Bonnie Strickland will moderate a debate on drug prescription privileges, and Ritch Savin-Williams will chair a symposium on gay and lesbian identity.

AAAPP convention Program Chair Ellen Kimmel extends an invitation for all to join the above presenters and many other outstanding women and men at this unique history-making and first meeting of an extraordinary new organization. The two-in-one convention will allow you to nourish your broad and special interests in psychology while enjoying Washington, with or without your family. The APS meeting begins June 13, and, by making your reservations for just one extra night (for the 16th), you will “double your pleasure” without having to take a step.

Advance registration for the AAAPP convention closes May 10th, and a registration form appears below.

**Advance Registration Form**

**June 16-17, 1991 • First Annual Convention**  
**Sheraton Washington Hotel • Washington, DC**

Please type or print. Send no later than May 10, 1991, to AAAPP. Mail a separate housing form to the hotel.

1. NAME: ________________________________
   LAST  FIRST  MI

2. INSTITUTION: ____________________________  3. CITY: __________________ STATE: ______ ZIP: ______

4. MAILING ADDRESS: ____________________________


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>PREREGISTERED</th>
<th>LATE OR</th>
<th>AMT. DUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAAPP Member</td>
<td>- 0 -</td>
<td>$ 5</td>
<td>$_____</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonmember of AAAPP (includes 1991 AAAPP membership)</td>
<td>$15</td>
<td>$20</td>
<td>$_____</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Total amount of check or money order made payable to the AAAPP

OR, Please bill my □ MasterCard □ Visa Account#_________  
Expiration Date __________ Signature (required) __________

7. Return with payment to: AAAPP, Box 1553, Norman, OK 73030

**AVAILABILITY OF AAAPP CONVENTION PROGRAM:** All advance registrants will automatically receive a copy of the Convention Program before the convention and do not need to order one. Programs will be mailed in May. Remember to bring your program to the convention. Limited copies will be available on-site for $5 per copy. On-site registrants will be given a copy when registering.

---

**APS OBSERVER**  
May 1991
"Senator Kerry's bill allows us to build on efforts that started in the last session," commented Alan Kraut, APS executive director, who noted that last year, similar legislation was introduced in the U.S. House of Representatives by former Representative Doug Walgren and Representative George E. Brown, Jr. (D-CA). Brown, who in January took over as head of the House Science, Space and Technology Committee, which oversees the NSF, recently toured the Bonney Center for the Neurobiology of Learning and Memory at University of California-Irvine, where APS president James L. McGaugh is director (see related story on page 3).

Solving a Perennial Problem

APS has asked Congress for its support of a separate directorate in order to rectify a "perennial problem of underfunding" at the Foundation.

In testimony to the House and Senate Appropriations Committees, Kraut said that APS "endorses the Administration's proposal to increase the budget for NSF," but noted that "once again, behavioral science research is not sharing equitably in this good fortune." In fact, Kraut noted, the one constant in the last ten years of fluctuating research budgets at NSF "has been the permanently lower plateau on which behavioral and social science is funded."

Structural Indifference

"We believe that the agency's indifference to improving these areas of research is due to the current NSF structure," Kraut told the House Appropriations Subcommittee with jurisdiction over NSF. Currently, behavioral and social science research is part of the Biological, Behavioral and Social Science (BBS) directorate at NSF. Under this arrangement, the behavioral and social sciences do not participate in higher levels of decision-making regarding the directorate's budget.

Favorable Task Force Report Due

As this issue of the Observer goes to press, an NSF task force charged with examining this issue, among others, is writing a draft report that will include a recommendation to establish a separate directorate (see January 1991 Observer). The task force was convened last year and is comprised of outside experts, most of whom are from the biological sciences. APS Board member Nancy Cantor, of the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan, is serving on the panel. The task force's recommendation is believed to have come as a surprise to NSF, and many observers believe that the agency will continue to resist a separate directorate.

Continued Pressure Needed

Addressing the task force's anticipated recommendation, Kraut testified that "unless continued appropriate pressure is forthcoming" from Congress, NSF probably will not take on the main recommendation of a separate directorate. Instead, he said, "I expect that NSF will put in place some of the less controversial task force suggestions and in that way will make the case that it has been responsive."

"A separate directorate is the answer to the funding problems being experienced by the behavioral and social science programs at NSF," Kraut told the Committee. "We do not ask for this lightly," he said, "but we do believe it is time for these sciences to be recognized and be given the voice they deserve within the Foundation."
The Student Notebook

Executive Council Candidates

Previously in the Student Notebook (January 1991), it was announced that candidates for 1990-91 APSSC Executive Council officers would be able to submit brief declarations of candidacy to appear in this issue. Candidates may announce their candidacy up until the offices are voted upon at the APS national conference in Washington, DC. [See also APSSC Bylaws Article 3, below.] Candidates are not limited to those who sent their statements in time to appear here. Any of the Society’s student affiliates are welcome to run for the offices: President, Graduate Advocate, Undergraduate Advocate, Secretary, Treasurer, or Student Notebook Editor. Other positions such as Historian, Mentorship Chair, and Chapter Recruitment Chair will be appointed by the President at the national conference, subject to the Executive Council’s approval.

Students who want to be involved in Student Caucus activities are encouraged to attend the Washington conference. Even those who cannot make it can contact any APSSC officer to discuss how they might participate. The 1990-91 officers’ names and addresses have appeared in past editions of the Student Notebook, and the 1991-92 officers will be announced in our next edition. Candidates’ statements are presented below according to which offices the individuals are running for. Although it in no way reflects the relative importance of the positions, offices are listed according to the order in which they are identified in the Student Caucus Bylaws.

Candidate Statements

President

"As one of the original Student Caucus officers, I have been involved in the planning and/or implementation of every national project that APSSC has undertaken in our two-year history. Since 1989, I have been responsible for representing the organization through the Student Notebook entries in the Observer. As an active student researcher and as the only candidate with experience as a national executive officer, I know the issues facing the Caucus (including but not limited to information networking, research support, employment, advocacy, and professional development) and strongly believe that I am most qualified to serve as President.”

Travis Langley
Tulane University
Candidate for President

President or Graduate Advocate

"In either position (President, Graduate Advocate), my goals would be similar, only my methods different. We must not only continue, but also add to the useful tools already in place that aid the transition from student to professional (Job Bank, etc.). Increasing membership and facilitating communication with each other and with members of the parent organization is most important. Networking students with similar interest for participation in multidisciplinary groups, conferences (e.g., the Mid-Atlantic conference recently held at Penn State), or political action is vital. Innovative economic ideas, cost-effective means are essential, so that membership may remain reasonably open to all.”

Bonnie Eberhardt
Pennsylvania State University
Candidate for President or Graduate Advocate

Graduate Advocate

“There are numerous issues facing graduate students in psychology today. However as APS continues to grow, I believe that several fundamental issues must be addressed and properly handled to ensure the success of this growth. First, we must continue to organize students with both similar and varied interests from several disciplines into an interactive organization which can foster and challenge new ideas among its members. We should be interested in recognizing graduate research and providing a positive atmosphere contributing to the academic, experimental, and professional growth of each member. These are the issues I would address as Graduate Advocate.”

Chris Koch
University of Georgia
Candidate for Graduate Advocate

The APS Student Caucus represents all the Society’s student affiliates. It is not an honor society. All chapter chairs are additionally recognized as members of the APSSC national Advisory Committee. Students or faculty wanting information about APSSC school chapter applications should contact:

Donna Desforges
Dept. of Psychology
Box 32878
Texas Christian University
Ft. Worth, Texas 76129
817-921-7414
BITNET: RP71IPS@TCUAMUS

When applying, student chapter founders are asked to provide information about the institution, department, and students, and to designate a faculty sponsor.
American Psychological Society
Student Caucus Bylaws

Article 1 - Name and Purpose
1. The name of this organization shall be the American Psychological Society
2. The purpose of this organization is to be a representative body of the student affiliates of the American Psychological Society. As such, the APS Student Caucus (hereafter, APSSC) is committed to the goals of that organization which are to advance the discipline of psychology, preserve the scientific base of psychology, to promote public understanding of psychological science and its applications, to encourage the giving away of psychology in the public interest, and to enhance the quality of education of the science of psychology.

Article 2 - Membership
1. All student affiliates of the American Psychological Society shall be members of the APSSC.
2. All student affiliates shall be treated without discrimination on the basis of race, national or ethnic origin, religion, gender, sexual orientation, age, or mental or physical disability. This does not preclude the Student Caucus from carrying out activities or programs which have as a goal the amelioration of conditions that may restrict members from full participation in the Student Caucus or its activities.

Article 3 - Officers, Duties, and Terms of Office
1. The officers of the Student Caucus shall consist of a seven-member Executive Council including a President, a Graduate Advocate, an Undergraduate Advocate, a Secretary, a Treasurer, an Editor-in-Chief, and either a Past-President or a Member-at-Large. The officers of the Student Caucus Executive Council shall be elected at the APS National Convention by the attending student affiliates. Candidates for executive offices and voting members must be present when the elections are held. The executive officers shall serve one-year terms. All seven officers will have full voting rights on the council.
2. Each member of the Executive Council shall perform the usual duties of the respective office and specific duties provided elsewhere in the Bylaws. The officers’ specific duties shall include the following: a. PRESIDENT: will be the exclusive liaison between the Student Caucus and the Board of Directors, will chair the APSSC Executive Council meetings, and will serve as an ex-officio head of all non-standing committees. b. GRADUATE ADVOCATE: serves as a graduate students’ advocate and assists, within practical resources, the recruiting of graduate student affiliates. Acts as student representative to the APS Graduate Education Task Force. c. UNDERGRADUATE ADVOCATE: serves as an undergraduate advocate and assists in student recruitment. The officer must be an undergraduate to allow fair representation on the council. d. SECRETARY: is responsible for the Executive Council minutes and information networking. c. TREASURER: is chair of the budget committee, makes budget proposals to the councils and serves as chair of fundraisers. e. STUDENT EDITOR-IN-CHIEF: chairs the editorial committee and is the exclusive liaison between APSSC and the APS Observer. Any submissions claiming to represent APSSC must be endorsed by the Student Editor-in-Chief before they are forwarded to APS for any further consideration. g. PAST-PRESIDENT: This position is automatically offered to the President at the end of his/her term. In the event the President is unable or unwilling to serve a second year, this office will be elected and referred to as “Member-at-large.” This position is only advisory, but carries a vote on the council.
3. The Advisory Committee of the Student Caucus will be comprised of the Executive Council, Student Chapter Chairs, and all Special Committee Chairs.
4. A member of the Executive Council may be removed from office by the unanimous vote of the other Executive Council members. The President (or Past-President in the event of incapacity of the President) shall then appoint a person to take over the duties of the vacant office with the approval of the majority of the Executive Council until the next APS national convention.

Mental Health Services Research
See the display on page 14 for information on an NIMH-hosted breakfast discussion of mental health services research to be held at the APS Convention in Washington, DC.
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Article 4 - Local Chapters
1. Student Caucus Chapters are granted to colleges and universities that want to be active participants in APS.
2. Application for a student chapter requires: (a) a faculty sponsor who is a professional member of APS; (b) a minimum of five student members; and (c) student members of the chapter be student affiliates of APS. Student founders are asked to provide basic information about their institution, department, and students, and to designate a faculty sponsor.
3. Student chapters are not honor societies.
4. There are no dues to be an APS affiliate, other than those required by the Society. Local chapters pay no additional dues to APS or to the national Student Caucus. However, chapters may, at their own discretion, charge nominal dues to student members of their local organization. In other words, students may be APS Student Affiliates — and therefore members of the Student Caucus — yet not meet additional financial or activity requirements of the local school chapter, and thus not be members of that chapter.

Article 5 - Special Project Committees
1. Special Project committees will be formed as needed in the following manner: a. When a need for a Special Committee is assessed, the President shall appoint a person who, with approval of two-thirds of the remaining executive officers, will develop a proposal for said committee and then serve as the committee chair. b. Once the proposal is approved by the majority of the Executive Council, the chair appoints the other members of the committee to implement the particulars of the proposal. c. The committee will report to the Executive Council as needed. d. When a Special Committee ceases to serve a purpose, as assessed by a two-thirds vote of the Executive Council, it shall cease to exist.

Article 6 - Rules of Procedure
1. The rules contained in the current edition of Robert’s Rule of Order (Newly Revised) shall govern the Student Caucus in all cases to which they are applicable and in which they are not inconsistent with these Bylaws or any special rules of order the Student Caucus may adopt.

Article 7 - Amendments
1. These Bylaws may be amended by a two-thirds vote of the members who reply to a mail ballot sent to the total membership. Bylaws amendments may be initiated by the Executive Council, by petition of two-thirds of the Advisory Committee, by petition of two-thirds of the voting student members attending the national conference, or by petition of 5% of the total student membership.

Article 8 - Dissolution
1. In the event of the dissolution or termination of the Student Caucus, all of the assets and titles to and possession of the property of the Student Caucus shall pass to the American Psychological Society; or, if APS no longer exists, to the American Association for the Advancement of Science; or, if AAAS no longer exists, to a similar scientific society selected by the Board of Directors.

Convention Job Bank Applications
May 31 Deadline

On June 13-15 at the Sheraton Washington Hotel in Washington, DC, APS will operate its official Job Bank/Job Placement Center during the APS third annual convention. Job Bank applications for employers and job seekers alike are due to APS on May 31. Two copies of a one-page form, available from central office, must be completed by all participants. Job seekers are asked to send two copies of their curriculum vitae.

Specific job openings will be sorted into three job classes: academic, clinical/counseling, and industrial/other. Job seekers must pay a minimal processing fee of $5, and employers pay $25. Prospective employers are not required to be present at the convention to participate. Specific job openings posted at the Job Bank will be available only during the convention.

APSSC Officers
Executive Council

All the officers welcome students and others who wish to contact them about concerns particular to their own offices. Contact Secretary Paul Reber for general inquiries, regional student conference information, and other requests. Correspondence, inquiries, and submissions to the Student Notebook should be directed to Editor Travis Langley.

President
Kenn White
Cronkhite Graduate Center - 1008
6 Ash Street
Harvard University
Cambridge, MA 02138
Tel.: 617-493-6442
BITNET: WHITIKE@HUGS1

Secretary (Information Networking)
Paul J. Reber
Department of Psychology
Carnegie-Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15217
Tel.: 412-268-8115

Treasurer (Research Awards)
Carolyn Roecker
Department of Psychology
The University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52246
Tel.: 319-338-9817

Student Notebook Editor
Travis Langley
Department of Psychology
Tulane University
New Orleans, LA 70118
Tel.: 504-865-5331 or 504-895-6338
BITNET: PS3GAWG@MUSIC.TCS.TULANE.EDU

Graduate Advocate
Kathleen Morgan
California State University
5500 University Parkway
San Bernadino, CA 92407
Tel.: 714-880-5570

Undergraduate Advocate
Michael Beddows
McGill University
17138 Brunswick Blvd.
Kirkland, Quebec
Canada H9S 1L0
Tel.: 514-695-4526

Past-President
Kathie Chwalisz
361 Lindquist Center
The University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52246
Tel.: 319-338-4990

Current Projects
Donna Desforges
Chapter Recruitment Coordinator
Texas Christian University
Department of Psychology
Box 32578
Fort Worth, TX 76129
Tel.: 817-921-7414
BITNET: RP711P9@TCUAMUS

Lisa Fournier
Travel Awards Contact
University of Illinois
304 E. Iowa St. #5
Urbana, IL 61801
Tel.: 217-333-2169
According to Hicks, McGaugh will be President-elect in June, 1991. Got it?

President-elect Gordon Bower said Hicks. "I think the high caliber of these three reflects positively on the membership of these two organizations [APS and WPA]."

Garcia, Gordon, and McGaugh are APS William James Fellows, and, "What I find interesting is that all three are members of the National Academy of Sciences," said Hicks. "I think the high caliber of these three reflects positively on the membership of these two organizations [APS and WPA]." he continued. "McGaugh is an entrepreneurial kind of leader, and that's just great for WPA, because we are a growing and very active scientific society," said Hicks.

According to Hicks, McGaugh will begin a three-year term on the WPA Board when he assumes the President-elect position June 31, 1991.

---

Last Call
Fellows of Other Societies

As a Fellow (or with comparable status) in certain other organizations, you are eligible to be "grandfathered" into APS as an APS Fellow up through June 30, 1991, at which point APS's Fellow criteria (see below) will become effective. But to take advantage of the current offer, you must let APS know of your desire to be granted Fellow status in APS. Hundreds of APS Fellows have taken advantage of this offer over the past two years, so don't you be left out! In order to be considered for this Fellow status offer, please fill out this form:

YES, I AM A FELLOW IN: __________________________ Name of Organization (include section or division, if appropriate)

Please include me in the APS Fellows list.

Name: __________________________________________
Address: _________________________________________
City: __________________ State: ___ Zip: _______

Return this form (or a reproduction), or, write a letter including requested information to:

APS
1511 K Street, NW
Suite 345
Washington, DC 20005-1401
ATTN: APS Fellow Program

APS Fellowship Status Criteria

(Effective July 1, 1991)

The basic criterion considered for Fellow status in the American Psychological Society is that of sustained outstanding contributions to the science of psychology. Candidates normally will be considered only after 10 years of outstanding postdoctoral contribution, though other exceptional cases will be considered.

Nominations
Individual APS Members may make nominations any time during the year and must supply the following to the APS Fellows Committee:

(1) A letter of nomination specifying why the nominee is judged to have made sustained outstanding contributions;
(2) A current vita of the nominee; and
(3) A list of three to five names of other outstanding contributors familiar with the candidate's work (these people need not be Members/Fellows of APS). Two or more of these will be contracted for further recommendations.

Fellows Committee
The Fellows Committee will consist of a Chair and six other Fellows of APS from diverse specialties. The Chair will designate two Fellows with primary responsibility for collecting the secondary recommendations and for writing a brief evaluation (one page maximum) based on the vita and recommendations about the nominee.

Review and Approval of Nominations
The Committee will consider the nominees for whom letters and vita have been received. The Committee's voting on Fellow status may be made during a Committee meeting at an annual meeting, on a conference call, or by mail ballot. A positive vote of five of the six members of the Committee other than the Chair, or four of the six members and the Chair, will constitute acceptance of the nominee as an APS Fellow. The Chair of the Fellows Committee will coordinate all evaluations, recommendations, and voting. The APS Board of Directors will be notified of nominees approved for Fellow status.
Warren Medal for Experimental Psychology

The Society of Experimental Psychologists awarded its prestigious Howard Crosby Warren Medal jointly to Robert A. Rescorla of the University of Pennsylvania and Allan R. Wagner of Yale University at its annual meeting in Los Angeles, California, this past March. They received the 1991 award for “their very influential Rescorla-Wagner model of Pavlovian conditioning, and for their separate and extensive contributions to experiment and theory in the areas of conditioning and learning.”

Nominations for the award are accepted and reviewed annually by the award committee. This distinguished 171-member society includes among its membership the most prominent leaders in experimental psychology. Each year the society elects approximately six new members to its ranks. Below is the majority of the acceptance speech presented by Rescorla and Wagner.

Statement Accepting the Warren Medal

We wish ... to express our deep gratitude. For both of us the Warren Medal has epitomized excellence in experimental psychology, and we are greatly honored to be among its distinguished recipients.

Good science is generally cumulative. But it is particularly appropriate for us, as theorists of the learning process, to acknowledge the continuity of our contributions with those of our predecessors. Those familiar with the field of learning will be quite aware of how our theories have built upon those of others. Particularly obvious are the influences of Pavlov, Konorski, Hull, Bush & Mosteller, and Estes. We are proud to have been able to continue in this tradition, but we are humbled to notice that our own efforts represent modest revisions of the thinking that has gone before.

But each of us also wishes to acknowledge the particular personal impact of our more immediate teachers. Bob Rescorla was extremely fortunate to have been introduced to psychology at Swarthmore by such wonderful teachers and intellectuals as Henry Gleitman, Solomon Asch, and Hans Wallach. The seed that they planted in a young undergraduate was allowed to grow and flourish in the newly renovated graduate program at Penn. There, his critical thinking was sharpened by such figures as Dottie Jameson, Leo Hurvich, Duncan Luce, Dave Green, Bob Bush, and Frank Irwin. But most of all, there he was encouraged and supported by Dick Solomon, who had a talent for creating a stimulating and thriving laboratory setting that allowed scientists to develop as independent thinkers. Then, as a young faculty member at Yale, Bob greatly benefited from the powerful intellects of Bob Abelson, Bill Kessen, Tex Garner, Endel Tulving, and Fred Sheffield.

Allan Wagner was jolted from any further thoughts of a complacent undergraduate life at the University of Iowa by encounter with the powerful intellects and personalities of Gustov Bergman and Kenneth Spence. They, respectively, caused him to question everything he ever thought he knew, and to hold it valuable to try to put something back together again as “theory.” The extraordinary graduate training that Spence provided was supported by Jud Brown’s insightful pragmatism, and was uniquely motivated by the family link with the likes of Abe Amsel, Frank Logan, and Howard Kendler, whom Allan tried hard to emulate. When Allan joined the Yale faculty some years before Bob, Logan was there to teach him how to look for what was right about someone else’s views, and Neal Miller was there to show him how very much he might find. Since then, there has been a continuing education by inspiring colleagues, including Bob Galambos, Endel Tulving, and Tex Garner.

We remember our working together 20 years ago as a uniquely exciting and intellectually satisfying bringing together of these influences. We have been fortunate indeed to have had these teachers and colleagues. The honor that we accept rightfully belongs to all of them. They allowed us to work with their ideas and to carry some of them a bit forward. For this, and for the honor that we accept today, we are deeply grateful.

ROBERT A. RESCORLA AND ALLAN R. WAGNER
ADAMHA Visit

Later that same day, McGaugh and Kraut met with Frederick Goodwin, head of the Alcohol, Drug Abuse, and Mental Health Administration (ADAMHA). Among other things, they discussed the status of the search for a Director of the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH), and the need to recruit senior behavioral scientists for vacancies in NIMH.

To NIH in May

McGaugh will be making at least one more visit as APS president. This time it will be with Bernadine Healy, newly appointed Director of the National Institutes of Health (NIH). In addition to introducing APS to Healy, the list of issues to discuss includes health and behavior, basic brain research, and NIH support of psychology research.

FAA from Page 11

spend a lot of time and effort preparing proposals that may be very well thought through but not at all appropriate for a particular agency’s priorities.”

The FAA’s “cooperative agreements” differ, however, from other grants in that a government investigator is materially involved as a co-principal investigator in the conduct of the research. There is a principal investigator (PI) on the university or laboratory side, and a PI on the government side,” Foushee explained.

Also part of the plan is the creation of “centers of excellence” at universities or other non-profit institutions where two or more related projects involving some synergy among them are under way, Foushee said.

Targeted Research Areas

Five broad arenas of human performance are targeted in the plan: in the flightdeck or cockpit, air traffic control, integration between flightdeck and air traffic control, aircraft maintenance, and airway facilities maintenance.

The section of the plan on automation and advanced technology may be particularly interesting to psychologists, Foushee believes, because it deals with fundamental problems and issues concerning what people do best and how people think and deal with complex performance situations vis-a-vis very sophisticated technology.

Systems now aboard modern aircraft can perform 99 percent of the work that pilots and navigators handled 30 years ago, Foushee pointed out. “Before, the pilot was in the loop, and now he’s outside, looking at the loop,” Foushee said, attributing the metaphor to Miami University psychologist Earl Wiener.

Technology Turns Flying Upside Down

“What implications does that have for a pilot’s cognitive map of what is happening? Is the level of his/her situational awareness the same? ... If we continue to move away from human monitors to systems monitors in designing aircraft, the question becomes: How do you design a system to maintain a meaningful role for the human yet take advantage of the tremendous efficiency gains you get with computers and automation? ... Or, do you turn the equation around and have the computer step in when the human steps out of safe bounds? So there are research projects in cognition, perception, artificial intelligence, computer science and obviously classic areas of human factors as well,” Foushee said.

“All the major players in aviation systems” had input into the plan, Foushee said — major airlines, aircraft manufacturers, express parcel services, the Air Transport Association and Allied Pilots Association, and all federal agencies concerned with air transportation.

“In the past, researchers have not always worked with the people in the real world who have the problems. This time we asked these major players to tell us what their main operational priorities are. The national plan was tailored specifically to those problems, and then we took it back to them and they adjusted it,” Foushee explained.

For copies of documents and further information call 202-267-7125 or write to H. Clayton Foushee, Chief Scientific and Technical Advisor for Human Factors, FAA, AXR-3, 800 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, DC 20591. D.K.

Have You Renewed Your APS Membership for 1991?

If you misplaced your renewal form or don’t recall whether you have renewed, contact the APS Membership Officer, Allen Walker, (202-783-2077) to receive a new form or to check on your membership status.
Although Washington science reporter Joseph Palca holds a PhD in psychology from the University of California-Santa Cruz, he is best known these days as a veteran journalist covering federal science policy. He currently is a senior writer with *Science* magazine. Palca recently consented to take a seat on the other side of the tape recorder in an interview with Sarah Brookhart, APS's Director of Government Relations and frequent contributor to the *Observer*.

Palca is outgoing President of the [Washington] DC Science Writers Association (DCSWA), an active organization of science journalists that cover every conceivable science topic and science policy issue in the nation's capital. One recent activity of this organization was a unique meeting with the chair of the U.S. House of Representatives Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, Representative George Brown, Jr. (D-CA). Brown met with the group of about 50 journalists in part to forge a rapport that may help in boosting the visibility and influence of his science committee in Washington. [See also story on page 3.] Palca is also on the Board of the National Association of Science Writers based in New York.

**To Sleep, Perchance to Research**

**SB** You probably don't often find yourself in the role of interviewee. But then again, I don't often find myself in the role of interviewer, so I guess we're even. What led you into and away from psychology?

**JP** You're right — it's not entirely natural for me to be on this side of an interview.

My research involvement in psychology was more pragmatic than anything else. I got interested in sleep research when I was an undergraduate at Pomona College. When I decided to go to graduate school, Ralph Berger, the sleep researcher I wanted to study with, held joint appointments in psychology and biology, so I formally enrolled through the psychology department. The psychologists I worked with were oriented toward the biological side of behavioral research.

**SB** Did you come to a fork in the road where you just decided not to continue on with research?

**JP** I never really had the conscious thought of leaving psychology and going into journalism until I heard about a summer fellowship program at AAAS [the American Association for the Advancement of Science] that gave scientists a chance to try their hand at being public communicators.

**SB** How did you end up in Washington?

**JP** AAAS asked 'Where would you like to spend the summer?' and I said I'd just gotten married and my wife has a fellowship in San Francisco. And they said 'fine' and sent me to Washington!

**For Science, Dig Deeper**

**SB** Sounds like yet another communication problem in science ... I assume your science experience is an asset in your writing. Does your background as a researcher make you less objective?

**JP** I don't know whether you have to be a scientist to be a good science journalist but I don't think it hurts. In a traditional journalism sense, I suppose my background makes me less objective. It's easier for me to be sympathetic to a scientist who says 'we just didn't have time to look into that' when I ask why a particular research project didn't include what in retrospect seems like a obvious analysis. A journalist with no research experience might interpret the 'we didn't have time' answer as merely an evasion on the part of the scientist. But of course sometimes the scientist is being evasive.

That's on the down side. On the positive side, I am far less likely to go jump on a popular science story, because I think I can recognize the difference between something that's truly scientifically significant as opposed to being a media creation.

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE
SB Do you find it difficult to serve the demands of both science and journalism?

JP Sometimes it is tremendously difficult. Science writers in the mass media have a particularly hard time because they’re competing with sports, crime, and other things that people see as more directly connected to their lives. Also, in television and radio, where I started out, there is enormous pressure to say things very compactly. You often don’t have time to get more than one opinion about, say, new developments in surgery or medicine. Usually you only hear, for example, from the doctor who is describing the new technique. The result is that often what passes for science journalism on local news stations is what I would call science dissemination, usually health related. To do a good job of science journalism, you have to dig a little deeper.

Not for Scientists Only

SB A lot of scientists feel increased pressure to talk to reporters in order to increase public understanding of science. But they’re often very uncomfortable talking to reporters.

JP I think that’s because scientists are used to speaking to other scientists, and the public (and by extension reporters) aren’t interested in hearing a scientific presentation. They’re asking for a different kind of analysis. That’s always going to make scientists uncomfortable. When you read about a new discovery in the newspapers, it’s important to remember that the scientist is not talking to his peers but to a different audience with a different understanding. Unfortunately, a scientist’s words reported in a newspaper for a popular audience may be thrown up in his or her face at the next scientific conference, so there is a need for more understanding in the scientific community as to how the media works as well.

SB Give us the “scoop” — if you still use words like that — on the science writer’s motives.

JP Science reporters, like all journalists, are primarily interested just in getting the story right. I don’t think they’re as confrontational as political writers who are used to thinking that someone’s trying to hide the truth or pull a fast one on them. Sure at times there’s an adversarial component between scientists and journalists, particularly scientists who are also administrators, but it’s not to the same degree as in other spheres of journalism.

A Big Black Box

SB You’ve mentioned that as a researcher you were happier making physical measurements of your subjects than trying to figure out what was going on inside their heads. But as a journalist aren’t you having to do just that in covering the political establishment, the people who make federal science policy?

JP Yes, and it can get frustrating, especially here in Washington. The whole town is gossipy. There are a lot of people who are willing to talk who don’t know what’s going on, and there are people who do know what’s going on who never talk.

Maybe it’s government in general, but I find the pace of decision-making glacial and astoundingly obtuse. This Administration is like a big black box. It’s discouraging when all you get are shreds of information that just don’t hang together. A federal agency will put out a particularly murky press release, and you ask ‘How did you come to this conclusion?’ And they say ‘Well, we’re not available for interviews.’

SB Is science overshadowed by political concerns?

JP There are times when the political process is swayed by rational, thoughtful, careful analysis, and occasionally people with no vested interest pursue an objective because they think it’s important for the country. But very often, choices are made that have nothing to do with rational thought. It’s the pork barrel situation. And the power of certain members of Congress can’t be underestimated.

Here’s what can happen: Let’s say you at APS want to make a case for more funding. You conduct a study, develop a report recommending an overall increase of $50 million for psychology research, get the stamp of the National Research Council, go through all the channels, and you bring it before an Appropriations Committee in Congress. But a critical goal of the Committee chair is to get more money for his district, so he says ‘That $50 million is a great idea, and we’re going to give $35 million of it to the State University in my district.’ You get the $50 million all right, but not the way you wanted it, and there’s really no higher authority to complain to.

Noise, Jobs

SB Speaking of research funding, Congress last year enacted a new budget process. How do you think science will do?

JP I’ve heard people say the whole budget thing is going to come unglued because of squabbling between the White House and Congress about who keeps score on how the budget is doing. But it may not affect science that much. The scale of science funding is such small potatoes compared to the military and entitlement programs. It is pretty much in the ‘noise,’ and as long as you’re in the noise, you’re not big enough to kill. Somebody once said that you emerge from the noise when your program grows above $500 million. Then you’re not a science program any more — you’re a jobs program. And jobs programs are politically sacred and nearly impossible to cut.

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE
Call for Conference Proposals

The New York Academy of Sciences invites proposals for conferences in all fields of science, especially in biomedicine, psychology and neuroscience.

The Academy sponsors meetings all over the world, and provides the logistical, administrative and fund-raising support necessary for the successful presentation and discussion of research reports. Academy conferences typically are an interdisciplinary examination of a single topic, generally have 24-30 speakers and poster sessions, last three days, and have about 250 attendees. Proceedings of these conferences are published as volumes of the *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, which are distributed internationally and widely cited.

The Academy encourages all interested scientists to submit preliminary conference proposals. Although the current focus is 1992, conference proposals for 1993 are also welcome. If you are interested in planning a meeting with the Academy, please prepare a two-page description of the meeting as you envision it, including title, focus, the primary topics to be covered, and the names of three or four key scientists who might be on the program. Send your preliminary proposal to:

Conference Director  
New York Academy of Sciences  
2 East 63rd Street  
New York, New York 10021.

Within a month after receipt of the preliminary proposal, the Academy will contact you and, if appropriate, invite you to submit a complete proposal. If you would like to see a typical conference program or have any questions at all, please call the Conference Department at 212-838-0230 or FAX 212-888-2894.
Organizational Profile

**PURPOSE:**
The Association for Behavior Analysis (ABA) is dedicated to advancing (a) the study of behavior as a natural science and (b) the application and analysis of science-based interventions to problems of individual, social, and cultural importance. Its purview encompasses basic and applied research, conceptual analysis, and the dissemination of both scientific and public information. The ABA’s activities include membership services (e.g., special interest groups), journal underwriting (*The Behavior Analyst*), directories (e.g., for graduate training), a quarterly newsletter, and an annual convention. The ABA is affiliated with numerous state and regional chapters and actively promotes international development of behavior analysis.

**MEMBERSHIP:**
ABA currently has approximately 2,000 paid members, including a significant international representation. Annual dues are $60. Students pay $20; chapter affiliates, $15. All membership categories receive a new-member discount.

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

**BACKGROUND:**
The Association was begun in 1974 with a planning meeting at the University of Chicago. Its first convention was held the year following. Among the Association’s past presidents are Nathan Azrin, Sidney Bijou, Charles Catania, Barbara Etzel, Ogden Lindsey, Jack Michael, Ellen Reese, and Beth Sulzer-Azaroff. Scientists, scholars, and practitioners in psychology, philosophy, education (regular and special), sociology, business, and rehabilitation have all participated in the Association’s governance. The journal, *The Behavior Analyst* (ISSN 0738-6729), began publication in 1978.

**Annual Meeting**
The annual convention draws over 1,300 registrants. More than 600 presentations and poster sessions are offered, in addition to invited talks and symposia, panel discussions, special interest group meetings, and workshops. The 1991 meeting is being held in Atlanta, May 23-27. The 1992 (May 26-30) and 1993 (May 24-28) meetings will be held in San Francisco and Chicago, respectively.

**CONTACTS:**
For further information, write or telephone the Association for Behavior Analysis, 258 Wood Hall, Western Michigan University, Kalamazoo, MI 49008 (Tel: 616-387-4494/4495; Fax: 616-387-4457). For membership services, contact Sharon Myers, Business Manager; for convention information, contact Shery Chamberlain, Executive Manager. The Executive Director (and Secretary-Treasurer) is William K. Redmon.
Loevinger, David Magnusson, Alan Sroufe, Emmy Werner and Jerry Wiggins. To be held in Palm Springs, CA, November 8-9, 1991, attendance is limited. Graduate students are specifically invited, and funds will be available to help defray travel expenses for small number of students. For information and applications, contact: David C. Funder, Longitudinal Research Conference Committee, Dept of Psychology, Univ of California, Riverside, CA 92521.

CALLS FOR ABSTRACTS

The Society for the Advancement of Socio-Economics (SASE) announces its fourth annual conference to be held March 27-29, 1992, at the University of California-Irvine.

"Do we approach economic and business issues as rational decision makers seeking to maximize our own self interest? Can we act solely as individuals or are we usually influenced by the community around us? How do we react to changes in our government's economic policy?" These questions and other issues will be addressed including business ethics, theoretical analyses, empirical studies, and the psychological, sociological, and political aspects of our economic, and more generally, choice behavior. Write to us with your proposal. Others interested in participating must contact session chairpersons directly. For a list of chairpersons, write to SASE, a non-partisan organization seeking to advance information processing in the unconscious and incidence. and causes; memory for intraoperative events; effects of suggestion; information processing in the unconscious mind; memory and awareness in relation to anesthetics used; techniques of monitoring the nervous system. One page single spaced abstracts should be sent to one of the members of the organizing committee: Eugene Winograd, Dept of Psychology, Emory Univ, Atlanta, GA 30322; Peter Sebel, Dept of Anesthesiology, Crawford Long Hospial, Glenn Bldg. 25 Prescott St, NE, Atlanta, GA 30308; or Benno Bonke, Dept of Medical Psychology, Faculty of Medicine, Erasmus Univ, Rotterdam, The Netherlands. Deadline for receipt of abstracts is Nov. 1, 1991. For

OBITUARY

Irving L. Janis
(1918-1990)

With the passing of Irving Janis, Social Psychology lost one of its most productive and creative contributors. In a career spanning half a century, most of it spent at Yale University, this deeply thoughtful, humane and profoundly cultured scientist played a key role in shaping the modern dimensions of the fields of attitude change, persuasion, decision-making, and health psychology. Scholars surveying the literature in these and related fields will find carefully researched experiments, chapters, and books by Janis dating to the 1940s and 1950s that must be taken into account in developing current theory and research. A deliberate and meticulous empirical investigator, Janis was early involved in classic studies of political psychology and response to propaganda during World War II. He then moved on to research on attitudes and morale with the United States troops. This work, incorporated in the classic volume The American Soldier of which he was a collaborator, not only set a tone for theoretical analyses of attitude change research but also contributed to the eventual racial integration of the military. After joining the Yale faculty in 1947, Janis continued this line of research in his collaborations with Carl Holvland on communication and persuasion. It was in this series of studies that the principles of analyzing communications into source, message, and target were laid out. The 1959 volume, Personality and Persuasibility, reflected his special interest in integrating personality and social processes.

Beginning with his Air War and Emotional Stress (1951) Janis also launched a series of studies on emotional responses to physical danger which initiated the area of stress research. His internationally influential Psychological Stress (1958), with its studies of pre-surgery patients, paved the way for the field of Health Psychology. He pioneered in developing smoking and weight reduction clinics for studying realistic methods of testing models of persuasibility and attitude change. He continued this line of work through his last years at Yale where he was a leader of the strong group in Health Psychology.

During the 1970s and 1980s Janis also devoted himself energetically to issues bearing on political psychology and the avoidance of nuclear war. His fine book, titled Decision-Making (with Leon Mann), combined experimental research with remarkable case study analyses of important recent national policy decisions and events in a set of researchable principles of effective choice behaviors which continue to stimulate policy making as well as social research. He collaborated with Daniel Wheeler on a practical volume outlining useful steps for leaders, executives or individuals in making practical decisions. The dysfunctional aspects of "groupthink" which he identified from case studies of national decisions have become a feature of much general understanding in policy fields.

Janis' last psychological work, Crucial Decisions, written after his retirement from Yale, draws together many of the strains of his productive career. It addresses issues of leadership and cognitive rules of decision-making, develops a model of constraints in policy making, and, as is characteristic of his work, integrates social psychological theory with real-world concerns about peace and political justice.

Irving Janis was a remarkable human being. He also has received many honors including the APS William James Fellow Award and the Distinguished Scientist of the Year Award from the Society for Experimental Social Psychology. He was devoted to his wife, Marjorie, with whom he shared not only wonderful companionship but also concerns over their children and grandchildren. Married for almost half a century they were just completing a book on how to appreciate and respond to art when he died on November 15 in their home in Santa Rosa, California. A knowledgeable and tasteful art collector, a lover of fine music and literature, a rugged bicyclist to the end, he left his image implanted in the minds and hearts of dozens of collaborators and students.

Jerome L. Singer
Yale University
Professor of Psychology and
Director of Graduate Studies in Psychology