Brewer Elected President; Deaux, Weinberg to Join Board

APS voter participation remains high in third election; Amendments to APS bylaws approved

You don’t have to be from California to be President of APS, but apparently it helps. Marilynn Brewer, one of APS’s founders and Director of the Institute for Social Science Research at UCLA, has been elected President for a term beginning in June. She will succeed Gordon Bower of Stanford, who replaced James McGaugh of UC-Irvine.

Brewer is well known by the APS membership for her leadership in a number of activities, including the society’s involvement in accreditation issues. Brewer discusses her upcoming presidency in an interview on page 5.

APS members also chose two new Board members, and approved several changes to the bylaws, in what has become a tradition of high voter participation in APS elections.

Board Transitions
Kay Deaux, Professor of Psychology at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York, and Richard A. Weinberg, Professor and Director of the Institute of Child Development at the University of Minnesota, were elected as Members-At-Large to the APS Board of Directors. As

NSF Takes the Initiative on Basic Behavioral Research
NSF to set aside 20% of FY ’94 budget increase for HCI

WASHINGTON, DC—In an unprecedented expression of support for basic behavioral research, the National Science Foundation (NSF) has told both the Senate and the House that it plans to set aside funds for research tied to the APS-coordinated Human Capital Initiative (HCI) in the fiscal year (FY) 1994 budget.

The NSF had been directed by the Senate to incorporate the HCI in planning its behavioral science research agenda. As reported previously (September 1992 Observer), this followed APS discussions with Senator Barbara Mikulski (D-MD), chair of the Appropriations subcommittee overseeing NSF. But NSF has gone a step further and has made a commitment to “set aside 20% of the increase requested for FY 1994 for the Social, Behavioral and Economic (SBE) Research Subactivity, to support basic research projects related to the [HCI].”

The “subactivity” referred to is the behavioral and social science directorate that was created a year ago following intense pressure from APS and others in
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In Pursuit of the Commonweal

Cora Marrett
Assistant Director
Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences Directorate
National Science Foundation

The presence of the Directorate for the Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences (SBE) enriches the routes through which the National Science Foundation (NSF) can serve humankind. The staff of the Directorate shares with all of NSF the conviction that in science and engineering research and education lie the prospects of improved wealth and well-being of the nation. That conviction underscores the efforts of the three units that comprise the Directorate: the Division of International Programs (INT), the Division of Science Resources (SRS), and the Division of Social, Behavioral, and Economic Research (SBER). This review traces the paths that SBER has taken and those to be planned, in its pursuit of the conviction.

"Change," the watchword of the 1990s, translates for SBER into "consolidation." The Division results from the merger of three units, housed until December, 1991, in the Directorate for the Biological, Behavioral, and Social Sciences. The merger in January, 1993, into a single Division—of the Division of Behavioral and Cognitive Science, the Division of Social and Economic Sciences, and the Office of Studies on Science, Technology and Society—aimed to consolidate links among fields that examine human beings and the worlds they create. The change acknowledged that the puzzles which engage researchers and the problems that plague our populace time and again transcend traditional disciplinary lines. The consolidation aimed, too, to enable SBER to address with force issues identified in other directorates. Signs exist of significant progress toward both objectives.

The Division remains committed to the support of research and education that is at the forefront. The research portfolio consists of projects on topics that investigators identify, and projects on selected themes. In Foundation parlance, the former represents "curiosity-driven research" and the latter, "strategic research." Among the current strategic themes or initiatives are several common across the science and technology agencies of the Federal government; efforts specific to NSF; and still others contained within SBER.

With reference to strategic research and NSF, SBER has two roles. The first: To ensure that initiatives, wherever they originate, incorporate and increase our understanding of human processes. The second: To provide the community of social and behavioral scientists opportunities to identify, develop and pursue panoramic problems to which research on basic processes can speak. The development of an SBER initiative on the civil infrastructure illustrates the first role; support of the Human Capital Initiative demonstrates the second.

The Civil Infrastructure Systems (CIS) Initiative has its root in an effort that the Directorate for Engineering launched in 1992. Concerned about the fragility and deterioration of the highways, airports, and water systems in the United States, that Directorate convened a group of scholars to contemplate the research that might contribute to the renewal of the infrastructure. As that Directorate proceeded to sketch the issues and research needs, the importance of human elements became ever more apparent. SBER has now joined with Engineering, to assure the holistic approach that infrastructure renewal demands.

SBER participation is premised on the belief that the civil infrastructure systems of the future will not be like those of the past and that governments, engineers, construction

SEE MARRETT ON PAGE 12
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Aging Is Focus of HCI Workshop

Participants draft psychology research agenda

The second major Human Capital Initiative (HCI) workshop was held in Reston, Virginia, in early spring. More than 30 experts from 25 organizations, representing a variety of research perspectives, came together for the purpose of developing a consensus agenda for psychological research on aging. Sound difficult? Perhaps even impossible, for a two-day meeting? Well, the group left with a good part of their work completed!

"Vitality for Life" was the latest in a series of research agenda-formulating activities called for by the HCI. The HCI is a plan for a national behavioral science research agenda, coordinated by APS, and developed under the auspices of representatives of more than 70 organizations. (For further information about the Human Capital Initiative, or for copies of the HCI document, contact APS.)

The meeting was co-convened and co-funded by APS, the American Association for Retired Persons (AARP) and the American Psychological Association, as well as the National Institute on Aging (NIA) and the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). Researchers were asked to identify priorities for behavioral research on aging and to develop an initiative for use in planning the behavioral science programs of agencies that sponsor aging research.

Individual Commitment

Throughout the successful HCI process, one of the critical elements has been the level of commitment by individuals. This was clearly the case for the current workshop. In keeping with the HCI emphasis on action and results, workshop co-chairs Denise Park and John Cavanaugh kept the group's collective nose to the grindstone. Further, they and their drafting committee colleagues, Michael Smyer and Anderson Smith, toiled into the wee hours in order to incorporate the first day's discussion into the draft initiative.

It was this kind of effort plus the extensive advance work of the co-chairs, that made the workshop a success. Finding time to organize the meeting and develop a draft of the initiative was possibly the most difficult aspect, according to Park, who said "the easiest part was, in a way, addressing everyone's concerns because they were almost always legitimate and improved the document."

Cleared for Re-Entry

Park said the meeting was "productive and unexpectedly fun." Initially concerned that the diversity of the group would make consensus difficult, she said this was not the case and that "there was an enormous sense of good will and support among the many scientists present, and I found the ideas presented stimulating—and they resulted in a very different document that was stronger than the version presented to the group for discussion."

Her low-point occurred during the late-night drafting session "when I accidentally deleted four pages of text. Needless to say, it was clear who had to do the re-entry."

Workshop participants Anderson D. Smith (left), Michael Smyer, Christopher Hertzog, and John Cavanaugh (Workshop Co-chair)

Workshop Co-chair Denise Park speaks with George Niederehe of the National Institute of Mental Health.

A Call-to-Arms

Cavanaugh echoed this sense of satisfaction with the process, and he views the initiative as "an excellent call-to-arms for aging research." He predicts it will be "a first-rate advocacy document that raises real concerns about the future of this country if we fail to address the challenges posed by an aging society."

See Aging on Page 16
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with Brewer, their terms officially begin at the end of the APS Convention. Deaux and Weinberg each will serve four-year terms, replacing outgoing board members Bonnie Strickland and Nancy Cantor whose terms expire at the 1993 APS Convention.

Bylaws Amendments

The bylaws revisions include changing the two-year term of APS president to a three-year cycle that includes a stint for one year each of President-elect, President, and Past-president. Members will vote for a President-elect next year, during Brewer's second presidential year in order to have a President-elect in place for a year prior to his/her assumption of the presidency in 1995. This change in presidential term effectively increases the continuity and efficient utilization of the expertise of APS leadership.

When APS was founded in 1988, the founders had stipulated in the bylaws that a thorough review be made of the bylaws within five years in order to recommend changes to help keep APS on a steady course toward its primary mission, the promotion of science in psychology. Having witnessed at least one other significant psychology organization stray wildly from an original mission and thereby begin a needless decline, the founders wanted a means for efficiently guiding the society away from such unwarranted diversions.

While the change in the APS presidential term is perhaps the most notable change to the bylaws, virtually all of the other changes were recommended to clarify ambiguous wording or to fill in where insufficient details created difficult barriers to efficient functioning of the organization. In August 1988, APS's bylaws were drafted virtually overnight, and many of the just-approved amendments were designed simply as refinements to that basically solid body of rules. Significantly more than the minimum required two-thirds membership approval—to accept the bylaws amendments—was achieved.

Kay Deaux

Kay Deaux, an APS Charter Fellow, is Professor, Social-Personality Psychology, at the City University of New York Graduate School and University Center where she has taught since 1987. She received her doctorate in social psychology from the University of Texas-Austin.

"I want to represent social psychologists," said Deaux. She believes social psychology serves an important central role in the discipline of psychology. "In so far as APS is concerned with keeping psychology together as a discipline and avoiding a destructive fragmentation, I think social psychologists can serve a role in achieving that middle ground."

Deaux serves on APS's Human Capital Initiative Committee and thinks the HCI is an "extraordinarily important role for psychology." She would like to keep its momentum up and is encouraged by HCI's success so far in bridging the subdisciplines of psychology and increasing the positive visibility of scientific psychology. "The APS has served an important role in research funding," said Deaux. The APS has also done a good job of connecting with its members through the conventions, satellite meetings, and the Observer, she believes.

Her current research focuses on identity. Funded by the National Science Foundation, Deaux is engaged in a project to examine the various ways in which people define themselves as part of categories larger than themselves and the implications that has for a variety of behaviors. She is also involved in a project funded through the City University of New York that looks at acquisition of new identities—how people add new identities to their repertoire. "In this case we are looking at people assuming the identity of 'mother,' for example, for first-time parents," said Deaux. "We are looking at what psychological processes people go through. Also what kind of information they are getting and where they are getting it."

Richard A. Weinberg

The second new APS Board member, Richard Weinberg, is Director of both the Institute of Child Development and the Center for Early Education and Development at the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis. He received his PhD in Educational Psychology and Child Development from the University of Minnesota-Minneapolis.

Weinberg, an APS Charter Fellow, sees his election to the APS Board as a strong message regarding the concept of scientist/practitioner. "We need to be tuned in to the connection between good science and solutions to problems and public policy. APS has a vital role to play in that."

He believes it is important to have a strong science base to root program development and policy directions.

Weinberg wants to continue to play a role in the graduate education area and the accreditation issues, areas in which he has been professionally involved for many years. "With my past experience as president of the American Association of State Psychology Boards, I hope I can help smooth the way for better understanding about what the needs of the academy are in terms of the science of psychology and what the needs of licensed psychologists are all about."

He believes there are more people out there that would become involved in APS. Creating more opportunities, he said, will draw them in. "The best way members take ownership of an organization is to become involved and we need to work on that."

Weinberg is also actively involved as a developmental behavior geneticist. He continues to explore the follow-up of the Minnesota Transracial Adoption Project; he collaborates with Sandra Scarr, Co-editor of APS's Current Directions in Psychological Science, on this project. He is also involved in developing programming in the policy arena through his connections with the Society for Research and Child Development.

More than 40 percent of eligible APS members voted to elect the new APS president and board members and to accept the revisions to the APS bylaws. A more characteristic voting percentage for non-profit societies such as APS is 15 to 25 percent. M.T.
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Interview with President-elect Marilyn Brewer

Q: You are becoming president of APS just as the Clinton Administration embarks on major reform efforts for our health and social welfare systems. There will be new and expanded programs for children, jobs, productivity and in other areas where behavioral scientists are experts. Won’t this greatly increase opportunities and offer new roles for behavioral researchers?

I think we have been positioning ourselves for these new opportunities for the last five years. Not because we knew Bill Clinton would be our next president, but because there has been a sense that change was going to come and there would be greater recognition of behavioral research and the kinds of problems that psychologists tackle. I think the Human Capital Initiative is a good indicator of that kind of preparation. That program started up about three years ago, long before we knew the new Administration in Washington would be receptive to it. But the timing was perfect. So now instead of trying to get our act together to figure out how to make use of this new opportunity, we are already there, up and running. And I see the momentum building.

Q: Are you going to undertake any special projects or emphasize some special area during your two years as president?

I would like to call myself the “education president,” if that title hadn’t already been usurped by someone else.

Q: We wish you better luck than he had, but why education?

Because I remember what happened to me in my first psychology course, several decades ago. I was absolutely appalled to find out that I was learning about experiments with rats running in mazes and things like that. I had thought I knew beforehand what psychology really was all about—Freud and psychotherapy. At first I thought the person teaching the course hadn’t gotten his act together. But by the end of the term I not only understood better what psychology was, I also decided that the real enterprise of psychology was something in which I could invest myself much more readily than what I had imagined psychology to be before that first course.

Through that personal experience I see a challenge in all undergraduate teaching. A high percentage of undergraduate students take at least introductory psychology. And now psychology is being taught in high schools more and more. This gives us an incredible opportunity to raise awareness about psychological science.

What we are doing with all those students should be the model for increasing this awareness about psychology as a science and academic discipline first and foremost.

Q: So how are you going to promote it?

It shouldn’t require major new APS initiatives. I have been very pleased with the extent of APS’s educational initiatives at both graduate and undergraduate levels. Training the next generation of psychological researchers is, of course, most important and obviously a critical goal of our investment in education. But apart from training people who actually will become psychological scientists and behavioral scientists in the future, I think our broad presence in undergraduate education is our best opportunity for dissemination and public awareness of psychology. We should make the most of it.

One of the most exciting things about APS is that it has made psychologists and the public aware that there are many areas of applied psychology besides clinical psychotherapy—that we are a very applied discipline. I think that promoting the application side as well as the interchange between applied research and basic research is the most important thing we can do—making sure there is a continual reciprocal relationship between our applied work and our basic theory-driven work. The same people can do both, and when they are different people there should be links in communication, and a strong appreciation for work in all areas.
Behavioral Science in the Center at NIMH

WASHINGTON, DC—The National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) is establishing a $1-million centers program for basic behavioral science research. The announcement came in March, in response to a mandate from the U.S. Congress, and the Institute's leadership has pledged full support for the program not only for this year but for future years, as well.

The idea for the centers program was first proposed by APS in early 1990. How it became a reality is an interesting story; see the chronology of events as detailed on the opposite page.

A Little Overdue
There is great enthusiasm among NIMH's current leaders for the behavioral science centers. In a recent conversation, Institute Director Fred Goodwin said he thinks the behavioral centers are "timely, maybe even a little overdue."

According to Goodwin, the centers will bring together research approaches in ways that mirror the connections between various behaviors. As he put it, this will help shed light on what happens in disorders that occur when normally integrated behaviors are "disintegrated." He also noted that a wide range of activities will be possible, including biological correlates of behavior and animal behavior studies.

Unusual Collaborations
Alan Leshner, NIMH Deputy Director, believes the centers will be places "for basic behavioral science researchers to do research they could not otherwise do—where shared facilities are needed, or where unusual collaborations and resources are needed." But, he cautions, "These should not just be sets of R01s (individual investigator grant proposals) stapled together. They must have a demonstrated need to be a center."

Leshner expresses the hope that "having these centers will attract not only traditional NIMH behavioral science researchers but new ones as well."

Pivotal Opportunity
Mary Ellen Oliveri, Chief of the Personality and Social Processes Branch in the Division of Neuroscience and Behavioral Science, says the agency sees the behavioral centers program "as a pivotal opportunity to foster the growth of integrative research spanning the behavioral and social sciences" and they are "looking forward to receiving a number of outstanding applications."

The RFA (request for applications) has been sent directly to APS members. Interested parties are encouraged to contact Oliveri's office for further information as soon as possible: Tel.: 301-443-3942; fax: 301-443-4822; Email: OMR@NIHCUBITNET. The deadline for receipt of applications is June 24, 1993.

Novel and Focused
It is expected that one or two centers will be supported in FY 1993. The stated purpose of the centers "is to provide a unified, integrated research environment in which to pursue novel and focused questions in basic behavioral science related to mental health."

The centers will be supported by the Center grant mechanism (P50). The RFA is a one-time solicitation, with support provided for up to five years.

When asked why the centers are funded under an RFA rather than an on-going program announcement, Goodwin said NIMH is being "prudent" in an uncertain current fiscal climate. He noted that the President's Fiscal Year (FY) 1994 budget request proposes a slight reduction in funding from FY 1993. It is not clear what impact this might have on the centers program next year, but Goodwin indicated that the current budget outlook shakes the agency's confidence about funding in future years.

But Wait, There's More
The new centers program is just one of several initiatives in the behavioral sciences now—or soon to be—under way at NIMH. From time to time in these pages you have been reading about how APS has been prodding NIMH to create a number of new behavioral science initiatives. These have included not just the centers program, but also a program to attract new, younger behavioral scientists to NIMH-funded research. We recently learned that NIMH is about to launch just such a program. Look for information in future editions of the Observer. S.B.
Travel back with us to February 7, 1990—It was on that day APS proposed the idea of establishing a behavioral science centers program at NIMH. It happened while Executive Director Alan Kraut was interviewing Lew Judd—then NIMH program director—for the March 1990 Observer:

KRAUT: Centers funding is ... getting popular across the various agencies. ... Any chance for a behavioral science centers program?
JUDD: ... that's interesting. No one has raised that at this point. I would be very open to considering it. We have a very active centers program here. ... There has never been, interestingly enough—and that may say something—a suggestion for the creation of a behavioral science center.
KRAUT: Look back on this interview as creating the notion. That was three years ago. In the spring of 1993, a behavioral science centers program was inaugurated. Just like that!

Build It and They Will Come
Well, not just like that. In fact, rather than simple cause and effect—build it and they will come—the path leading to the establishment of the Behavioral Centers program was more a case of “for every action there is an equal and opposite reaction.” While Judd personally may have been open to the idea, getting a behavioral centers program was another story.

When further official interest from NIMH was not forthcoming, APS turned to Congress. We persuaded the Senate Appropriations subcommittee that oversees NIMH to support behavioral science centers. This led to the following language in the Appropriations report that directed the agency’s budget for fiscal year (FY) 1991:

The Committee was pleased to learn of the NIMH Director’s interest in behavioral science research centers, and would like to see how this interest is being pursued. We would be interested in seeing a timetable for a behavioral centers program, including schedules for distributing an announcement, for review, and for funding.

One Ringy-Dingy...
Note the relatively soft tone. “Was pleased...would like...would be interested.” This should have been a wake-up call from the lawmakers allowing the agency a fair amount of leeway on the issue. But NIMH chose to ignore this report. So with APS’s encouragement, the next year’s (FY 1992) Senate Appropriations report was a little stronger:

The Committee has not received a timetable for implementing a behavioral science research centers program, including schedules for announcing, reviewing, and fund-

ing such centers. The Committee requests that NIMH provide by January 31, 1992, a status report on the agency’s plan for this initiative.

Two Ringy-Dingy’s...
The shift in tone, predictably, did elicit a response from the NIMH. But just as predictably, it was a masterpiece of bureaucratic dodging.

In a three-page report with the somewhat misleading title of “Behavioral Science Research Centers,” NIMH told the Senate that “[t]he behavioral science research centers concept has provided a stimulus and focal point for review and evaluation of the NIMH investment in behavioral and social science research.” The agency then proceeded to list existing research centers that had behavioral or social science, and said this should satisfy the Senate’s interest.

In fact it had the opposite impact by pointing out how diluted the agency’s support was for behavioral and social science research. (The remainder of the report, by the way, explained that behavioral and social science research was essential in implementing the primary activities of the agency.)

They Didn’t Get It
This response wouldn’t have set well with the Senate folks even if APS hadn’t been right there to point out the non-responsiveness of the response. So, for the third year in a row, the Senate Appropriations Committee highlighted the behavioral science centers in its report. This time, the gloves were off. No more Mr./Ms. Nice Guy/Gal:

In the fiscal year 1992 report, the Committee requested NIMH to submit a plan for implementing a behavioral science research centers program. The agency responded that behavioral science research is being supported at several centers. The Committee is deeply concerned that the agency is continuing to sidestep this issue and is resisting congressional mandates to strengthen its support for behavioral science research. Therefore the Committee directs NIMH to develop a centers program for behavioral science research in fiscal year 1993.

So what started out as “pleased,” and “would be interested” eventually became “sidestepping,” “deeply concerned,” and one of the most dreaded things an agency can encounter, the word “directs.”

But Now They’ve Got It
It took three years, and increased Senate displeasure, but the NIMH has now issued the first of what is hoped to be an annual RFA (request for applications) for “Centers for Behavioral Science Research.”
of basic and applied research be associated with APS. It is in that spirit that I have been concerned about accreditation of psychology departments. Because I believe training people—to be scientist-practitioners, including the practitioners of clinical, counseling and school psychology—is part of one aspect of a broad spectrum of applied psychological science. I am very concerned that the accreditation process not make certain areas of applied science very different from other areas of applied psychological science. All training in all areas of application should be first of all science training plus the necessary ethical and practical knowledge and experience associated with each particular specialty.

So my involvement in accreditation (as chair of the accreditation summit in 1992 and now as chair of the accreditation steering committee) springs from my interest in developing alternative procedures and criteria for an accreditation system that would apply to scientist-practitioner doctoral programs in universities. The point is to be supportive of science as the first priority without being naive in failing to recognize the special needs in training for practice. But any application, any area, has special needs. The fact that clinical practice has special training needs is something that should be seen in the same way that other special training needs exist for other specialty areas.

Q: Some in basic science areas have raised eyebrows at APS's as well as your involvement in accreditation, no?

I want to say a word about why I am involved in this—certainly people who have known me throughout my career would not have predicted that I would be chairing a committee to develop an alternative model of accreditation for psychology doctoral programs. I have fought things like accreditation and designation throughout my career. I have been a foe of the whole concept of professional accreditation at all in departments of psychology. But I have come to accept the idea that if part of our mission in terms of training doctoral students in psychology involves interfacing with the practice of clinical, counseling and school psychology as one of the areas of application, then accreditation or something...
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An Animal Researcher’s Battle: The Rest of Michael Carey’s Story

This past January 24th, you may have seen the episode of CBS Television’s 60 Minutes program titled “Michael Carey, M.D.” The show portrayed the ordeal Carey has been going through since 1988, when animal rights activists first launched their campaign to end his research on brain injuries. APS decided to interview Carey, an army neurosurgeon and researcher at Louisiana State University (LSU) School of Medicine, and learned some very interesting details of the case that did not come out in the 60 Minutes story.

Research Derailed

Having treated hundreds of head-injured soldiers in Vietnam and been frustrated by the high casualty rate (45% of those who died from a single wound in ground combat in Vietnam were victims of head wounds), Carey was determined to find better treatments and to save more soldiers’ lives. Focusing on brain wounds, he received funding from the Department of Defense to conduct research (using anesthetized cats).

His research at LSU was making tremendous strides with a new drug that helped the injured brain recover better and faster, when his research became the target of an organization called Physicians Committee for Responsible Medicine (PCRM), founded by Neal Barnard, a non-practicing psychiatrist and self-proclaimed nutritionist.

The organization’s very name is misleading. PCRM is composed predominately of antivivisectionists, few of whom are bona fide physicians (less than 10% by their own admission) and less than 0.005% of all physicians in the United States are members of PCRM, according to the American Medical Association.

But Barnard’s group effectively bombarded U.S. Representative Bob Livingston (R-LA) with deceptive misinformation about Carey’s research project and demanded that his funding be cut off. Livingston requested a General Accounting Office (GAO) investigation of Carey’s research that dragged on for two years. Before the GAO report was complete, Livingston used his membership on the House Armed Forces Appropriations Committee to suspend Carey’s research funding.

Not What the Congressman Wanted to Hear

“There is a whole other story to be told that 60 Minutes did not touch upon” Carey said, and that was “the flagrant misuse of the investigative process of the GAO.” In what began well, the GAO appointed a seven-member committee whose members collectively had published more than 350 brain research papers. This panel concluded Carey’s research was worthwhile and was conducted in a humane and responsible manner, and should be continued. But that was not the end of it. Carey told us that, in an unusual move, the GAO then assembled a panel of veterinarian anesthesiologists to review his research. None of these individuals had published a paper on brain research in the previous 15 years, and some had never published such papers.

“The veterinarians did not submit a written report as did the first committee,” Carey noted. Their comments consisted of criticism of the method in which Carey anesthetized the cats, claiming it skewed the results of his research. Carey used i.p. and i.v. pentobarbital for his studies on brain edema and cerebral blood flow, anesthetics which have been commonly used for this purpose.

In 1990, more than a year after his project had been suspended, the GAO issued its report. Carey’s contract concluded in the spring of 1991. At the time, Carey was serving in Operation Desert Storm treating soldiers in desert field hospitals.

Not So Hidden Agenda

According to Carey, the GAO buried the report of the expert scientists involved in the investigation on page 284 of their 369-page report, and they built their 30-page executive summary “on the peripheral comments of the veterinarian anesthesiologists.” Four of the seven scientists on the original panel protested to the GAO over this but their protests fell on deaf ears. And when Carey, along with two deans from LSU, met with the GAO about the inaccuracies in the report, he was told “Doctor, the GAO can write anything it wants to in the report.”

Carey and others in the research community feel that Representative Livingston just wanted to end Carey’s research to squelch the PCRM-induced outcry from constituents who were misled into believing the cats used in Carey’s lab were being tortured. When we asked Carey if Livingston actually knew what was going on with PCRM’s misinformation campaign to end all use of animals in research, he replied “Many people from LSU and other universities had spoken with him about research.” Carey has “not heard a word” from Livingston since the GAO report came out nor since the 60 Minutes segment aired.

“Nobody’s Research Is Safe”

The dangerous precedent set by this action highlights the “politicalization of science,” warns Carey. That an organization like the PCRM has the ability to...
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terminate promising research "should make scientists' hair stand up on end," he says. "Nobody's research is safe," he continued. "The scientific community ought to raise hell about this kind of GAO review, because if it can happen to me, it can happen to anybody."

Carey doesn't believe the antivivisectionists are slowing down their activities either. He emphasized that "...they are as active as ever." He read to us from a flyer he recently received from the New England Antivivisection Society (on whose board Barnard sits) soliciting funds to launch a campaign against a neuroscience researcher at Boston University. It claims he is involved in a "cat killing experiment that needs to be stopped."

"This guy knows no bounds," Carey said. "Scientists must come out of the labs and be more visible and vociferous in enlightening the public about Barnard's tactics."

Impotent from Eating Meat

Barnard and his "physicians" group are no strangers to organized medicine. Over the past few years, the American Medical Association (AMA) has refuted many of PCRM's inaccurate statements (e.g., "25% of males will be impotent from eating meat") and has formally requested the PCRM "terminate the inappropriate and unethical tactics used to manipulate public opinion against the use of animals in biomedical research."

"The intellectual bankruptcy and basic dishonesty of the PCRM should be exposed," says Carey. "It's very important to get the message out that this guy [Barnard] is totally without scientific qualifications." A MedLine search reveals that Barnard has no scientific publications in medicine, yet he routinely accuses bona fide researchers of scientific fraud. The AMA noted in a recent press release that Barnard is also the "scientific advisor to the People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals (PETA), an organization that supports and speaks for the terrorist organization known as the Animal Liberation Front (ALF)."

Positive Response to 60 Minutes

We asked Carey about the response he had received following the 60 Minutes episode, and he indicated he had received close to 200 letters (all but seven were positive) "from a variety of people including those looking for help with brain injuries of their own or family members, a Nobel prize winner, and non-professional as well as professional people." When asked if he ever considered giving up his research under the extreme pressure and threats from the animal rights activists, he replied emphatically, "Representative Livingston by a rider to the 1989 defense appropriations bill, effectively stopped my research .... It was involuntary on my part. I believe the research is very critical."

Though the picketing and threats against Carey have stopped for now, the antivivisection campaign to end all use of animals in biomedical and behavioral research continues.

In the meantime, Carey has received an Army contract to study brain injury in anesthetized rats and remains undaunted in his determination to alleviate human suffering and death. As he said so poignantly on 60 Minutes, "...When you look at the Vietnam Wall, you see a name, but I hear a voice saying, 'Help me!'" B.W.

Judge Overturns USDA Animal Welfare Regulations

A recent ruling by federal court Judge Charles Richey has the research community very concerned. The February 25 ruling would overturn portions of the Animal Welfare Act dealing with the care and treatment of dogs and non-human primates used in research. The ruling results from a 1991 suit brought against the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), the Department of Health and Human Services (HHS) and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB), by the Animal Legal Defense Fund and several other animal rights activists. As the Observer went to press, the USDA was still reviewing the decision on whether to appeal to the Department of Justice. The USDA has until April 26 to decide whether to appeal the ruling.

Under the ruling, Judge Richey claimed that the USDA in drawing up its 1991 guidelines implementing the Animal Welfare Act, failed to set minimum standards for ensuring the "psychological well-being" of primates and ordered that more specific provisions for housing and exercise be written. Currently, researchers use "performance-based" guidelines which allow flexibility in determining the individual needs of animals, since these vary greatly according to species. The animal activists would like to see "engineering standards" established. Such standards would spell out very specific cage design and exercise program requirements, but researchers believe these are not only inappropriate and too restrictive, they also argue that they are not in the best interest of the animals, since there is insufficient information on many species' needs.

In addition to the enormous task of establishing what the minimum standards should be, the cost to comply with them could be as much as $2 billion by some estimates. Many research institutions, having just recently completed costly revisions in their laboratories to comply with the requirements in the 1991 USDA regulations, would find these recent changes obsolete. It could be particularly costly to behavioral researchers who often use dogs and primates in their research. APS has written to Agriculture Secretary Mike Espy and HHS Secretary Donna Shalala, whose agency provides grants to about 1,000 research institutions through the NIH, to urgently request appeal of the ruling.
firms, and public and private organizations will need to learn to manage resources in different ways. The emphasis on systems management within a different technological universe requires different decision and management tools. Location and siting decisions require the use of emerging Geographic Information System (GIS) technologies. Financing public infrastructure construction requires a better understanding of the problems of public finance during times of budget stringencies. Legal restrictions on new approaches to construction could seriously curtail experimentation. In all these areas, research supported by SBER will provide information that is vitally important to the success any attempt to rebuild the nation’s public infrastructure.

The Human Capital Initiative proved appropriate for SBER to consider, given the extensive outreach that produced the initiative as well as the breadth and timeliness of its concerns. A proposal from the American Psychological Society to support further development of the initiative won endorsement from both within and outside of SBER. The scholars who reviewed it commented favorably, not just on the attractiveness of its ideas, but on the quality of the plan for tackling them. Consequently, SBER awarded a grant to help APS organize workshops through which a concrete research agenda would evolve.

The Human Capital Initiative meshes well with interdisciplinary research, partnerships with other agencies and organizations, and the enhancing of human capabilities.

**The Human Capital Initiative meshes well with the emphasis of NSF on interdisciplinary research, partnerships with other agencies and organizations, and the enhancing of human capabilities.**

---

**APS Staff Addition...**

**Paul Rigby Joins APS as Bookkeeper and Office Manager**

APS welcomes Paul Rigby as the new Bookkeeper/Office Manager. Paul will oversee and coordinate all of APS’s financial activities as well as provide administrative assistance for the smooth operation of office support.

Paul joined APS staff on March 15, and comes to us with eight years of experience in accounting. Six of those years were spent at the National Building Museum, a national membership organization in Washington, DC, where he oversaw the computerization of all phases of their accounting system. Prior to that, Paul worked in the accounting department of Crestar Bank, one of Washington’s largest banks, and he served as a staff accountant for five years for the municipality of New Amsterdam in Guyana.

Picking up quickly on the many and varied tasks required of a manager of a small office, Paul seems to be enjoying working at a smaller organization for a change. “I’m most impressed by the camaraderie of the APS staff,” he said. “It’s a sharp and pleasant contrast to the climate of the large organizations in which I’ve worked.”

A native of Guyana, Paul brings a high level of expertise that will be beneficial to the increasingly sophisticated accounting and office managerial needs of APS. Paul attended the University of Guyana and the Prince Georges Community College in Maryland. He is also a member of the American Institute of Professional Bookkeepers.

Because Paul replaces APS’s former financial officer, Patricia Redmon, who left APS to pursue entrepreneurial interests, APS’s staff remains at a “lean and nice” total of 10.

Moreover, the initiative complements the SBER endeavors to move cognitive science forward. Aware of the part that human reasoning plays in countless arenas, the predecessor Division launched an initiative to elucidate that phenomenon. That initiative began in 1992 with a set of workshops to assess developments in cognitive science and the niche NSF might fill. The workshops produced recommendations that formed the basis for a Foundationwide effort to reveal the processes through which both biological and artificial systems handle complex information. Planning for that effort continues in 1993; increased support for interdisciplinary projects is expected for 1994.

We anticipate that initiatives will continue to emerge in NSF, augmenting the curiosity-driven research that will remain our insignia. We anticipate, too, that the problems to which the initiatives speak will demand knowledge about humans—their behavior, predilections and products. Hence, we invite the views and participation of the community of psychologists, to give us confidence that the paths we follow lead to significant ends, that we recognize the accomplishments past research has brought, and that we promote conceptual and methodological advances able to address contemporary issues and those not yet fathomed.
equivalent to it has come to be a necessity to allow individuals flexibility in that system. To train people to work in that area and not give them the wherewithal to be licensable is to send them off with a serious handicap in working in clinical settings.

So, given the inevitability of it, my concern is the extent to which the fact of accreditation competes with the primary goal of PhD training, namely, preparing people to be independent research scientists. I am not taking a stand against graduate education seems to me first and foremost research training.

Q: What is the current status of the accreditation effort?

The steering committee has worked out a draft of principles for an accreditation system. The primary principles are that science should underlie practice, that something equivalent to a peer review system. The primary principles are that science and the philosophy of science is the peer scientists. Is it that intersects three quite different disciplines: the physics of sound sources and the propagation of sound through air and other materials, the anatomy and physiology of the transformation of the physical sound into neural activity in the brain, and the psychology of the perception we call hearing. Compact disc (CD) contains more than 20 acoustic demonstrations, 0-8058-1251-2 [c]/6-93/320pp/$69.95 0-8058-1348-6 [p]/$32.50 0-8058-1450-7 [paper + CD]/$49.95 0-8058-1451-5 [CD only]/$19.95 * Please note that CDs cannot be returned.

RULES OF THE MIND
John R. Anderson
Relating to the earlier well-known ACT production system theory, this book's basic goal is to present evidence for the psychological reality of a production system model of mind. The new theory -- ACT-R -- involves a neurally plausible implementation of a production system architecture. The theory is applicable to a wide variety of research disciplines, including memory, problem solving, and skill acquisition. Accompanying disk (for use with LISP 2.0 on a Mac II) allows readers to explore the simulations described in the text. 0-8058-1445-7 [c]/6-93/304pp/$69.95 Special Prepaid Offer! $45.00 No further discounts apply 0-8058-1200-9 [p]/$24.95

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF PREJUDICE
The Ontario Symposium, Volume 7 edited by Mark P. Zanna and James M. Olson
A Volume in the Ontario Symposium on Personality and Social Psychology Series Presents state-of-the-art research programs addressing prejudice from the point of view of bigoted people and victims. The chapter authors confront the primary issues two major -- and previously separate -- research traditions: the psychology of attitude and intergroup conflict. Topics covered include the normative and consequences of stereotypes, individual differences in prejudice attitudes, intergroup relations, and victims' responses. 0-8058-1116-2 [c]/6-93/368pp/In Press 0-8058-1353-1 [p]/In Press
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if it chose to do so. There are about two hundred university programs that would potentially be able to commit themselves to this kind of endeavor.

Q: Who is doing this, APS?

No, APS’s involvement is basically a support function, helping the effort get under way, providing some staff support.

Q: When did you first get involved with APS?

Before it was born, when a small group of American Psychological Association [APA] “activists” first decided the time had come to create an independent organization to represent psychology as a science and an academic discipline.

I was on the APA Board of Directors at that time. The Council of APA took a relatively defensive posture at that time, threatening that anyone involved in APS couldn’t hold office in APA. I think they regret it now, but that’s how it started. That led Sandra Scarr and me to resign from the APA Board of Directors. It was one way of demonstrating that APS was an independent venture and that we were going to devote our energies to it.

Later I worked on the APS graduate education and publications committees. But I didn’t run for office. It seemed to me really important to get as many new people—senior people in the field but new to the organizational effort—into our APS Board of Directors.

My decision also had to do with keeping APS “lean and nice” as far as bureaucratic structure is concerned. That’s a real problem. I firmly believe in the kind of leaness in the administrative structure that we’ve opted for. On the other hand, we certainly want to find ways for people to feel actively involved.

It’s an interesting tension: How do you do both—keep the organizational structure lean while providing opportunities for active roles in decision making?

I think the concept of the summit has been a brilliant answer to that problem. I’d like to see more of them.

Q: The APS summits that led to the Human Capital Initiative?

Yes, the second and third summits of 60-plus psychology organizations and the latest summit on accreditation reform that followed the HCI program creation. It’s absolutely amazing that nothing like that had ever been done before, never had there been any pulling together of all the psychology societies as at the first summit.

Yet if you had looked around, you could have seen the signs that psychology had evolved, as sciences do, into specialties, and the specialties had formed separate organizational structures. But no one seemed to have recognized that we now have more than 60 national-level organizations—that can be identified as primarily psychology—let alone all of the other organizations that psychologists belong to in other fields they’re interested in.

APA’s model was that everything develops within APA. But most of these psychology societies are outside of APA and its divisional entities. So APS then did something new. Instead of trying to incorporate all these groups, it became a broker for their interaction and networking and coming together for matters of common interests and common concerns. It was absolutely brilliant. And I think the Human Capital Initiative has had so much influence with Congress and other branches of government in part because people are impressed that all those psychology organizations got together and agreed on something. Its cooperative nature caught the attention of Congress and others. When this many organizations in psychology cooperate to say “These are our priorities,” that impresses people.

Q: Does the APS model have some interest for you as a researcher?

It does indeed. I’m very interested in social identity and how people relate to groups that relate to bigger groups. I tend to see things in terms of social group identities.

My own work suggests that individuals don’t relate to big organizations directly, that they need the buffering of smaller organizational structures.

As for APS, it’s not so much that APS itself grew that way. It’s that APS came in and saw that this is the way the world is. We recognized that this is how science is organized and how the
The overarching theme of the initiative is “older adults are a national resource.” Priorities for research thus far identified include: understanding and changing health behaviors to promote productive aging; optimizing the psychological functioning of the oldest-old; working in later adulthood; and assessing and treating mental disorders in older adults.

A draft initiative is being circulated to workshop participants and other interested parties for additional review, with a final version expected in late spring or early summer. Several observers have commented that the relative ease with which the initiative has come together is a reflection of the fact that researchers in the field of aging have a history of working together and that the groundwork already existed for a shared vision.

Glad to Be Partners

A major appeal of the aging initiative is its potential to make a difference in the daily lives of older persons and their families, according to Constance Swank, director of the AARP Division of Research, who called the initiative “balanced, energetic, exciting and definitely worth serious consideration by policy makers and the research community.”

AARP is “glad to be partners in this effort,” said Swank, adding that she believes strongly that the “results of research
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should be shared.” She also pointed out that AARP has outreach to millions of individuals who could benefit from the information.

Model Workshops

“It’s exciting to see researchers from different perspectives and societies work together collaboratively,” said Milt Hakel, chair of the HCI Coordinating Committee. He further indicated that the aging workshop, and the previous HCI meeting on the changing nature of work are serving as models for future HCI efforts.

“The Coordinating Committee has learned a lot that will be put to use in proceeding on the other thrusts of the Human Capital Initiative,” he said.

The Feds Said

The involvement of federal agency staff also contributed to the cooperative spirit of the workshop. NIA’s Robin Barr offered some important perspectives about the federal climate, commenting that there are increased pressures to show the relevance of research. This is an “excellent time for us as psychologists to develop a coordinated agenda and to direct that agenda to the different voices that are interested in us,” Barr told the group.

Those voices, he and George Niederehe of NIMH pointed out, belong to the new Administration, many new members of Congress, and an increasingly aware public, all of whom want to know how tax dollars are being spent.

Other Initiatives

Several initiatives spawned by the HCI effort are in various stages of development. In addition to an initiative on “The Changing Nature of Work,” other topics include literacy and reading as well as other aspects of education, substance abuse, mental health, and violence.

In other recent news, the National Science Foundation will soon join the growing list of federal agencies supporting the Human Capital Initiative. NSF will soon be awarding a grant to APS to help support HCI activities relating to basic research, and the Foundation also has indicated to Congress that it plans to set aside funds expressly for HCI-related research. (See related story on page 1.)

S.B.

NEW EQS 4.0

The popular structural equations package widely-used in psychology, sociology, business, and education has been enhanced, and is now better than ever.

Full Range of Statistics and Methods of Estimation for EQS 4.0:

- least squares
- generalized least squares
- maximum likelihood
- multiple sample analysis
- analysis of means and covariances
- asymptotic distribution free
- estimates with elliptical correction
- Satorra & Bentler scaling correction
- Akaike information criterion
- Bentler-Bonett fit indices
- comparative fit index
- average residuals
- Weight-type standardized solution
- categorical dependent variables
- polyserial and polychoric correlation for treating categorical data
- ability to import weight matrices
- Runs On A Variety Of Computing Platforms

EQS is available for MS Windows 3.1, DOS, Macintosh, IBM/CMS, IBM/OS, VAX/VMS, DEC/ULTRIX, SUN/OS, and RS6000/AIX.

Call us for more information, or to ask about our special upgrade and introductory price offers.

SPECIAL PRICE OFFER

Now Available! EQS/Windows

EQS 4.0 offers substantial new statistical, user interface, and plotting options exclusively for the new EQS/Windows package:

- new spreadsheet-like data editor
- improved data import/export facility
- extensive data manipulation functions
- basic statistics through factor analysis
- intuitive built-in code generator
- enhancements to RETEST and WTEST options
- several new plotting capabilities

For more information, contact BMDP Statistical Software, Inc., 1440 Sepulveda Blvd., Suite 316, Santa Monica, CA 90405, phone 310-479-7799, fax 310-312-0161.
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the behavioral science community who wanted a separate, more visible, presence at NSF. This was seen as the solution to the chronic underfunding these previous structure where they were subsumed under the biological sciences directorate.

This latest development is exactly what we hoped would happen once the separate directorate was formed. It should be noted that the set-aside is contingent on congressional approval of SBE's budget request. As this issue goes to press, Congress is in the process of considering the Clinton Administration's budget for FY 94.

A Marrett-orious Proposal

Cora Marrett, assistant director of NSF for the social, behavioral and economic sciences, is chiefly responsible for the concept of the proposed set-aside. She has been a strong advocate of the HCI since it was presented to her shortly after her arrival at NSF a year ago. (Marrett discusses this issue as guest author of the "Presidential Column" on page 2.)

Let's Go to the Highlights

The NSF report to the Senate is too long to reprint here, but following are some highlights:

We agree with the Committee that the efforts of over 60 psychological and behavioral science organizations to develop a forward-looking plan for behavioral and psychological research addressing some of the nation's most pressing and difficult problems provides an excellent basis for enhancing programs of research support in these fields by the National Science Foundation and other federal research agencies.

Staff from the Foundation and other agencies participated in the Behav-

SEE NSF ON PAGE 30

ARMSTRONG LABORATORY & AIR FORCE OFFICE OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

Call for Workshop Applicants

CENTRAL AND PERIPHERAL VISION IN SELF-MOTION PERCEPTION

The Human Engineering Division of the Armstrong Laboratory and the Air Force Office of Scientific Research are planning a workshop on "Central and Peripheral Vision in Self-Motion Perception." The planned three-day workshop will be held in Fall 1993 at or near an Air Force Base with flight training simulators. Participants will tour the simulators and be briefed by instructor pilots and simulator engineers on the state of the art, concerns, current parallel applied Air Force research, and wishes for future simulators.

The purpose of the workshop is to be a state-of-the-art assessment of the BASIC SCIENCE underlying the selection, justification, and design of visual scenes in flight simulators. Emphasis will be on the role of peripheral vision in self-motion perception, dynamic visual acuity, and spatial orientation/disorientation. The exact topics are to cover a broad spectrum from physiology to psychophysics and may include non-visual concerns.

If you would like to present a paper, please submit a current resume and a one-page description of your topic and its relevance to:

Rik Warren
AL/CHP BLDG 248
2255 H ST
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB OH 45433-7022
email: rwarren@falcon.asml.com

If you are selected, your travel costs will be covered upon receipt of a report for post-workshop proceedings.

Administered by CSERIAC
AL/CHF/CSERIAC BLDG 248
2255 H ST
WRIGHT-PATTERSON AFB OH 45433-7022
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GET
IN THE LOOP!

Outstanding Convention Program Finalized...

After months of careful evaluation, the final selections for the 1993 APS Convention program have been made. As reported in the March Observer, program submissions were up by 20% over last year, offering a true embarrassment of riches to the Program Committee and Poster Subcommittee.

The Program Committee crafted the impressive schedule of addresses and symposia through both special invitations to distinguished colleagues and judicious acceptance of sessions submitted by the membership. Time and space constraints dictated that only 52% of the many worthwhile member submissions be accepted, and the Program Committee's commitment to a balanced program highlighting the diversity within psychological science made for a tough exercise in choice behavior. The boxes below announce the addition of two new invited speakers and an invited symposium to the program as well as the titles of the 22 sessions submitted by the membership and scheduled for the Chicago meeting.

With more than 700 poster proposals to consider, the Poster Subcommittee faced the monumental task of creating a coherent schedule out of a dazzling array of research presentations exploring every aspect of scientific psychology. Over 90% of the poster proposals were accepted and organized into seven poster sessions. A listing of posters will appear in the Convention Program to be mailed to all members in mid-May.

So make plans now to GET IN THE LOOP with APS in Chicago (advance registration deadline and hotel reservation deadline is May 26)!

INVITED ADDRESSES

John A. Bargh, New York University

Automaticity in Action: Behavioral and Motivational Consequences of Priming and Accessibility

The accessibility, or ease of use, of mental constructs relating to social behavior (e.g., hostility) has been shown to influence how that behavior is perceived. However, we have found recently that experimental manipulations (i.e., priming) of construct accessibility cause people to behave in line with the primed construct as well, without any awareness of the source of influence. Further evidence points to the activation of motivational or goal states as the underlying mechanism for the behavioral effects.

Mark Snyder, University of Minnesota

Stereotypes, Prejudice, and Discrimination: A Motivational Inquiry

I examine the motivational foundations of stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination and argue that a variety of motivations may be served by possessing stereotyped beliefs, harboring prejudicial feelings, and engaging in discriminatory actions. Moreover, it may be possible to identify these motivations and to propose interventions that may work to reduce reliance on stereotypes, as well as the prejudice and discrimination associated with them.

INVITED SYMPOSIUM

The Human Brain Project: Integrating Enabling Technologies with Behavioral Research

Stephen Koslow, chair
National Institute of Mental Health

The Human Brain Project is a broad-based federal research initiative which will bring advanced technology to address issues in the brain and behavioral sciences. Leading experts in this area will present examples of opportunities afforded by this multidisciplinary approach. Other participants: Michael Huerta, NIMH; John Mazziotta, UCLA; Alan Evans, Montreal Neurological Institute; Michael Gazzaniga, UC-Davis
Addresses with Commentators
Critical Issues in Diagnostic Assessment Combining Cognitive Science and Psychometrics
Paul Nichols, American College Testing, speaker

Can Psychological Theoretical Models Really Be Effectively Applied to Critical Disease Prevention Programs (e.g., HIV/AIDS, Substance Abuse)?
Richard I. Evans, University of Houston, speaker

Debate
Chaos Theory: Secret Sect for Mathematical Mystics Versus Popular Multidisciplinary Metamodeling Paradigm
Frederick D. Abraham, Society for Chaos Theory in Psychology, chair

Panel
NIMH Support for Research in Personality and Social Processes
Mary Ellen Oliveri, National Institute of Mental Health, chair

Multispecialty Symposia
Startling Facts About Affect and Fear: Reflex Modulation in Animals and Humans
Margaret M. Bradley, University of Florida, chair

Neural Networks in Clinical Psychology: Modelling of Behavior Disorders, Diagnosis and Sub-typing
Ira L. Cohen, New York State Institute for Basic Research in Developmental Disabilities, chair

Recovery from Attention Fatigue: Health, Effectiveness and Restorative Environments
Stephen Kaplan, University of Michigan, chair

Symposia
The Intersection of Occupational Stress and Personality Research: Negative Affectivity
Irvin Schoenfeld, City College of New York, chair

Social Context and Mental Health: Basic Research Studies
Mary Ellen Oliveri, NIMH, chair

Overcoming Key Obstacles in Team Research
Robert M. McIntyre, Old Dominion University, chair

Understanding Attitudes Toward Sexual Risk Taking
Barry E. Collins and Marie Helweg-Larsen, University of California-Los Angeles, co-chairs

Temperament and Attachment: Toward a More Complex Synthesis
Hill H. Goldsmith, University of Wisconsin-Madison, chair

New Views on Gender and Emotion
Stephanie A. Shields, University of California-Davis, chair

Whistleblowing and Retaliation in Science
Robert L. Sprague, University of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign, chair

Peer Communication Training: New Methods and Findings
Elaine A. Blechman, University of Colorado-Boulder, chair

Achievement Goals and Motivational Processes
Judith Harackiewicz, University of Wisconsin-Madison, chair

Nonliteral Language: Processing and Use
Roger J. Kreuz, Memphis State University, chair

Evaluating Skilled Memory: Methodological, Empirical, and Theoretical Considerations
David G. Payne, State University of New York-Binghamton, chair

Hands Across the Waters: Cross-Cultural Psycholinguistic Gesture Research
Susan Goldin-Meadow and David McNeill, University of Chicago, co-chairs

Community and Organizational Interventions to Improve Health and Safety
E. Scott Geller, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, chair

Why Can't the Psychopath Learn From Experience? Conditioning and Psychobiology of Psychopathy
Marvin Zuckerman, University of Delaware, chair

Gesture-Speech Mismatch as a General Index of Transitional Knowledge
Susan Goldin-Meadow, University of Chicago, chair

Have You Bought Your Ticket for APS's Special Comedy Night at Second City Theater? NO!! What Kind of Joker Are You, Anyway?

Trust us, you don’t want to miss this chance to see Chicago's world-renowned improvisational comedy troupe in action. The combination of Chicago-style pizza, cold draft beer, and no-holds-barred comedy is simply irresistible.

Tickets may be purchased via your registration form at a cost of $15 for Student Affiliates, $20 for Members, and $25 for Nonmembers. Forgot to reserve your ticket on the registration form you’ve already sent in? NO PROBLEM! Simply write a note explaining how many tickets you would like at which rate, enclose payment in the form of a check, money order, or VISA or MasterCard number, and mail it to APS 1993 Convention, PO Box 90457, Washington, DC 20090-0457 before May 26.
New Theories, New Treatments, New Technologies

AAAPP Conference to Precede APS Convention

The American Association of Applied and Preventive Psychology (AAAPP) will hold its third annual convention at the Sheraton Chicago Hotel and Towers on June 24-25, immediately preceding the APS convention. AAAPP is an organizational affiliate of APS with approximately 2,500 members interested in research-oriented applied and preventive psychology. Its convention is focused on a wide variety of applications of psychological research.

This year's convention theme is "New Theories, New Treatments, New Technologies." The program is designed to showcase cutting-edge approaches to a wide variety of real-world problems and situations. In addition to the traditional empirical studies, the 1993 program sought out theoretical pieces and demonstrations of methods, treatments, or other techniques in applied and preventive psychology.

The meeting is designed to both allow applied psychologists present their work and allow other psychologists to contribute their findings to the development of applied and preventive approaches. The program is structured so that attendees have many opportunities for interaction with presenters and other attendees. Scheduled meetings of Assemblies, groups representing various specialty areas of psychology or topical interests, provide for more focused interaction.

The convention will begin at 7:00 PM on Thursday, June 24, with a keynote address by Marshall Duke and Stephan Nowicki of Emory University. An awards ceremony and a social hour (with cash bar) and poster session will follow.

A full day's program on Friday, June 25, will begin with a panel, "New Approaches with Children and Adolescents," including talks by Anne-Marie Albano (Center for Stress and Anxiety Disorders Clinic, Albany, NY), Elaine Blechman (University of Colorado-Boulder), and Dennis Molfese (Southern Illinois University-Carbondale). A panel on "New Approaches with Adults" will follow, including talks by Lynn Tondat Carter (University of Massachusetts-Dartmouth), Steven Hayes (University of Nevada-Reno), Sheri Johnson (Butler Hospital-Brown University), and Howard Lipke (North Chicago VA Medical Center).

Assembly meetings and another poster session will begin the afternoon session on June 25. Samuel H. Osipow, editor of the AAAPP journal, Applied and Preventive Psychology: Current Scientific Perspectives, will also hold a meeting of interested persons to get feedback about the periodical and suggestions for topics for future issues.

An invited address, "Pop Psychology: A Paradigm Shift," by Lyle Miller and Alma Dell Smith (Boston University Medical Center, Biobehavioral Institute of Boston, and the Biobehavioral Treatment Center) will focus on making psychological science more accessible to the general public. The 1993 convention will conclude with a business meeting prior to the opening keynote address of the APS convention.

Scheduled as a pre-convention to the APS convention, the AAAPP convention is a nice complement to the APS program, involving no effort beyond arriving a day or two early. For more information contact AAAPP, c/o PO Box 1553, Norman, OK 73070 or call (405) 329-8411.
Letters to the Editor

Multiple-Choice Tests
Dear Editor:

The article, "How to Develop Multiple-Choice Tests," by Sechrest, Kihlstrom, and Bootzin (January 1993 Observer) was generally excellent. The poor reputation of multiple-choice (MC) and true-false (TF) exams among the lay public is often well deserved, but the problem is with poorly constructed tests, not with the test method itself. Hence, any effort to raise teachers' awareness of the issues involved in writing good MC and TF tests is valuable.

Sechrest et al. are correct that there is little objective evidence bearing on these issues. For that reason, many of one's decisions must be based on the face validity of the rationale ... and face validity, like facial beauty, is largely in the eyes of the beholder.

Incomplete advice is counter-productive, however, and I believe the Sechrest et al. article was marred by several weaknesses requiring comment. Specifically:

1. Sechrest et al. correctly note that items at the 50% difficulty level are maximally discriminating of the better from the poorer students, and I also agree that a 70% level creates a more favorable atmosphere. But the authors fail to include validity (correlation with total test score) in their analysis of this point. An exam comprised entirely of 70% difficulty items with very high validity coefficients would yield a bi-modal distribution of scores, 70% near perfect and 30% near zero. Now no one can consistently write near-perfect items, but the better one is at writing good (i.e., valid) items, the more important variability in difficulty becomes.

2. Although the choice of the number of alternatives in a MC exam is arbitrary, Sechrest et al. fail to mention one rationale for the 4-alternative format. Such items require two BITs of information. Because a TF item requires one BIT of information, there is a simple, rational weighting formula if one mixes the two types of items. Furthermore, the 2-BIT format is often ideal for writing symmetrical alternatives. For example, the amount of information required in TF and MC items is, respectively, (a) 1 and 1, (b) 1 and 2, (c) 2 and 1, (d) 2 and 2. (Asymmetry is a rule used by test-wise students.)

3. Balancing the key so that the correct answer appears equally often in each position is a rule all students expect and frequently use in guiding their choice on difficult items. The problem is that "guessing by the numbers" is differentially successful; it is helpful for good students, but for poor students, who are more likely to have missed earlier items, it compounds their errors.

I think the best strategy is to make the location of the correct alternative random, that is, not predictable by any sequential probabilities. In the long run (i.e., over one's item-writing career), each position will be equally often correct, but in the short run (i.e., on any particular exam), there may be a substantial deviation from equality. (Teachers who follow my advice must tell their students about this fact in advance. So deeply ingrained is the expectation of equal frequency that even the best students will complain about being deceived! I take this opportunity to teach about the gambler's fallacy and then urge them to learn to behave appropriately.)

4. Keeping length of options fairly consistent within items is a good rule, but it is actually a corollary of a more general rule: Be sure length is not a cue to the correct alternative. (Novice exam writers often use more words in the correct alternative.) Items with several long and several short alternatives, or those with a graduated series of lengths, may be equally as useful as ones with equal lengths.

5. Sechrest et al. advise students to guess because they may have implicit knowledge about the item. The problem with implicit knowledge is that it is indeed unconscious and hence the person is not aware of the source of the knowledge. Especially in lower-division psychology courses, the source of the knowledge is very likely to be some popular misconception about psychology. Hence, one's "hunch" is probably wrong!

I recommend that, when students must guess between two remaining alternatives, they really guess rather than pretend guess. One way to really guess is to toss a coin; another is to adopt a guessing rule such as the first visible alternative on odd-number items and the second on even-number items. I have elsewhere (Logan, 1991) described some more sophisticated guessing tactics.

Let me depart from the aforementioned article and offer two additional recommendations. First, I make all of my previous exams, together with the rationale for their answers, available to all students. I tell them that their exam will contain some old (possibly revised) items, and some new items. I explain why they should use the past exams for review purposes, not for trying to memorize all of the answers. I have found that valid items can be used many times even when the students have them available for study.

Finally, I plan the length of an exam so that there is time to go over the correct answers immediately. Students turn in their answer sheets but retain the test sheets on which they have also marked their answers. The reason for giving the correct answers right after the exam is to prevent the students from learning their wrong answers. If you wait until the next class to go over the answers, students are likely to remember their answers better than yours.

Reference
Frank A. Logan, PhD
Professor Emeritus
University of New Mexico
Department of Psychology
Albuquerque, NM 87131-4121
Tel.: 505-277-4121

Nodding Heads vs Nodding Asleep
Dear Editor:

This is a procedural footnote to William Estes's recent article, "How to Present Visual Information," APS Observer, March 1993. If my experience is a good predictor, Estes has gotten many

CONTINUED ON PAGE 30
Obituaries

Political Personality Researcher Richard Christie (1918-1992)

Richard Christie, social psychologist and APS Charter Fellow, died on December 21, 1992. He was stricken by a heart attack at Schermerhorn Hall on the Columbia University campus. He was 74.

Friends remembered Christie at a funeral in New York on Christmas Eve. His colleague Bob Krauss spoke of this "gallant and dignified man ... a straightforward and open person, but not an uncomplicated one." Krauss spoke for many as he recalled Richard's "unaffected personal warmth ... modesty ... irrepressible curiosity ... sense of adventure ... [and] deep concern for ... the poor, the victimized, and the oppressed."

His effect on students was attested to by a former student who arose to speak briefly, not giving his name: "I owe my life, and my career, to Richard Christie ... I was one of those students, one of the odd ones he nurtured along."

Richard Christie was a warm personal friend. Ours was a friendship that grew closer over the years since we met in 1968, and particularly after 1978 when we both joined the new International Society for Political Psychology. We had many interests in common, and we shared a love of travel and good food. Following most ISPP meetings, we found an extra day to tour together, often with his wife Dolores. About 1986 we began a serious collaboration, with his former student Gerda Lederer, on a book that was to assess the status of authoritarianism. Sadly, he did not live to see the finished product. The advance copy of Strength and Weakness arrived the day after his death. I will miss Dick, my good friend and valued colleague.

In 1954-1955, as a Fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences, Christie began the work that made him famous, his studies of the Machiavellian personality. Studies in Machiavellianism (with Florence L. Geis, 1970), recounted his conception of the manipulative personality, the development of the Mach Scales, and the creative research done with his Columbia University students.

He also had a career-long interest in the Authoritarian personality, an interest that he later applied to his jury selection work. He co-edited the critical Studies in the Scope and Method of "The Authoritarian Personality" with Marie Jahoda in 1954. Following his retirement from Columbia University in 1988, he devoted his time to writing a chapter on the measurement of "Authoritarianism and Related Constructs," and co-editing a book on the current status of authoritarianism that was published posthumously.

Pre-eminent Social Psychologist Stuart W. Cook (1913-1993)

The creation of solid scientific research and theory that could contribute to solving important social problems was the cornerstone of Stuart W. Cook's professional and personal life. Social psychology lost one of its pre-eminent applied researchers when he died of congestive heart failure at his home in Boulder, Colorado, on March 25, 1993. He was a Charter Fellow of APS.

The hallmark of Stuart Cook's career was his never-ending commitment to improving the human condition, especially for socially disenfranchised groups. Most of his research centered on experimental procedures to reduce prejudice and improve relations between blacks and whites. His studies of the effects of equal-status interracial contact in naturally occurring situations (e.g., housing developments, the military) and in experimentally created small groups are classics in the field.

His repeated calls for intergroup research that takes a proactive stance—rather than research that simply reacts to social events—inspired many young psychologists. Perhaps his most notable contribution in this vein was his co-authorship, with Isidor Chein and Kenneth Clark, of the social scientist statement on the negative effects of segregation on black children. This statement was cited by the U.S. Supreme Court in its landmark 1954 decision outlawing school segregation. In later years, Cook also studied ways of increasing energy conservation behaviors.

Cook's research and writings on prejudice and social events—inspired many young psychologists. Perhaps his most notable contribution in this vein was his co-authorship, with Isidor Chein and Kenneth Clark, of the social scientist statement on the negative effects of segregation on black children. This statement was cited by the U.S. Supreme Court in its landmark 1954 decision outlawing school segregation. In later years, Cook also studied ways of increasing energy conservation behaviors.

Cook's career was his never-ending commitment to improving the human condition, especially for socially disenfranchised groups. Most of his research centered on experimental procedures to reduce prejudice and improve relations between blacks and whites. His studies of the effects of equal-status interracial contact in naturally occurring situations (e.g., housing developments, the military) and in experimentally created small groups are classics in the field.

His repeated calls for intergroup research that takes a proactive stance—rather than research that simply reacts to social events—inspired many young psychologists. Perhaps his most notable contribution in this vein was his co-authorship, with Isidor Chein and Kenneth Clark, of the social scientist statement on the negative effects of segregation on black children. This statement was cited by the U.S. Supreme Court in its landmark 1954 decision outlawing school segregation. In later years, Cook also studied ways of increasing energy conservation behaviors.

Cook's research and writings on prejudice and social events—inspired many young psychologists. Perhaps his most notable contribution in this vein was his co-authorship, with Isidor Chein and Kenneth Clark, of the social scientist statement on the negative effects of segregation on black children. This statement was cited by the U.S. Supreme Court in its landmark 1954 decision outlawing school segregation. In later years, Cook also studied ways of increasing energy conservation behaviors.

Cook’s research and writings on prejudice and social events—inspired many young psychologists. Perhaps his most notable contribution in this vein was his co-authorship, with Isidor Chein and Kenneth Clark, of the social scientist statement on the negative effects of segregation on black children. This statement was cited by the U.S. Supreme Court in its landmark 1954 decision outlawing school segregation. In later years, Cook also studied ways of increasing energy conservation behaviors.

Cook’s research and writings on prejudice and social events—inspired many young psychologists. Perhaps his most notable contribution in this vein was his co-authorship, with Isidor Chein and Kenneth Clark, of the social scientist statement on the negative effects of segregation on black children. This statement was cited by the U.S. Supreme Court in its landmark 1954 decision outlawing school segregation. In later years, Cook also studied ways of increasing energy conservation behaviors.
SEE US AT THE APS ANNUAL CONVENTION, BOOTH #116

How Far Does Your Mac Stats Package Go?

“If you’re looking for the most fully functional statistical package, look no further than StatView 4.0.” — MacUser

StatView® 4.0 is the only software package that offers all the tools that scientists and researchers need to analyze data and present results — in a single application.

StatView 4.0 integrates data management, statistical analysis, graphing, drawing, and color presentation into one powerful, elegant program. From data entry to presentation, StatView 4.0 dramatically saves you time and effort.

NOT JUST ANOTHER STATS PACKAGE
With StatView 4.0, Abacus Concepts introduces many unique features not found in traditional data analysis software, including the ability to:

• access data, analyses, and results via floating browsers
• update results automatically when data changes
• generate new data columns using other variables and/or over 150 built-in functions
• specify and save simple or complex criteria to restrict analyses to data subsets
• customize and annotate graphs and tables with a full set of drawing and presentation tools

Best of all, you can save your work as templates and apply them to any other data. Because templates remember everything you do — analysis and graph specifications, formatting, text, drawings — you save time and never have to repeat your work.

StatView 4.0 was developed so that new statistical and graphing features may be easily added as modular extensions. Look for our first extension — QC Tools — this summer.

These features (and many more), combined with seamless integration and unparalleled ease of use, make StatView much more than just another statistics package.

CRITICS AND USERS AGREE:
STATVIEW IS THE BEST
The editors of MacUser awarded StatView the 1992 Eddy for Best New Science/Engineering Product. Our users have voted StatView five Macworld World Class Awards. And it’s the most popular statistics software on the Macintosh. Before you try the rest, try the best.

FIND OUT MORE
StatView 4.0 has a list price of $595 (U.S.). Academic discounts are available. To find out more, please call Abacus Concepts at 1-800-666-STAT. Or stop by Booth #116 at the APS Annual Convention and see StatView in person.

© 1993 Abacus Concepts, Inc. StatView is a registered trademark of Abacus Concepts. All other trademarks are property of their respective holders. Overseas offices:

France: (+33) 76-41-54-30; Switzerland: (+41) 32-23-34-45; Belgium: (+32) 25-34-45-35; UK & Ireland: (+44) 0 865-784000; Japan: (+81) 03-990-2311; Sweden: (+46) 08 - 225 2223; Germany: (+49) 030 31 31 13-9; Australia & New Zealand: (+61) 03 326 5255.


**Obituaries continued**

**CHRISTIE from PAGE 25**

Working on these latter publications gave Dick a chance to reflect on a long career in social psychology. Richard Christie was at heart an experimental social psychologist. He loved planning and carrying out experiments. In his animal studies conducted under the supervision of Edward C. Tolman, he found that the way rats were raised and handled by the experimenter had a large effect on their learning. This was followed by his dissertation research on rigidity in humans and his work on Machiavellianism. Other Berkeley mentors were Else Frenkel-Brunswik, and David Krech; his graduate school contemporaries included Donald T. Campbell, Daniel Levinson, and Milton Rokeach.

Christie’s political sensitivity was increased by his experiences as a social scientist in the repressive atmosphere of the 1950s when scientists in the United States were harassed by Communist-hunters. In the late 1960s and early 1970s his interest in social justice led him to become involved in some of the most publicized trials of dissidents in the United States. With Jay Schulman, he served as a volunteer counselor to the defense in the trials of the “Harrisburg Seven,” the “Gainesville Eight” and numerous other political trials of the era. Their work laid the ground for an empirically based model of jury selection.

His interest in politics and psychology led him to become a Charter Member, in 1978, of the International Society of Political Psychology. The Society honored Christie in 1990 with the prestigious Nevitt Sanford Award for his contributions to political psychology. At the Summer ISPP meetings, he found colleagues from many disciplines who shared his interests. Those associations led to Strength and Weakness, a book that became, like so much of his work, a truly collaborative effort.

Christie was born to American parents in Saskatchewan, Canada. His family returned to the States when he was four. He graduated from the University of Tulsa, served with the U.S. Air Force during WWII, and took his Masters degree (Nebraska, 1947) and his PhD (Berkeley, 1949) after the war. He taught at Sarah Lawrence College and New York University before affiliating with Columbia University in 1956. He became a full professor in 1960 and served as first Chairman of the Department of Social Psychology. He taught at Columbia for 32 years.

Most of Christie’s adult life was spent in New York, the city he loved above all others; there he met his wife, Dr. Dolores Kreisman, now Associate Clinical Professor of Psychiatry at the New York State Psychiatric Institute. Besides his wife, children, grandchildren, and great-grandchildren, Richard Christie leaves a rich legacy in his work and in the hundreds of students that he guided during his long career in psychology. He will long be remembered by those students, and by his friends and colleagues.

**WILLIAM F. STONE
UNIVERSITY OF MAINE**

COOK from PAGE 25

with the Army Air Force in the United States and England, studying the selection and training of airborne radar operators.

Profoundly influenced by the Jewish Holocaust and the hostility of war, Cook focused his postwar efforts on intergroup relations. He was selected by Kurt Lewin to direct research on combating anti-Semitism, through the Commission on Community Interrelations of the American Jewish Congress. In 1949, Cook moved to New York University—to serve as chair of the Psychology Department—where he continued his study and pursuit of the improvement of intergroup relations through his founding of the Research Center for Human Relations.

He became Psychology chair at the University of Colorado in 1963, where he was named Distinguished Professor in 1978. Later he directed the Institute of Behavioral Science there.

Though he officially retired in 1980, Stuart Cook remained professionally productive, continuing to publish important and thought-provoking papers through 1990.

Cook’s contributions were not limited to research theory and public policy; he also played an active role in the infrastructure of psychology. His concern for the professional and scientific ethics of psychologists was reflected in his service on the committee that developed a national code of ethics for psychologists, Ethical Standards for Psychologists. He also chaired the committee that developed a national human subjects code of ethics, Ethical Principles in the Conduct of Research with Human Participants.

As chair of the Joint Council of New York State Psychologists on Legislation, he led the legislative campaign that was responsible for the professional certification of psychologists in New York. The breadth of Cook’s professional contributions is illustrated by his receipt of the 1956 award for distinguished contributions to clinical psychology, given by the New York Society for Clinical Psychologists, his chairing of a national conference on the professional training in 1965, and his numerous activities within APA.

He also co-authored in 1951 (with Marie Jahoda and Morton Deutsch) the first text (Research Methods in Social Relations) on procedures for experimental and quasi-experimental research on questions of social significance. Subsequently revised by other co-authors in several editions, this book continues to make an important contribution to the training of students.

Stuart Cook sustained a remarkably high level of concern for others in both his personal life and across his 50-plus-year professional life. He was not afraid of controversy, as demonstrated by his publication (with Marie Jahoda) of articles on freedom of thought and ideological compliance during the height of the repressive McCarthy era in the early 1950s. His courageous speech that kept a volatile campus antiwar demonstration from becoming violent two decades later is also remembered.

But interpersonally, Cook was a gentle, caring, kind, and supportive person, a good listener, a valued source of wisdom and support for graduate students and younger colleagues. His deep, abiding concern for others, his basic decency and overriding dedication to doing the right thing was just as visible in his personal as in his professional life. Even on the tennis court, the “silver fox” or “grey ghost” (as some students respectfully called
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**APS OBSERVER**

May 1993
Robert R. Mackie was born August 15, 1924, in Los Angeles and died of cancer on January 31, 1993, in Santa Barbara. He is survived by Shirley, his wife of 43 years, their four children and three grandchildren.

Bob Mackie’s professional life was a major influence on the advancement of applied behavioral research. He sought to bridge the gap between behavioral science and applied problems. He relished this difficult task and inspired coworkers to maintain the highest standards of research while pursuing the answers to applied problems in human factors and engineering psychology.

His contributions to basic and applied research on human performance were widely recognized. He was, for example, a Charter Fellow of the American Psychological Society, a fellow of the American Psychological Association and the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and was a founding member of the Human Factors Society. He received numerous awards for his professional contributions including a certificate of recognition from the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, the Franklin V. Taylor award for outstanding contributions to engineering psychology, and the David Lee Shanbrom Memorial Award for meritorious contributions to highway safety.

A founding partner of Human Factors Research, Inc. (HFR) in 1955, Mackie served as its President for nearly 30 years. He subsequently headed the Human Factors Research Division of Essex Corporation in Goleta, California, until his retirement in 1989. He continued to be actively involved as a consultant until a few weeks before his death.

He wrote about gaining insight into the difficulties of applied research, noting that “there is a serious gap, extraordinarily hard to breach, between what goes on in the psychology laboratory and what needs to be done in measuring the behavior of people in real-world systems. ... [We] were challenged by the prospect of performing research that might actually, at one and the same time, lead to insights about human behavior and also to ways of improving operator performance in the real world!”

His early work reflects this dual dedication to theoretical psychology and practical problems. From his experience as a Naval Officer in the Pacific Fleet in World War II, he was keenly aware of the importance of the perceptual and cognitive performance of the sonar operators for the survival of the ship and crew. From his academic training (MA and PhD) in psychology at the University of Southern California, he was steeped in the methods and content of experimental psychology. This conjunction led to early work on identifying selection procedures for sonarmen and to important contributions in the area known as “vigilance”—the decrement in human signal detection capability as a function of time (Mackie, 1977).

Over the next few decades, Bob Mackie presided over one of the most formidable groups of applied researchers ever assembled, including Donald N. Bucker, William Harris, James J. McGrath, Chester H. Baker, Douglas H. Harris, and many others. The work produced by this organization had the stamp of Bob Mackie. His commitment to quality in research and writing was unfailing. No technical report or journal article with the HFR logo escaped painstaking cycles of editing and improvement. The quality of the work was much more important to Bob than business criteria such as corporate profitability. But, in a seeming contradiction to his unfailing commitment to good methodology and high quality, Bob was not a stern taskmaster. He was a kind mentor, softly but consistently encouraging younger colleagues to perform up to their potential.

Over his long, productive career, Bob Mackie made important contributions to a number of application areas including systematic approaches to training, personnel selection testing, driver fatigue and performance, truck driver fitness for duty, human performance in security systems, nuclear power plant control room design, and the acceptance of technological innovation (Mackie and Wylie, 1988).

Bob recently summarized his thoughts on the field of Human Factors and Ergonomics that he helped form. “Ours is a problem-solving profession. We have learned how to apply our research methodologies in the interest of making systems safer and more effective. This can be an immensely satisfying experience for a researcher. The thrill comes from seeing something change for the better as a result of one’s research or design efforts....”

Beyond his professional contributions, Bob will be remembered as a fun person, full of life and laughter. He definitely knew how to enjoy life and promoted a sense of joie de vivre in the corporation. Even during hard times, his wit and humor helped to keep things in perspective. Always a soft spoken gentleman, Bob was unfailingly supportive of others.

Not long ago, Bob wrote, “...[In 40 years] I have rarely had an uninteresting assignment. I have had the privilege of working with professional peers whose exceptional insights and abilities were invaluable stimulating.” On behalf of the many professional associates who had the opportunity to work with Bob, I know I can say that the privilege was ours.

JACK BRIGHAM
FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

Human Factors Psychologist
Robert R. Mackie (1924-1993)

Robert R. Mackie was born August 15, 1924, in Los Angeles and died of cancer on January 31, 1993, in Santa Barbara. He is survived by Shirley, his wife of 43 years, their four children and three grandchildren.

Bob Mackie’s professional life was a major influence on the advancement of applied behavioral research. He sought to bridge the gap between behavioral science and applied problems. He relished this difficult task and inspired coworkers to maintain the highest standards of research while pursuing the answers to applied problems in human factors and engineering psychology.

His contributions to basic and applied research on human performance were widely recognized. He was, for example, a Charter Fellow of the American Psychological Society, a fellow of the American Psychological Association and the American Association for the Advancement of Science, and was a founding member of the Human Factors Society. He received numerous awards for his professional contributions including a certificate of recognition from the Office of the Chief of Naval Operations, the Franklin V. Taylor award for outstanding contributions to engineering psychology, and the David Lee Shanbrom Memorial Award for meritorious contributions to highway safety.

A founding partner of Human Factors Research, Inc. (HFR) in 1955, Mackie served as its President for nearly 30 years. He subsequently headed the Human Factors Research Division of Essex Corporation in Goleta, California, until his retirement in 1989. He continued to be actively involved as a consultant until a few weeks before his death.

He wrote about gaining insight into the difficulties of applied research, noting that “there is a serious gap, extraordinarily hard to breach, between what goes on in the psychology laboratory and what needs to be done in measuring the behavior of people in real-world systems. ... [We] were challenged by the prospect of performing research that might actually, at one and the same time, lead to insights about human behavior and also to ways of improving operator performance in the real world!”

His early work reflects this dual dedication to theoretical psychology and practical problems. From his experience as a Naval Officer in the Pacific Fleet in World War II, he was keenly aware of the importance of the perceptual and cognitive performance of the sonar operators for the survival of the ship and crew. From his academic training (MA and PhD) in psychology at the University of Southern California, he was steeped in the methods and content of experimental psychology. This conjunction led to early work on identifying selection procedures for sonarmen and to important contributions in the area known as “vigilance”—the decrement in human signal detection capability as a function of time (Mackie, 1977).

Over the next few decades, Bob Mackie presided over one of the most formidable groups of applied researchers ever assembled, including Donald N. Bucker, William Harris, James J. McGrath, Chester H. Baker, Douglas H. Harris, and many others. The work produced by this organization had the stamp of Bob Mackie. His commitment to quality in research and writing was unfailing. No technical report or journal article with the HFR logo escaped painstaking cycles of editing and improvement. The quality of the work was much more important to Bob than business criteria such as corporate profitability. But, in a seeming contradiction to his unfailing commitment to good methodology and high quality, Bob was not a stern taskmaster. He was a kind mentor, softly but consistently encouraging younger colleagues to perform up to their potential.

Over his long, productive career, Bob Mackie made important contributions to a number of application areas including systematic approaches to training, personnel selection testing, driver fatigue and performance, truck driver fitness for duty, human performance in security systems, nuclear power plant control room design, and the acceptance of technological innovation (Mackie and Wylie, 1988).

Bob recently summarized his thoughts on the field of Human Factors and Ergonomics that he helped form. “Ours is a problem-solving profession. We have learned how to apply our research methodologies in the interest of making systems safer and more effective. This can be an immensely satisfying experience for a researcher. The thrill comes from seeing something change for the better as a result of one’s research or design efforts....”

Beyond his professional contributions, Bob will be remembered as a fun person, full of life and laughter. He definitely knew how to enjoy life and promoted a sense of joie de vivre in the corporation. Even during hard times, his wit and humor helped to keep things in perspective. Always a soft spoken gentleman, Bob was unfailingly supportive of others.

Not long ago, Bob wrote, “...[In 40 years] I have rarely had an uninteresting assignment. I have had the privilege of working with professional peers whose exceptional insights and abilities were invaluable stimulating.” On behalf of the many professional associates who had the opportunity to work with Bob, I know I can say that the privilege was ours.


Notes from the President

We are excitedly awaiting and preparing for our national conference in Chicago, June 25-28. Since the convention marks the end of one Caucus year and the beginning of a new one, this seems like an appropriate time to review some of the activities of the Caucus for this year. I particularly want to thank the Executive Council and Committee Chairs for all of the time and effort they have put into helping make this such an active organization.

Chapters

We are pleased to welcome five new chapters established this academic year: Freed-Hardemann University in Tennessee; North Carolina State University; State University of New York-Plattsburg; University of Central Florida; and the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill. The chapter recruitment committee reports that three or more chapters are in the process of completing their application.

Membership

Our total student membership now stands at 5,200. We want to encourage all members to participate in the benefits of caucus membership and be aware of new benefits begun this year.

Email and More

One of the most exciting new benefits has been the APSSCNNet, our own electronic mail system which now boasts 205 subscribers.

This year the Shahin Hashtroudi Memorial Prize for graduate research in cognitive approaches to human memory was established. We thank Shahin’s family, the foundation president, APS Fellow Marcia K. Johnson, and other board members of the Hashtroudi Foundation for making this prize available to us. Finally, the Mentorship program has become fully operationalized and has a growing data base.

Convention

We hope lots of students will be participating in or attending the Chicago Convention. I am especially looking forward to meeting many of you there. Please plan to attend the business meeting. We are looking for students who would like to become more involved in caucus leadership. We will be holding elections, and it is not too late to think about running for an office or chairing a committee (or just being on a committee). We are attempting to design an electoral process more accessible and inclusive of all members. Student Caucus affiliates will be easy to find at the convention. You can ask for us at Convention Registration or find us at the ever popular Job Bank. At the Professional Member Business Meeting we will announce the winners of the Research Competition and present the Outstanding Chapter Award. Thanks to all for a great year! See you in Chicago!

Bonnie

ASK AUNT KENN ...

Dear Aunt Kenn,

Is it important for graduate students to do post-docs? Are they hard to find? Is the competition difficult? Where can I go for more information?

Walking in a state of daze and confusion,
S.F.
Palo Alto, CA

Dear Dazed and Confused,

So many good questions makes it difficult to start.

But here we go... The answer to your first question depends largely on you and your professional agenda. First consult with your advisor, other students and faculty members for their advice. But generally speaking, there are some fields in psychology which seem to be moving in the direction of post-docs. This is only Aunt Kenn’s opinion mind you, but my contacts at NIH and NSF tell me that students in physiological, developmental, health, cognitive, and neuropsychology are usually encouraged to receive some type of post-doctoral training, if they are seeking jobs in the academy.

This makes sense when you consider the budget cuts and limitations under which many institutions currently find themselves operating. In other words, in a time of hiring freezes and budgetary belt-tightening, do as much as possible to make yourself a more attractive candidate. In a sense, your task in graduate school and beyond is not only to receive good, solid training in your field, but also to make yourself a more marketable academic, in terms of producing publications and establishing personal contacts with senior faculty in your field (the dreaded “networking”). This is particularly true if you have experimental leanings.

Which brings us to your next question: Where are these post docs, and how tough are they to get? Aunt Kenn suggests that you first start at your library. Most colleges and universities have some wonderful resources on grants and post-doctoral awards.

Next, contact your advisor and ask if she or he knows colleagues seeking post-doc students. Then, check the APS Observer and the APS Observer Employment Bulletin, and even the Chronicle of Higher Education. Also, don’t forget to contact any specialized professional organizations or divisions which may have information. For example, The Society for Neuroscience, APA Division 6 (Developmental), and The Cognitive Science Society all regularly publish training opportunities offered by their members. Then, check out regional psychology meetings in your area—many such gatherings advertise for recent (and ABD) student prospects.

There is one other source you might try. Aunt Kenn has
discovered a wonderful, little-known program at the National Institutes of Health (NIH) in Bethesda, Maryland, (just outside of Washington) called the Intramural Research Training Award (IRTA) Program. The IRTA Fellowships are offered for current graduate students or recently degree students, on either a summer- or 2- to 3-year basis. You may not know it, but NIH (including NIMH, NIDA, NIAAA, NINDS, and NICHD) is not just a granting agency. It is also a large academic campus housing hundreds of laboratories, as well as a major patient research clinic. To learn more, call (301) 496-2000, and ask for the publications department. As with most government agencies, there are dozens of brochures just begging to be read if you just knew where to look. Or, if you feel particularly bold, call an NIH investigator personally and ask about training opportunities in his or her laboratory.

Well, enough of the “data-based” advice. Aunt Kenn has some juicy gossip about post-docs and simply must pass it on: I hear health psychology and psychoneuroimmunology are the hot fields in terms of funding bucks for post-docs. Also, I have it from reliable sources that anybody who’s anybody in clinical neuropsych is offering some training (especially in medical schools). Also, under President Clinton, expect to have anything related to kids to get much more attention. Lastly, cognitive neuropsych is an up-and-comer—watch for funding here to BOOM!

This is but the first of Aunt Kenn’s information-packed advice column. Future editions of the STUDENT NOTEBOOK will feature equally exciting tips from Aunt Kenn. Watch this space...!

NETTALK...

The ‘net’ is an electronic mail system created for students. We have open discussions on issues related to student life, relevant political events, and research interests, and we include information about post-doctoral and career opportunities. If you would like to subscribe to this no-cost system, you need a mainframe computer account that permits Bitnet or Internet access. Then, send the following message to

 LISTSERV@MCGILL.EDU
ADD (try SUB if you don’t have success with ADD) APSSCNET YourUserIDCode YourFirstname YourLastname YourInstitution. You will receive information about the network and introductory details. Join us on the network...

Observer Reprints of Interest . . .

♦ Writing Your Vita
♦ A Short Course on APA Style
♦ How to Apply to Graduate School
Contact APS Observer for single copies.

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:

Kimberly DeLemus
Department of Psychology
CB #3270, Davie Hall
Univ. of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, NC 27599
Tel.: 919-942-0794
Bitnet: UKIM@UNC

When applying, student chapter founders are asked to provide information about the institution, department, and students, and to designate a faculty sponsor.

This is but the first of Aunt Kenn’s information-packed advice column. Future editions of the STUDENT NOTEBOOK will feature equally exciting tips from Aunt Kenn. Watch this space...!

APSSC Officers ♦ 1992-1993

All the officers welcome students and others who wish to contact them about concerns particular to their own offices.

Executive Council
President
Bonnie Eberhardt (Pennsylvania State University)
PO Box 10819
Calder Square
State College, PA 16805 Tel.: 814-234-8879
Bitnet: BKE100@PSUVM

Graduate Advocate
Kathleen White
Institute for Child Study
University of Maryland
310 Quarter Lane
Silver Spring, MD 20904 Tel.: 301-890-8669
Email: KWHITE@WAM.UMD.EDU

Undergraduate Advocate (Resources)
Ephraim Fischer (Touro College)
1002 Avenue K
Brooklyn, NY 11230 Tel.: 718-951-1183

Student Notebook Editor
Dianna Newborn
Department of Psychology
Texas Christian University
Fort Worth, TX 76129 Tel.: 817-921-7415
Bitnet: RPS01PS@TCUAMUS

Secretary
Kathleen Morgan
Department of Psychology
Wheaton College
Norton, MA 02766 Tel.: 508-285-7722, ext. 483
Email: KATHLEEN_MORGAN@WHEATONMA.EDU

Treasurer
Paul J. Reber
Department of Psychology
Carnegie-Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15217 Tel.: 412-268-8113
Email: REBER@CMU.EDU

Past-President
Carolyn Roecker
Department of Psychology
University of Iowa
Iowa City, IA 52246 Tel.: 319-338-9817
Bitnet: BLACYR@WIAMVS

Special Officers and Committee Chairs

Student Chapter Recruitment
Kimberly DeLemus
Department of Psychology
CB #3270, Davie Hall
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, NC 27599 Tel.: 919-942-0794
Bitnet: UKIM@UNC

Membership Conversion
Steve Fiore
Department of Psychology/601 LRDC
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Travel Awards/Volunteers
Aki Caramanos
Department of Psychology
McGill University
Montreal, Quebec H3A 1B1 Canada
Email: AKI@HEBB.PSYCH.MCGILL.CA

Chapter Co-chair/PSI Chi Liaison
Bill Dockett
6325 N. Bridgehampton
New Orleans, LA 70126 Tel.: 504-246-3569
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heads nodding up and down in agreement.

In the late 1960s I held an appointment as Liaison Scientist with the U.S. Office of Naval Research, London Branch. In that capacity I attended a fair number of professional meetings, in the UK and through Europe, and discovered that Americans had no monopoly on poorly prepared visuals used to accompany lectures and technical presentations.

I pointed that out in a slightly tongue-in-cheek piece for ONR’s European Scientific News Bulletin, titled something like “Ten commandments for putting one’s audience to sleep.” The response to my note was unexpectedly heavy and positive.

My favorite letter, directly relevant to the Estes article, came from an academic physicist (name forgotten, unfortunately) in the U.S. He had devised a simple procedure for deciding whether to include 35 mm slides in his briefings. It went something like this: Find a comfortable seat close to an open window. Hold each slide at arm’s length out the window. Try to read the slide. If it is legible, retain it. If not, gently separate thumb and forefinger letting the slide drop into the shrubbery. Continue until all visuals have been assessed in this foolproof manner.

H. Wallace Sinaiko
Program Director
Manpower Research and Advisory Services
Smithsonian Institution
Washington, DC 20560
Tel.: 202-357-1829

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

---

**One Easy Way to Reach the Best Candidates for Your Position Openings:**

**The APS Observer Employment Bulletin**

**Three easy ways to place your ad in the Bulletin:**

- **Fax:**
  202-783-2083 (Attn: Observer)

- **Email on Bitnet or Internet, respectively:**
  LHERRING@APS
  LHERRING@BITNIC.EDUCOM.EDU

- **Postal mail:**
  APS OBSERVER
  1010 Vermont Ave., NW
  Suite 1100
  Washington, DC 20005-4907
  Tel.: 202-783-2077

Advertising rates for OBSERVER Employment line-ads are $5.00 per line (34 characters fit on a line and there is a 6-line minimum). Display-ad rates are available on request via fax or mail. Call 202-783-2077 for a copy.

---

**NSF from Page 19**

In order to further enhance the Foundation’s support of basic behavioral and social science research in the areas of concern identified in the [HCI] document, we plan to set aside 20% of the increase requested for FY 1994 for the Social Behavioral and Economic Research Subactivity, to support basic research projects related to the [HCI] process....

In addition to the proposed set-aside, NSF this year will be awarding a grant to APS to help support the workshops being held to develop specific research agendas under the HCI. There are a number of HCI activities already under way. (See related story on “Vitality for Life Workshop” on page 3.) S.B.
Origins and Purpose

The International Society for Comparative Psychology (ISCP) is organized for the purpose of encouraging the teaching, theoretical development, and experimental investigation of comparative psychology—the study of the evolution and development of behavior. The ideas behind the society are few and simple: to foster the international development of comparative psychology, to bring comparative psychology to those parts of the world in which it is absent, to draw attention to global aspects of comparative psychology, to raise awareness about ecological crises and to take positive action to solve them. The society is an affiliate organization of the International Union of Psychological Science.

Membership

Membership is open to anyone with an interest in the study of animal behavior. Accordingly, our members include psychologists, biologists, primatologists, anthropologists, and scientists from other disciplines representing 21 countries. We especially encourage graduate students and new members of the science community to seek membership. There are two categories of membership: full members and student/re­tiree members. The $50 dues include a subscription to the society’s journal, The International Journal of Comparative Psychology. Student/Retirees pay $25. All members receive the journal, newsletter, and all official correspondence.

The “Organizational Profile,” a fairly regular feature of the APS Observer, informs the research community about organizations devoted primarily to serving psychological scientists and academics. 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.

OFFICERS

Roger Thompson, President
Franklin and Marshall College, USA

Lesley Rogers, President-Elect
University of New England, Australia

Barbara Zoeke, Past-President
Munich University, Germany

Journal Editor
Ethel Tobach
American Museum of Natural History, USA

Secretary-Treasurer
Sally McFadden
University of Newcastle, Australia

Historian
Nancy Innis, University of Ontario, Canada

Newsletter Editor
Gary Greenberg, Wichita State University, USA

Members-at-Large
Cesar Ades (Brazil)
Ruben Ardila (Columbia)
Bryan Jones (Scotland)
Emanuela Prato Previde (Italy)

BACKGROUND

The ISCP was founded in June, 1983 at a meeting of the Cheiron Society in Toronto. Our first meeting attracted members from Columbia, Italy, Japan, Canada and the USA. Our affiliate status permits us to hold our meetings with the International Congress of Psychology every four years. This meeting was recently held in Brussels in July, 1992. Symposia and individual presentations provided more than 50 scientific papers from 14 countries. Our biennial meetings are cosponsored by local scientists, in Costa Rica (1986) by the University of Costa Rica, in Australia (1988) by the Australasian Society for the Study of Animal Behavior, in Barbados (1990) by the University of the West Indies. The 1994 meeting of the society will be hosted by the University of Sao Paolo, Brazil. Our meetings have included sessions in which local scientists discussed issues of paleogeography, anthropology, and sociology as they pertained to their indigenous people and fauna. Past presidents are Ethel Tobach (USA), Ruben Ardila (Columbia), Charles Tolman (Canada), Barbara Zoeke (Germany); the current president is Roger Thompson (USA).

Publication

Submit manuscripts for The International Journal of Comparative Psychology in triplicate to Ethel Tobach, American Museum of Natural History, Central Park West at 79th Street, New York, NY 10024.

Contacts

Roger Thompson
Franklin & Marshall College
Lancaster, PA 17604
(717) 291-4202

Gary Greenberg
Wichita State University
Wichita, KS 67260
(316) 689-3823
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discipline is organized, so let’s build our role around that.

Q: How would you diagram that? With APS on the top of the constellations of specialty of societies, in the middle? Where do you put it?

APS is not on top exactly. This is not a hierarchical model. I guess it would probably be a very complex Venn diagram: One big circle with all the intersecting, interacting circles around it. APS would encompass others in an inclusive sense but not try to provide the administrative glue for everything.

I think APS has done a good job of defining a mission that is unique, recognizing that the smaller organizations can’t serve all functions for themselves. And it’s distinct from APA because of the APS exclusive focus on the science and discipline. So there’s a very complementary relationship between APS as a national organization and all the other national societies. Our recent successes at NSF and NIMH demonstrate that APS provides a clear and distinct voice for research and academic psychology.

Q: Are there gaps in your own research area, places where researchers don’t quite know how to get a handle on things?

Almost all of the positive things that human beings do they do in the context of groups or for groups. On behalf of their groups, people sacrifice self-interest, engage in altruistic acts, help other people who belong to their groups. But how to take advantage of the positive aspects of identity without experiencing the dramatic conflicts and other negative consequences of group differentiation is an area with many challenges—that is the big unanswered question.

Q: You are moving from UCLA to Ohio State...

I am. The reality of it is just beginning to hit me.

Q: Has the move been in the cards for some time?

I accepted the position a year ago. I move to Columbus right after the APS Convention in June. The position is what is called an Ohio Regents Eminent Scholar in Social Psychology. It’s a wonderful opportunity for a social psychologist to occupy a research chair of a unique sort.

Q: After Southern California how do you think you’ll like Columbus?

I’ve been to Columbus but I haven’t been there in the winter. So I had it specified in my contract that it’s not supposed to snow.

Background

Marilynn Brewer is a social psychologist specializing in studies of social identity in organizations and in society at large. Her research interests have ranged from ethnocentrism in East African tribal groups to prejudice, racism, and discrimination in the United States, often focusing on ingroups and outgroups and interpersonal perceptions within and between groups. She has looked at how aging people categorize other aging people, sexual harassment on the job, and the perceptual processes in cross-cultural interaction, and has generated a wide body of research on impression formation and the distinctiveness of social identity.

Her numerous research grants and consultantships from the National Science Foundation (NSF) and the National Institutes of Health include a current NSF grant to investigate intellectual capital and its commercialization in biotechnology.

Brewer has been president of the Western Psychological Association, the Society of Personality and Social Psychology, and the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues. In 1992 she received the Donald T. Campbell Award for Distinguished Research in Social Psychology from the Society for Personality and Social Psychology. She received her PhD in social psychology at Northwestern University in 1968, taught at the University of California-Santa Barbara from 1973 to 1982 and then at UCLA up to the present. In July she moves to Ohio State University as Ohio Regents Eminent Scholar in Social Psychology.