Second Phase of HCI Shows First-of-a-Kind Results

A Productive Meeting on Developing the “Changing Nature of Work” Initiative: Implications for Our National Competitiveness in the Global Economy

WASHINGTON, DC—Chances are, the average worker’s job has changed considerably over the past few years, and if the job hasn’t changed, the workers themselves (i.e., demographics) have changed. All of this has a dramatic impact on the nation’s productivity and competitiveness in the ever-emerging global economy.

Change Reactions

A scientific understanding of these changes is important, and organized psychology just completed a major link in that evolving chain of change. In fact, “work” and “productivity” were more than just research themes of an APS-sponsored September 20-21 meeting on the Human Capital Initiative (HCI). In two enormously productive days, a group of more than 30 psychologists from a wide variety of scientific backgrounds developed the basic elements of a specific initiative on “The Changing Nature of Work.” The group also established an ambitious drafting and review schedule that could result in a presentation of an initiative to federal research agencies and Congress as early as the beginning of 1993.

With this meeting, “phase two of the HCI is off to a flying start,” according to Milton D. Hakel, chair of the HCI Coordinating Committee, the group responsible for overseeing this stage of the HCI process.

HCI Background

The first stage of the HCI culminated in the publication in February 1992 of the Human Capital Initiative document. Intended as a framework for a sustained research effort, it targets six major problems facing the nation, communities, and families—Literacy, Productivity, Aging, Substance Abuse, Health, and Violence—and describes these issues in terms of psychological research. (APS

Congress Highlights

APS Priorities for ’93

High and Low Points of Federal Appropriations for Research

WASHINGTON, DC—A gloomy end-of-year federal budget resulted in funding for the National Institutes of Health (NIH) of $10.363 billion for FY 1993. That’s $291.2 million above FY 1992 funding and is an increase of less than 3%, the smallest increase in years. Still, included in the funding bill were congressional directives that should increase both funding and visibility for behavioral science.

Also included in the funding is $586.7 million for the National
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Pressures on American Research Universities

Charles A. Kiesler
University of Missouri-Columbia

The APS membership is represented by many faculty in research universities. Research universities are both the backbone of the education of future scientists for the country and the core of current basic research. So, APS members are probably well aware of the increasing dilemma in which higher education finds itself—caught between the skepticism of the public on the one hand and uncontrollable expenses on the other.

In the press and legislative bodies, the following criticisms are endemic. Universities are seen as out of control; unable to act; lacking leadership and direction; demonstrating poor business practices; and overcharging students despite rich endowments. Faculty are seen as avaricious—not in the classroom and not working very hard (e.g., Prof Scam).

Everywhere but in the United States, the American university system is considered the best in the world. I have read over 100 domestically authored articles unfavorably comparing United States K-12 education with other countries. I have yet to see one article positively compare the quality of American universities to other countries.

Changes in federal regulations have made life more complicated for universities. It has become very expensive to deal with changes in regulations regarding institutional safety (e.g., radioactive waste), accounting of indirect costs (Circular A21), animal care, and many other areas. A university can spend several million dollars a year supporting a bureaucracy to deal with regulatory changes, while being accused by the government of spending too much on non-teaching activities.

The long partnership between the federal government and universities to promote basic research and educate future generations of scientists is threatened. The true costs of doing research are not being reimbursed, and indirect cost recovery is being further reduced, often without any rational basis. Instead of acknowledging the special role of universities in basic research and graduate education, the federal government treats universities less well than independent research institutes, not only in terms of indirect cost recovery but direct research time as well. No research institute would contribute free time to a project. Yet the cost of a university doing so can exceed its total indirect costs recovered.

American universities have a myriad of objective problems which are not well understood. For example, we are still bedeviled by deferred maintenance that dates back to short-term responses to the high inflation times of the 1970s. In my experience, the huge estimates one sees in the press regarding deferred maintenance in some of our best universities are very likely to be accurate and will continue to rise if unattended.

Another objective problem relates to price indices. I have seen the Consumer Price Index (CPI) used dozens of times to judge tuition increases, but never the Higher Education Price Index (HEPI). There is no specifiable relationship between the CPI and

**See Kiesler on Page 20**
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Task Force Addresses Merging of ADAMHA Institutes Into National Institutes of Health

An Interview with Wendy Baldwin (NICHD) and Susan Blumenthal (NIMH): Ensuring a Smooth Landing of ADAMHA Institutes onto NIH Deck

To explore ongoing internal organizational changes surrounding the merger, effective October 1, of the research components of the Alcohol Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration (ADAMHA) and those of the National Institutes of Health, APS Executive Director Alan Kraut recently met with APS member Wendy Baldwin and Susan Blumenthal, co-chairs of the National Institutes of Health (NIH) task force working to facilitate the transition of the research components of ADAMHA into NIH. Baldwin is Deputy Director of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD), and Blumenthal is Chief of the Behavioral Medicine Program, Basic Prevention and Behavioral Medicine Research Branch at NIMH.

How well will behavioral science fare in the new configuration at the National Institutes of Health (NIH)? That was the crux of questions APS Executive Director Alan Kraut discussed with the co-chairs of the NIH transitional committee guiding the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH), the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA), and the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism (NIAAA) into the NIH organizational structure.

Baldwin: This merger is no sudden, precipitous event. For more than a year people here have been studying what it would take to bring the three research institutes [NIDA, NIMH, NIAAA] into the NIH. Now is the time to celebrate, because for the intramural research programs it’s a time to take a fresh look at how they are working together. And for the extramural programs it’s a chance to look at where we can think anew about cooperative funding and how the programs fit together. We have a bigger community now. Certainly for behavioral research it makes for a bigger community within NIH.

Blumenthal: The task force overseeing the transition will serve as a forum for scientific and advocacy groups to express their concerns and make recommendations to us about what they feel are promising future directions. We want to take advantage of the opportunity for change by looking at scientific areas that cut across a number of institutes. That’s the sort of thing that doesn’t necessarily happen on a routine basis.

Kraut: One of the issues is where behavioral science fits in NIH. I have heard a lot over the last year from people who are concerned that behavioral science within NIMH, NIDA, and NIAAA will be “biomedIALIZED.” On the other side of the fence I hear from NIH-supported behavioral scientists whose research should have been comfortable at NIMH, NIDA, and NIAAA, but they say NIMH has had a neuroscience leaning over the past three or four years that prevents a good fit with their work. They are concerned that bringing neuroscience in as the prototype of behavioral science would actually work to restrict the range of the behavioral science that will be funded at NIH.

Blumenthal: Over the past decade there

Call for Nominations

Editor, Psychological Science

The Publications Committee of the American Psychological Society (Sam Glucksberg, Chair; Judy DeLoache; Robert Krauss; Lynn Nadel) invites nominations for Editor of the Society’s flagship journal, Psychological Science, to succeed the current editor, William K. Estes, whose term will end December 1994. Nominees must be members of APS, and should be prepared to begin receiving manuscripts early in 1994 for publication in 1995. To nominate candidates, please provide a brief statement in support of the nominee. Self-nominations are encouraged, as are nominations of members of underrepresented groups in psychology. Nominees are encouraged to briefly discuss their ideas on future directions for the Journal. Nominations should be sent by March 1, 1993 to Sam Glucksberg, Chair, APS Publications Committee, American Psychological Society, 1010 Vermont Ave., NW, Suite 1100, Washington, DC 20005-4907. For electronic mail, Bitnet APS@APS or Internet APS@BITNIC.EDUCOM.EDU
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Members’ Largest Contributions to APS’s Success

Contributors to APS and the 1992 APS Convention And APSSSC Student Travel Fund

The generosity of APS members toward the Society and toward the student affiliate organization, the APS Student Caucus, has been substantial over the past two years. Monetary donations to the Society for various programs and activities are much appreciated and are testament to the commitment of APS members to the mission of APS.

Listed here are some of the many members who have contributed money to the Society in 1991 and 1992. We list them here in appreciation for their generosity.

### APS General Fund Contributors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Imam Abdulrazzaq</td>
<td>Robyn M Dawes</td>
<td>Dorothy Jackson</td>
<td>Albert M Prestrude</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ronald P Abeles</td>
<td>Rene V Dawis</td>
<td>Marion K Jacobs</td>
<td>Gary G Price</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marilyn J Adams</td>
<td>Victor H Denenberg</td>
<td>Louis P James</td>
<td>Claire K Purcell</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scott A Adler</td>
<td>Emanuel Donchin</td>
<td>George G Janzen</td>
<td>Ausma Rabe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy S Anderson</td>
<td>Timothy W Elg</td>
<td>James J Jenkins</td>
<td>Albert Ivan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter C Apostolakos</td>
<td>Norman R Ellis</td>
<td>Mylreda L Jensen</td>
<td>Eugene M Ramras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Harold Babb</td>
<td>Leonard D Erion</td>
<td>Marcia K Johnson</td>
<td>Michael L Ray</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Babia</td>
<td>Ora Ezrachi</td>
<td>John Junginger</td>
<td>Bill Reese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Babladelis</td>
<td>Herman Feitel</td>
<td>James W Kalat</td>
<td>Bruno H Repp</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abram Barch</td>
<td>Herbert C Finkel</td>
<td>Peter R Killeen</td>
<td>Henry N Ricciuti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rupert Barnes-Nacoste</td>
<td>M Bruce Fisher</td>
<td>Gregory A Kimble</td>
<td>Lorrin A Riggs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theodore R Bashore</td>
<td>John D Fletcher</td>
<td>Don N Kleinmuntz</td>
<td>Arthur J Riopelle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howard J Baumgartel</td>
<td>Raymond H Fletcher</td>
<td>J W Kling</td>
<td>Ralph J Roberts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard L Bayles</td>
<td>Gabriel P Frammer</td>
<td>Maria Kovac</td>
<td>George H Robinson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edward C Beck</td>
<td>Norman Frederiksen</td>
<td>David H Krantz</td>
<td>Judy F Rosenblith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry E Bender</td>
<td>J Rox Fuqia</td>
<td>Alan G Kraut</td>
<td>Stanley Schneider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Katherine A Benson</td>
<td>Kathy A Gainor</td>
<td>Dolores E Kreisman</td>
<td>Gary E Schwartz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elizabeth L Bjork</td>
<td>Kurt F Geisinger</td>
<td>Charles D Lauffer</td>
<td>Milton Schwobel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel D Blaine</td>
<td>Israel Goldiamond</td>
<td>Jack I Lavevose</td>
<td>Lee Sechrast</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grant S Blank</td>
<td>Edmund W Gordon</td>
<td>Howard Leventhal</td>
<td>William L Simmons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karen K Block</td>
<td>Harrison G Gough</td>
<td>Donald B Lindsey</td>
<td>Charles W Simson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois Bloom</td>
<td>Frances K Graham</td>
<td>William R Lovalo</td>
<td>Earl L Simson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles J Boltuck</td>
<td>Donald L Grant</td>
<td>John R Lutzker</td>
<td>Joan M Sinnott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter L Borchelt</td>
<td>Cecily Gross</td>
<td>John R MacKinnon</td>
<td>J A Skalston</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Daniel O Bowman</td>
<td>Elizabeth P Hagen</td>
<td>Eleanor E Maccoby</td>
<td>Frank J Smith</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard A Brayer</td>
<td>Jennifer A Hall</td>
<td>Tom P McDonald</td>
<td>Allen R Solerm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John W Brelsford</td>
<td>Rosalie J Hall</td>
<td>David McDouerty</td>
<td>Janet T Spence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lois A Brockhoff</td>
<td>Raphaol Hanson</td>
<td>W J McKeachie</td>
<td>Richard K Staley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin J Bruno</td>
<td>John S Harding</td>
<td>Ivan N Mensh</td>
<td>Walter C Stanley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David F Campbell</td>
<td>George S Harker</td>
<td>Thomas W Milburn</td>
<td>Robert F Stanners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarah D Cann</td>
<td>Albert A Harrison</td>
<td>Edward W Minium</td>
<td>Homer E Stavelly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John B Carroll</td>
<td>Robert C Harrison</td>
<td>Jeffrey S Mio</td>
<td>Jane A Steinberg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desmond S Cartwright</td>
<td>Edwin A Hartman</td>
<td>Ruth H Munroe</td>
<td>Margaret Stevens McClure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dorwin P Cartwright</td>
<td>William F Hawkins</td>
<td>Stephen D Munt</td>
<td>Kenneth J Sulka</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parnell W Cephus</td>
<td>Norman Henderson</td>
<td>Paul M Hussien</td>
<td>Murray Tondow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raymond E Christal</td>
<td>Nancy M Henley</td>
<td>John R Nesselroade</td>
<td>Robert F Utter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richard Christie</td>
<td>Roger W Heyns</td>
<td>Arthur J Normann</td>
<td>Lani M Van Dussen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Della M Cioffi</td>
<td>Ernest R Hilgard</td>
<td>Stanley Novak</td>
<td>William Vogel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth B Clark</td>
<td>Erasmus L Hoch</td>
<td>J Bruce Overmier</td>
<td>Richard D Walk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenneth E Clark</td>
<td>Barbara G Hofelich</td>
<td>Robert Perloff</td>
<td>William F Walsh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William E Coleman</td>
<td>Howard W Hoffman</td>
<td>Daniel Perschonok</td>
<td>Barbara A Watkins</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patrick R Conley</td>
<td>John L Holland</td>
<td>E Lakin Phillips</td>
<td>Michael JS Weiss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelley A Conard</td>
<td>James A Horel</td>
<td>George M Pion</td>
<td>Clark L Wilson</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frank Costin</td>
<td>Milton W Horowitz</td>
<td>John Polich</td>
<td>Stanley B Woll</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thaddeus M Cowan</td>
<td>Pamela P Hufnagel</td>
<td>Vicki E Pollock</td>
<td>Lawrence A Young</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Francis C Dane</td>
<td>Ira Iscoe</td>
<td>Marvin Powell</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### APS Convention and Student Travel Fund Contributors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Name</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joel W Ager</td>
<td>Raymond H Fletcher</td>
<td>Lawrence Z Freedman</td>
<td>Prem S Fry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mark B Alcorn</td>
<td>Joachim Funke</td>
<td>John Garcia</td>
<td>Kurt F Geisinger</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce Ambuel</td>
<td>Lawrence R Gordon</td>
<td>Arthur C Graesser</td>
<td>Donald L Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Babladelis</td>
<td>Donald L Hartman</td>
<td>Linda Vaden Gratch</td>
<td>Judith Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornelius Baldwin</td>
<td>Nancy M Henley</td>
<td>Gretchen L Haas</td>
<td>Richard C Harrison</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Barbara H Basden</td>
<td>Nancy A Hicks</td>
<td>Ernest R Hilgard</td>
<td>E Alan Hartman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arthur Benton</td>
<td>Robert A Hicks</td>
<td>Harmon M Hmisch</td>
<td>Nancy M Henley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene R Bleacker</td>
<td>Ernest R Hilgard</td>
<td>James J Jenkins</td>
<td>Joseph R Kressin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles J Boltuck</td>
<td>Howard W Hoffman</td>
<td>Nancy K Dess</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon H Bower</td>
<td>John E Carr</td>
<td>William K Estes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eregina Bradford</td>
<td>John B Carroll</td>
<td>Josephine C Ferraro</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruce L Brown</td>
<td>Delia Cioffi</td>
<td>Lawrence A Young</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John E Carr</td>
<td>John G Conger</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John B Carroll</td>
<td>Marjorie Dachowski</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frances C Dane</td>
<td>E Lakin Phillips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ursula Dorworth</td>
<td>E Lakin Phillips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nancy K Dess</td>
<td>E Lakin Phillips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William K Estes</td>
<td>E Lakin Phillips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joseph R Ferrar</td>
<td>E Lakin Phillips</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Graduate Research Prize In Cognitive Psychology

Shahin Hashtroudi Memorial Award Established

A prize for graduate research in cognitive approaches to human memory will be available in 1993 from a new source [see September 1992 Observer]. It is a foundation established in memory of Shahin Hashtroudi, a George Washington University psychology professor who was fatally shot in a parking lot near the National Institutes of Health on February 24.

The foundation president is Marcia K. Johnson, an APS Fellow and professor of psychology at Princeton University who has had many years of collaboration with Hashtroudi. At the time of Hashtroudi’s death at age 45, they were conducting research on memory and aging under a grant from the National Institute on Aging (NIA). Fatemeh Hashtroudi, Assistant Vice President at St. Francis Central Hospital in Pittsburgh, is the foundation’s secretary. Hashtroudi’s husband, Ira H. Shavel, is treasurer. He is a vice president of ICF Resources Incorporated, an energy consulting firm. Other board members are Barbara Schwartz, of the Veterans Affairs Medical Center and Georgetown University in Washington, DC, and Elizabeth S. Parker, an APS Fellow and adjunct professor of neurology and neurosurgery at the University of California at Irvine. APS is assisting in the review and management process and in announcing the awards. [See box on page 7.]

On the APS Trail . . .

Keeping up with APS can be challenging, so here’s a brief synopsis of some recent activities:

Over 900 APS members have volunteered as contacts in nearly 500 institutions to help spread the word about what APS is doing on behalf of scientific psychology and to serve as point people for APS. This boosts the ranks of the original 600 such volunteers by over 50%! To volunteer yourself to serve with this group, contact Sharon Hantman at APS headquarters (Bitnet: SHantman@APS. Internet: SHantman@BITNICE.COM.EDU) Tel.: 202-783-2077 ....

White House Science Advisor D. Allan Bromley responded to APS Government Relations Director Sarah Brookhart’s questions about the role of scientific society priority setting in relation to new pressures on government to “procure research.” Bromley indicated that priority setting within scientific disciplines was an important step toward reducing the likelihood that federal funding of basic research will lose out to the procurement model of funding. The exchange occurred at a Sept. 15 briefing by the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy at the Old Executive Office building in Washington, DC. Participants included nearly 100 representatives of the scientific community ....

A September follow-up meeting of the Accreditation Summit Steering Committee in Chicago brought the seven-person committee (chaired by Marilynn Brewer of UCLA) to a decision to begin drafting an alternative accreditation plan in conjunction with the ongoing two-year review/evaluation of the APA accreditation system. The alternative plan is being prepared to meet the needs of psychology university-based training programs. [See May 1992 Observer.] The committee will meet again in January ....

Join Hands for Education in Support of a Healthier and Safer Environment is a Washington, DC-based alliance that promotes education about the need for animal research and testing. The alliance focuses primarily on public outreach programs through communications with the news media and educational systems. APS’s Assistant Director for Government Relations, Betty Willis, attended the organization’s September symposium at the National Press Club ....

APS Executive Director, Alan Kraut, and Government Relations Director, Sarah Brookhart, met with Cora Marrett, Director of the National Science Foundation (NSF) Directorate of Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences on Sept. 14 to discuss the NSF support of the Human Capital Initiative (HCI). Also, the National Institute of Mental Health has agreed to fund the development of a mental health component of the HCI ....

A worker productivity component (the Changing Nature of Work) of the Human Capital Initiative (HCI) advanced closer to reality during a two-day September workshop as 31 participants followed up on the 1991 HCI summit (see story on page 1). Led by a committee chaired by Milton Hakel, the group began drafting specific research proposals .... [See February 1992 Observer.]

Several companies have joined those who offer major price discounts on journals, books, and products for APS members [see insert in this issue]. Discounts to APS members are available now from 30 companies ....
Hashtroudi devoted much of her career to understanding memory through analysis of how memory processes are disrupted by alcohol intoxication, normal aging, and, most recently, Alzheimer's Disease. She explored a broad range of memory issues. They included the relation between priming and skill learning, age differences in phenomenal characteristics of memory for imagined and experienced autobiographical events, and source monitoring, which deals with the processes involved in identifying the origin of remembered information.

Hashtroudi's NIA grant with Marcia Johnson funds a comprehensive study of source monitoring deficits in older adults. That research assesses age differences in remembering the sources of stored information and how the differences are influenced by perceptual and contextual detail and other memory characteristics. It investigates the possibility that older adults' focus on thoughts, feelings and other subjective aspects of experience may be responsible for problems in remembering objective information. "Shahin brought exceptional methodological and conceptual rigor to everything she explored," Johnson said. "Her affection and loyalty never clouded her ability to challenge a half-baked idea or spot a flaw in logic. She was a caring friend and wonderful collaborator. This memorial award is a fitting way to remember both her deep interest in cognitive psychology and her enthusiasm for students."

Hashtroudi was outstandingly popular with her students. After her first semester at George Washington University many graduate students in her class joined in sending a letter to her department chair and dean praising her teaching, Shavel recalled.

One of her recent graduate students wrote in a letter to her family, "She was truly the best teacher I ever had... She left a legacy for me and what she taught and in her excellence. I don't think I shall ever write a sentence without thinking of her."

---

1993 Shahin Hashtroudi Memorial Prize

Application

Deadline: February 15, 1993

I would like to be considered for the Shahin Hashtroudi Memorial Prize in cognitive approaches to human memory. In support of my application, I have enclosed:

- This signed application form
- A letter of nomination from my advisor or the chairperson of the department from which I received my degree
- A copy of my doctoral dissertation or master's thesis (accepted by my institution between September 1, 1991 and February 15, 1993) and an abstract (not to exceed 10 pages in length)
  or
- A paper, prepared for publication or already published, that is based on my dissertation or thesis
- My curriculum vitae

Sincerely,

(signature)

(printed name)

(address)

(telephone)

Note: The letter of nomination is confidential and must be in an envelope sealed by the letter's author.

Return to: The Shahin Hashtroudi Memorial Prize
American Psychological Society
1010 Vermont Avenue, NW, Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005-4907
Attn: Sharon Hantman
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A Citationist Perspective
On Psychology

Eugene Garfield
President and Chief Executive Officer
Institute for Scientific Information (ISI)
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania

Part 1.
Most-Cited Papers, 1986-1990

[Editor’s Note: The following three-part series of articles appeared originally in the Brussels Congress News, the daily newsletter of the 25th International Congress of Psychology held in Belgium in July 1992. It is reprinted here with the permission of the Institute of Scientific Information in Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.]

On the occasion of the 25th International Congress of Psychology, I was invited by Dr. Piet J. Janssens, President of the Press and Public Relations Committee, to contribute a column to the Congress newspaper. Since about 6,000 research psychologists from around the world are assembled, we decided that the most appropriate topic would be to provide an informetric analysis listing the highest impact papers, institutions, and authors in psychology. In short, a citationist perspective.

This study is based on more than 225 psychology journals covered by the Institute for Scientific Information (ISI) in Current Contents, Social & Behavioral Sciences (CC/S&BS) from 1986 through 1990. They represent virtually all fields of psychology research, including applied, behavioral, clinical, developmental, educational, experimental, mathematical, social, and so on.

The study does not include psychology papers published in Science, Nature, and other multidisciplinary journals, or the New England Journal of Medicine, Lancet, and other medical journals. We have also excluded books. Also, psychiatry journals were not included. But papers by psychiatrists that were published in psychology journals will appear, and several psychiatrists will be listed in the ranking of high impact authors in part three.

About 50,000 papers published in 1986-1990 were included in this study. By “papers” we mean original research articles, reviews, and technical notes only—editorials, letters to the editor, meeting abstracts, and other forms of research communication were excluded.

These papers received over 94,000 citations during 1986-1990 as recorded in the combined Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI) and Science Citation Index (SCI). Dividing citations by papers, the average psychology paper was cited 1.89 times. This is the five-year citation impact “baseline” for this study. It should be noted that papers published in 1990 would have received fewer citations than those in 1986. From this database, it is fairly straightforward to generate ranked lists of the highest impact papers, institutions, and authors.

The table at right lists 26 papers published between 1986 and 1990 that were cited at least 75 times during this period. Complete bibliographic information is provided—all authors, article title, journal title, as well as volume, pages, year, and author institutional affiliation.

Space does not permit detailed comments on each paper, which might be superfluous since the topics involved are familiar to this readership. This report will simply summarize the scientometric data.

The 26 papers were published in 11 journals. Psychological Bulletin accounted for seven papers, followed by Journal of Personality and Social Psychology (5), Behavioral and Brain Sciences (4), and American Psychologist and Psychological Review (2 each). Not surprisingly, they rank high among psychology journals in terms of impact, as reported in the 1990 Journal Citation Reports (JCR) volumes of the SSCI.

Thirty-six institutions were involved in producing the most-cited psychology papers, of which 30 are in the United States. Four of these each published two papers (Univ. of California-Berkeley, Univ. of California-Los Angeles, Univ. of Illinois, and Univ. of Pennsylvania). Canada was represented by two institutions (Univ. of Ottawa and Univ. of Toronto), and one each is based in Belgium (Brussels Free Univ.), Finland (Univ. of Helsinki), France (Univ. of Paris), and the United Kingdom (Univ. of Oxford).

In the second part of this series, the highest impact institutions in psychology research will be identified based on all 50,000 papers, not just the 26 papers shown here. The third and final part will focus on the most-cited authors.
### Most-Cited Psychology Papers

(at least 75 citations, 1986-1990 SCI/SSCI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cites</th>
<th>Bibliographic Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>82</td>
<td>Hastie R &amp; Park B. The relationship between memory and judgment depends on whether the judgment task is memory-based or online. <em>Psychol. Rev.</em> 93:258-268, 1986. Northwestern Univ., Dept. Psychol., Evanston, IL</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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In Part 1 of this series [pp. 8-9], the most-cited psychology papers in the combined 1986-1990 Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI) and Science Citation Index (SCI) databases were identified. This Part 2 focuses on the highest impact institutions during this time period.

To restate the basis for this study, more than 225 psychology journals covered in Current Contents, Social & Behavioral Sciences (CC/S&BS) from 1986 through 1990 were analyzed. Records for about 50,000 original research articles, reviews, and technical notes were extracted. These “papers” received over 94,000 citations from 1986-1990. Dividing citations by papers, the mean impact for psychology research was 1.89.

ISI’s databases include information on all authors and institutions. Thus, it is possible to aggregate and rank publication, citation, and impact data by author, institution, and so on.

Highest Impact Institutions

The 50 highest impact institutions for psychology research in the period 1986-1990 are listed in the table on the opposite page. Their citation impact was 1.6 to 3.2 times as great as the average for the field.

Of the 50 universities, 43 are based in the United States. Canada and the United Kingdom each were represented by three institutions, and Germany by one.

It should be noted that only those institutions that produced at least 100 papers over the five-year period were considered. Institutions that produced between 50 and 99 papers and met the minimum impact threshold of 3.00 were: Southern Methodist University-Texas (7.38), University of California-Riverside (5.44), National Institute of Mental Health (4.42), University of New Hampshire (4.39), Florida Atlantic University (4.16), University of St. Andrews-Scotland (4.12), Brandeis University-Massachusetts (3.97), Georgia Institute of Technology (3.69), University of Denver (3.69), University of Toledo-Ohio (3.68), Dartmouth College-New Hampshire (3.64), University of Rhode Island (3.60), Fairleigh Dickinson University (3.58), Flinders University-South Australia (3.31), and the City University of New York (3.08).

Most Productive Institutions

In terms of productivity, of the 50 institutions in the table, those that published at least 400 papers were the University of California-Los Angeles (728), University of Illinois (725), University of Michigan (517), University of Minnesota (483), University of Pittsburgh (447), University of Toronto (437), and Harvard University (432). Stanford University should also be mentioned since it produced 399 papers.

If you consider the entire database rather than just the table, three other institutions also produced at least 400 papers: the University of Maryland (463), Pennsylvania State University (411), and the University of Missouri (410). Ohio State University-Columbus produced 399 papers and Purdue University-Indiana followed with 391.

Most-Cited Institutions

As you would expect, the same institutions lead in terms of absolute citations (as distinct from impact). Of the 50 institutions in the table [on the opposite page], the most-cited were the University of Illinois (3,275), University of California-Los Angeles (2,794), University of Michigan (2,113), University of Toronto (2,088), University of Pittsburgh (1,997), Stanford University (1,844), Harvard University (1,668), and the University of Minnesota (1,527).

Considering the entire database, five institutions received at least 1,300 citations: The University of Washington (1,475), the University of Pennsylvania (1,461), Indiana University (1,348), the University of California-Berkeley (1,335), and Yale University (1,314).

In the third and concluding part in this series, the highest impact authors for the period 1986-1990 will be identified.
## 50 Highest Impact Institutions in Psychology
(at least 100 papers, 1986-1990 SCI/SSCI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank and Institution</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Papers</th>
<th>Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Carnegie Mellon Univ. Pittsburgh, PA</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>1,213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Univ. Vermont Burlington, VT</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>557</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Univ. Toronto Toronto, Ontario, Canada</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>437</td>
<td>2,088</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Univ. Pennsylvania Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>4.70</td>
<td>311</td>
<td>1,461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Stanford Univ. Stanford, CA</td>
<td>4.62</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>1,844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Univ. Illinois Champaign-Urbana, IL</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>726</td>
<td>3,275</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Univ. Pittsburgh Pittsburgh, PA</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>447</td>
<td>1,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Univ. Oregon Eugene, OR</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>209</td>
<td>926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Univ. Chicago Chicago, IL</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Northwestern Univ. Evanston, IL</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>1,153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Univ. Calif.-Berkeley Berkeley, CA</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>316</td>
<td>1,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Vanderbilt Univ. Nashville, TN</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>184</td>
<td>754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Univ. Michigan Ann Arbor, MI</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>2,113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Univ. Calif.-San Diego San Diego, CA</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>1,157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Harvard Univ. Cambridge, MA</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>432</td>
<td>1,668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Univ. Calif.-Los Angeles Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>728</td>
<td>2,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Indiana Univ. Bloomington, IN</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>1,348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Univ. Washington Seattle, WA</td>
<td>3.70</td>
<td>399</td>
<td>1,475</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank and Institution</th>
<th>Impact</th>
<th>Papers</th>
<th>Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>27. Cornell Univ. Ithaca, NY</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29. Yale Univ. New Haven, CT</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>360</td>
<td>1,314</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30. SUNY-Stony Brook Stony Brook, NY</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>630</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31. Univ. Calif.-San Francisco San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>668</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32. Univ. Connecticut Storrs, CT</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Univ. Western Ontario London, Ontario, Canada</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>377</td>
<td>1,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Univ. Calif.-Santa Barbara Santa Barbara, CA</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Univ. Kentucky Lexington, KY</td>
<td>3.38</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. Univ. British Columbia Vancouver, BC, Canada</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>1,131</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Brown Univ. Providence, RI</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Univ. Virginia Charlottesville, VA</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Columbia Univ. New York, NY</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41. Univ. Minnesota Minneapolis, MN</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>483</td>
<td>1,527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42. Johns Hopkins Univ. Baltimore, MD</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>214</td>
<td>672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43. Univ. Massachusetts Amherst/Boston, MA</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44. Michigan State Univ. East Lansing, MI</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45. Univ. Utah Salt Lake City, UT</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46. Univ. Colorado Boulder/Colo. Springs, CO</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>370</td>
<td>1,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47. Univ. Miami Coral Gables, FL</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48. Rutgers State Univ. New Brunswick, NJ</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>284</td>
<td>857</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49. State Univ. New York-Buffalo Buffalo, NY</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>502</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50. Texas A&amp;M Univ. College Station, TX</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>396</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Part 3.

Highest Impact Authors, 1986-1990

In the first two parts of this series (pp. 8-11), the most-cited papers and highest impact, most productive, and most-cited institutions in psychology were identified. This concluding part will focus on the 50 highest impact authors.

This study is based on about 50,000 papers from more than 225 psychology journals covered in Current Contents, Social & Behavioral Sciences (CC/S&BS) during 1986-1990. These papers were cited more than 94,000 times in the combined 1986-1990 Social Sciences Citation Index (SSCI) and Science Citation Index (SCI). Thus, the mean impact for the field was 1.89.

From this database, publication, citation, and impact data were aggregated and ranked for all authors in the by-line. More than 102,450 names were identified, which include homographs—that is, two or more authors with the same surname and initials.

In this study, we have considered only those authors who published at least 10 papers in the five-year period of this study. Some authors may achieve high impact rankings on the basis of having published just one or two highly cited papers. For example, A. Browne of the University of New Hampshire, Durham, had an impact of 128.00, based on a single 1986 paper on child sexual abuse, which was listed in the first part of this series.

Highest Impact Authors

The table on the opposite page shows the 50 highest impact authors in psychology for 1986-1990. Every reasonable effort was made to ensure that homographs were purged from the list. This involved checking each author's address.

The impact of these authors was between 4.5 and 10.5 times as great as the average for the field. And they rank among the 99.95th percentile of all author names in the 1986-1990 psychology database on impact.

The table also shows the 1990 institutional affiliation for each author. Thirty-nine authors were based in the United States. The University of Illinois accounted for four. The following institutions accounted for two each: National Institute of Aging, Southern Methodist University, University of California-Berkeley, University of Michigan, University of Pittsburgh, University of Washington, and Yale University.

Canada is represented by seven authors, three of whom were based at the University of Toronto. The United Kingdom follows with two high impact authors, and one author each was based in Finland and Germany.

Most ProductiveAuthors

In terms of number of papers, the most productive authors on the list are D.L. Schacter (23 papers), A.T. Beck and K.A. Matthews (20 each), J. Rodin (19), and P.T. Costa, J.B. Hellige, and S.E. Taylor (17 each).

If you consider the entire database rather than just the table, the following authors were the most prolific during the period 1986-1990: D. Lester, Stockton State College, New Jersey (238 papers); A. Furnham, University College of London, England (64); E.B. Blanchard, State University of New York-Albany (58); M. Mikulincer, Bar Ilan University, Ramat Gan, Israel (43); H.J. Eysenck, University of London, England, N.P. Spanos, Carleton University, Ottawa, Canada, and C.E. Watkins, North Texas State University (39 each); R. Plomin, Pennsylvania State University (36); J.J. Ray, University of New South Wales, Australia (35); and D.H. Barlow, State University of New York-Albany, R. Gustafson, University of Orebro, Sweden, and M.D. Newcomb, University of California and University of Southern California (34 each).

Most-Cited Authors

In terms of absolute citations rather than impact, the leaders on the list are D.L. Schacter (457 citations), P.T. Costa (271), D.A. Kenny and R.R. McRae (230 each), E.T. Higgins and E. Lichtenstein (221 each), S.E. Taylor (220), and A.T. Beck (208). When the entire database is considered, other authors with at least 200 citations are: S. Folkman and R.S. Lazarus, both of the University of California-Berkeley (318 each); A. Delongis, University of Illinois (257); M.D. Newcomb (254); A.E. Kazdin, Yale University, Connecticut (222); R. Plomin (220); J.P. Rushton, University of Western Ontario, London, Canada (214); H.S. Friedman, University of California-Riverside, (208); and E.B. Blanchard (206).

This concludes our citationist perspective on psychology research. Readers' comments are welcome as we expect to publish this series in Current Contents in the near future.
### 50 Highest Impact Authors in Psychology

(at least 10 papers, 1986-1990 SCI/SSCI)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Impact Papers Citations</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Impact Papers Citations</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Impact Papers Citations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Markus H</td>
<td>19.90 10 199</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Marlatt GA</td>
<td>12.57 14 176</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>Swann WB</td>
<td>9.27 11 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Univ. Michigan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Univ. Washington</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Univ. Texas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ann Arbor, MI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Austin, TX</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Schacter DL</td>
<td>19.87 23 457</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Moscovitch M</td>
<td>12.31 13 160</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Perner J</td>
<td>9.10 10 91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Univ. Arizona</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Univ. Toronto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Univ. Sussex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tucson, AZ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Toronto, Ontario</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Brighton, England</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Kenny DA</td>
<td>17.69 13 230</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Pennebaker JW</td>
<td>12.30 10 123</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Craik FIM</td>
<td>9.00 12 108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Univ. Connecticut</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Methodist</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Univ. Toronto</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Storrs, CT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Univ. Dallas, TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Toronto, Ontario</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Lichtenstein E</td>
<td>17.00 13 221</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Coye JC</td>
<td>10.90 10 109</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Rodin J</td>
<td>9.00 19 171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oregon Research</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Univ. Michigan Sch.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yale Univ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Inst. Eugene, OR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Med. Ann Arbor, MI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Haven, CT</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Costa PT</td>
<td>15.94 17 271</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Combs BE</td>
<td>10.83 12 130</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>Triandis HC</td>
<td>8.91 11 98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natl. Inst. Aging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Univ. Vermont</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Univ. Illinois</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baltimore, MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Burlington, VT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Champaign-Urbana, IL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Park B</td>
<td>15.90 10 159</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Baltes PB</td>
<td>10.70 10 107</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Spector PE</td>
<td>8.83 12 106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Univ. Colorado</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Max Planck Inst. Human</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Univ. South Florida</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boulder, CO</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Develop. &amp; Educ. Berlin, Germany</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Tampa, FL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Wyer RS</td>
<td>15.64 11 172</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>Ingram RE</td>
<td>10.58 12 127</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>Dobson KS</td>
<td>8.82 11 97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Univ. Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego State Univ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Univ. Calgary</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Champaign-Urbana, IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>San Diego, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Calgary, Alberta, Canada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tulving E</td>
<td>14.75 12 177</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Diener E</td>
<td>10.46 13 136</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>Sergeant J</td>
<td>8.75 12 105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Toronto, Ontario</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Champaign-Urbana, IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Montreal, Quebec, Canada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Shimamura AP</td>
<td>14.67 12 176</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Beck AT</td>
<td>10.40 20 208</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>Cooper PJ</td>
<td>8.70 10 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Berkeley, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cambridge, England, UK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>McCrae RR</td>
<td>14.38 16 230</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Naatanen R</td>
<td>10.33 15 155</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>Tetlock PE</td>
<td>8.70 10 87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Natl. Inst. Aging</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Univ. Helsinki</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Univ. California</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Baltimore, MD</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Helsinki, Finland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Berkeley, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Wilson GT</td>
<td>14.21 14 199</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>McKoon G</td>
<td>10.23 13 133</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Steer RA</td>
<td>8.67 15 130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rutgers State Univ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Northwestern Univ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Univ. Med. &amp; Dent. of New Jersey</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Brunswick, NJ</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Evanston, IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Camden, NJ</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Graf P</td>
<td>14.09 11 155</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>Stoney CM</td>
<td>10.20 10 102</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>Stiles WB</td>
<td>8.64 11 95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Vancouver, BC, Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pittsburgh, PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oxford, OH</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Grossberg S</td>
<td>14.08 13 183</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Hayes SC</td>
<td>10.00 16 160</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>Steinberg L</td>
<td>8.62 13 112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boston Univ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Univ. Nevada</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Temple Univ.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boston, MA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reno, NV</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Higgins ET</td>
<td>13.81 16 221</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Reznick JS</td>
<td>9.90 10 99</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Velicer WF</td>
<td>8.50 12 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Columbia Univ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yale Univ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Univ. Rhode Island</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>New Haven, CT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Kingston, RI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Brown JD</td>
<td>13.50 14 189</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>Matthews KA</td>
<td>9.85 20 197</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Hellige JB</td>
<td>8.47 17 144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Seattle, WA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pittsburgh, PA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Watson D</td>
<td>13.36 11 147</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Hendrick C</td>
<td>9.80 10 98</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Shaw BF</td>
<td>8.44 16 135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Southern Methodist Univ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Texas Tech, Univ.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Toronto Hosp.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dallas, TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lubbock, TX</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Toronto, Ontario, Canada</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Taylor SE</td>
<td>12.94 17 220</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Donchin E</td>
<td>9.36 11 103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Univ. California</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Univ. Illinois</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Los Angeles, CA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Champaign-Urbana, IL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APS to Blow into Chicago in ’93!

... And Here’s a Preview of the ’93 Convention...

APS plans to take the Windy City by storm with its 5th Annual Convention, June 25-28, 1993, at the Sheraton Chicago Hotel & Towers. As always, the APS Convention will bring you the best in the field of psychological science—the most distinguished speakers, the most provocative addresses and symposia, and the latest in research discoveries. Best of all, our carefully crafted program offers both integrative sessions that transcend the boundaries of specialties and explore major issues from a variety of perspectives and hundreds of diverse poster presentations highlighting specific research questions and cutting-edge findings.

Here’s a tantalizing look at just a few of the presentations already planned by the Program Committee ... but don’t forget that we want to hear from you, too! The Call for Proposals (published in the September Observer and mailed to all members last month) has a deadline of January 8, 1993, for submissions; please call the APS Central Office at 202-783-2077 to ask questions or request additional copies.

**KEYNOTE ADDRESS**

**Eleanor J. Gibson**
Cornell University
(Recipient of the 1992 National Medal of Science)

*Where in the World Is Psychology Now?*


**BRING-THE-FAMILY ADDRESS**

**Paul Rozin**
University of Pennsylvania

*Disgust: The Cultural Elaboration of a Basic Emotion*

The emotion of disgust will be discussed, with an emphasis on how the elicitors of disgust have changed through human cultural evolution and in human development. We will consider the hypothesis that disgust originates as a food rejection but becomes a more generalized rejection of anything that reminds humans of their animal nature and origin.
INVITED ADDRESSES

William T. Greenough
University of Illinois-Urbana

Brain Adaptation to Behavioral Demands

Once viewed as the basis of learning and memory, the phenomena of “brain plasticity” are proving more diverse than easily fits that narrow category. Changes in a variety of brain components occur in response to the demands placed upon them by the organism’s needs. The focus of the presentation will be both upon which changes are more closely tied to learning and how the diverse changes may be mediated and orchestrated.

Ellen J. Langer
Harvard University

The Illusion of Calculated Decision

A new theory of decision-making will be presented in which calculation of costs and benefits properly play a minimal role. The theory focuses on the refining of options and creating of new ones rather than merely the selection of options as in rational choice models.

INVITED SYMPOSIA

Ecological Psychology as Ecological Science:
Problem Driven Interdisciplinary Research

William M. Mace, organizer
Trinity College

We provide examples of current ecological research programs, emphasizing distinctive features: mutual roles for animal and environment, and perceiving and acting; analysis of information; analysis of tasks as goal-directed action; and a commitment to creating a system in which biology, physics, and psychology cooperate rather than compete. Other participants: Edward S. Reed, Franklin & Marshall College; William H. Warren, Jr., Brown Univ.; Claudia Carello, Univ. of Connecticut; Michael T. Turvey, Univ. of Connecticut and Haskins Laboratories.

Emotion

Margaret S. Clark, organizer
Carnegie Mellon University

This symposium will focus on the role of emotion in relationships. Questions to be addressed will include how the structure of relationships influences experiences of emotion, how our emotions color our perceptions of the other’s behavior, how our impressions of the other are influenced by specific emotions the other may express, and how we may strategically present/ suppress expressions of emotion in relationships.

Memory Disorders in Parkinson’s and Huntington’s Disease

Daniel B. Willingham, organizer
University of Virginia

Memory disorders are usually associated with damage to the medial temporal lobe, thalamus, and basal forebrain. Patients with striatal dysfunction due to Parkinson’s or Huntington’s disease also have memory difficulties. Each speaker will address a different aspect of the memory disorders. Other participants: Nelson Butters, San Diego Veterans Administration Med. Ctr.; John D.E. Gabrieli, Stanford Univ.

Sex Differences in the Brain and Behavior:
Unique Perspectives

Janice M. Juraska, organizer
University of Illinois

Recent data indicate that sex differences in the brain are more widespread and plastic than previously assumed. This symposium will explore sex differences in spatial behavior and in the neural response both to cortical damage and to variations in the environment during development. Other participants: Christina Williams, Barnard College; Jane Stewart, Concordia Univ.; Celia Moore, Univ. of Massachusetts-Boston.
HCI FROM PAGE 1

members received the HCI document as part of a special edition of the Observer. Contact APS for more copies.)

Under the Umbrella
The HCI has entered a second phase. Using the Human Capital Initiative document as an umbrella structure, groups of individual investigators representing scientific societies are being brought together to develop specific initiatives for use in planning the behavioral science research agenda of various federal agencies. Representatives of several federal agencies participated in the first stage of the HCI and have pledged to continue working with the psychology community in this phase.

There also has been significant congressional interest in the HCI process, including a directive this year from the Senate to the National Science Foundation to use the HCI in planning its upcoming behavioral and social science research activities. (See September 1992 Observer for details.)

Unprecedented Collaboration
"The meeting resulted in the unprecedented collaboration of an extremely diverse set of scientific societies," said Hakel. "I was elated by the collegial interaction of people coming from such different research traditions and viewpoints." His enthusiasm was clearly shared by the workshop participants, who represented industrial/organizational research, engineering, psychopharmacology, computers, social psychology, testing and evaluation, clinical psychology, women's issues, aging, physiological psychology, and research in judgment and decision making, among other areas.

During a brainstorming session, the group identified over 60 topics and issues relating to the changing nature of work. The long list of topics was distilled into a "short list" of several broad themes around which representatives of various specialties coalesced. These coalitions in turn are represented on a drafting group that will develop the various portions of the research initiative. James G. Greeno, Stanford University, and Virginia E. O'Leary, Indiana State University, were chosen as co-editors of the document that will be produced by the drafting group and presented to societies for review.

Greeno, who is a member of the HCI Coordinating Committee and represented APS and the Society for Mathematical Psychology at the workshop, said that the "views and ideas about research prospects relevant to work were very impressive," and that the group "covered a lot of ground" in a brief time. The goal, he says, is to find a way to best communicate what psychology has to offer within those topics.

In talking about the challenges of their task, O'Leary said one of the goals is "to provide a single voice" about the contributions of psychology to developing an understanding of and coping with changes that are emerging in the workplace. These changes range from demographics to the introduction of new technologies. "We're not prioritizing" among the different facets of psychology, she said. "Rather, we are setting a focus for addressing these issues."

A Good Model
Speed and flexibility appeared to be critical factors in moving the process along during this first workshop. Both factors will continue to be essential for the success of this and other HCI projects, particularly when the initiatives enter the operating environment of the federal agencies and Congress.

"At this point," according to Hakel, "it looks like the workshop process will serve as a good model for future initiatives. It is open to all societies, it is collaborative and it is fast." S.B.
Behavioral Research Budgets

Although APS would like to have seen more money available for agencies supporting behavioral science research, the good news is that Congress continues to underscore the importance of behavioral science in reports that accompany appropriations bills. These reports reflect congressional intent, and they influence funding priorities within federal research agencies—something that is especially important at a time when funding is tight.

As in past years, APS again worked closely with members of the House and Senate appropriations committees to ensure a greater recognition of behavioral science research in the programs of NIH and NIMH. The following excerpts, taken from both the House and Senate appropriations committee reports for the FY 1993 budgets, are some of the results.

“Greying of Behavioral Science Researchers” - NIMH

Concerned with the growing problem of recruiting and retaining young investigators in behavioral science research, APS has for the past several years been urging NIMH to reverse the disturbing erosion in the base of young psychology researchers. The Senate appropriations subcommittee overseeing NIH and NIMH has also expressed concern about this trend. The subcommittee first included language in the 1990 appropriations report directing the NIMH to set aside funds to help reverse this trend. There has been some movement: APS helped arrange a workshop this past March at NIMH to develop solutions and strategies to the problem (see May 1992 Observer). However, Congress remained dissatisfied with the lack of progress as demonstrated in the following report language:

The Committee is aware of an alarming decline in NIMH support for young investigators in the behavioral sciences. The Committee is concerned that this decline must be reversed, or the Nation’s ability to study the psychological, behavioral, and social factors associated with the health and welfare of its people will erode. The Committee had directed NIMH previously to set aside sufficient funds to reverse this trend in the behavioral sciences. To date,
HEPI (although the latter is usually higher), but in 1984-90, the HEPI rose 60% more than the CPI.

Further, the HEPI is representative of all colleges and universities and underestimates the costs of a major university. Major research universities invest more in technology—in the classroom and in research—and replace it more quickly. They are also more dependent on a base of cutting-edge scientific journals and books, the prices of which are going up much faster than, say, the periodicals index. Further, the HEPI does not take into account increasing demands of the federal government on grants accounting, safety in research space, and the sharing of research costs.

One important way in which universities as organizations are different from big business is that their personnel costs represent a much larger proportion of total costs. Thus, although rapidly increasing costs of health care and Medicare and raised salary ceilings of social security affect all businesses, they have a disproportionate financial impact on universities.

There are no simple answers in this complicated situation. Clearly, we must get on top of our financial situation, and convince the public that we are. American universities must become more sophisticated in business principles of management. However, we certainly must avoid perhaps the major problem of American business today—namely, the tendency to emphasize short-term gain at the expense of long-term stability. The problem with an emphasis on management is that it typically requires a greater centralization of authority. Already, polls indicate that faculty tend to regard their university administration as authoritarian, and greater centralization is unlikely to be well appreciated.

But, these business issues are only part of the challenge, because if American universities are actually run principally as corporations, they will cease to be the best in the world. The defining quality of American universities is faculty independence. The clash of ideas and values provides a haven for the outspoken and those ahead of their times, and a sense of intellectual excitement that, in my opinion, distinguishes the very best universities from all others.

To be effective, American universities must adequately represent publicly two quite different cultures: the business/management perspective, which tends to be what is emphasized by the public; and the creative/scholarly perspective, which is the one emphasized by the faculty. The creative/scholarly perspective is typically represented by individual entrepreneurs within the university, leading Cohen and March (1974) to refer to the American university as “organized anarchy,” and Karl Weick (1985) to describe universities as representing “loosely coupled nodes.” The special quality of a research university comes through its scholarly effort, and the more deeply ingrained and special that effort is, the more difficult it is to run a university as if it were a business.

The emerging great universities in the coming decades will be those which can develop conceptual umbrellas under which seemingly contradictory cultures can flourish—those of the business and creative worlds. While we ask a skeptical public to sacrifice on our behalf, we also must sacrifice. The overriding issue should be to maintain the American university system as it has been for decades—the best in the world.


NIMH has not complied adequately with the Committee's directions. The Committee requests that NIMH prepare a specific plan to strengthen its support for young behavioral science researchers and forward a report on this plan to the Committee by February 1, 1993.

Behavioral Science Research Centers - NIMH

For the past two years, APS-initiated language has been included in the appropriations committee reports requesting NIMH to implement a behavioral science research centers program. As noted in the following excerpt, insufficient action was taken on the requests, and Congress once again addressed the issue in the FY 1993 Senate report, this time directing the agency to develop a program:

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.

Normative Research on Ethnic Minorities - National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD)

APS, in conjunction with the Society for Research in Child Development (SRCD), succeeded in getting support for a research initiative in normative development of ethnic minorities in last year's House and Senate appropriations committee reports. This led to a Request for Applications (RFA) from the NICHD in June. Language in this year's House appropriations report expresses continued support for the initiative:

The Committee understands that NICHD has released a Request for

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

November 1992
Applications for an initiative encouraged in last year's report in the area of normative development in ethnic minorities. The Committee encourages NICHD to further expand research in this area and would like to be kept informed of this project.

Middle Childhood Development Research - NICHD

This year, both the House and Senate committee reports reflect another joint APS-SRCD initiative calling for more research into middle childhood development. The Senate language was as follows:

The Committee encourages the NICHD to embark on a long-term planning process to investigate psychological and behavioral processes of the middle childhood years, ages 5 to 11. The Committee appreciates that many problems of adolescence and young adulthood—problems of school dropouts, unwanted pregnancies, gangs, alcohol and drug abuse, and AIDS, among others—have their roots in the preceding years of middle childhood. Yet the Committee understands that middle childhood may be the period least understood by child development experts. In order to combat the behavioral and emotional concerns that emerge in adolescence, we need a strong research agenda on a number of basic social and emotional processes at play in the earlier years, including skills involved with decision-making, resolving conflicts, fighting off peer pressure, building self-confidence, traditional academic functioning, and many others.

The Committee encourages NICHD to develop a new, general behavioral science initiative in the area of middle childhood development. The Committee would like NICHD to begin that planning effort in fiscal year 1993 with the intention of providing funds in fiscal year 1994 and beyond.

Similar language also appeared in the House committee report, plus it encourages NICHD and NIMH to collaborate in developing an initiative in this area.

Health and Behavior - National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute (NHLBI)

The Senate appropriations report commends the NHLBI for its support of research into the behavioral components of cardiovascular diseases and encourages several specific activities:

Medical advances and better public health care have eliminated or controlled many of the conditions that previously were responsible for most death and disease. Today, heart disease is the leading killer in this country, followed by cancers, cerebrovascular disease, and accidents and their adverse effects. The Committee commends NHLBI for recognizing that each of these has a significant behavioral component and urges the Institute to give full consideration to projects that examine biobehavioral mechanisms of hypertension, the impact of emotion and psychosocial interventions on such things as cardiovascular disease, smoking cessation, and psychosocial and emotional stress as factors in some forms of cardiovascular disease. The Committee further encourages the Institute to focus on women, minorities, and persons of lower socio-economic status in such studies.

Behavioral Science at NIH

In addition to the above appropriations report language, APS initiated language that was included in the conference report accompanying the Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration (ADAMHA) Reorganization Act to protect the behavioral science mission of the ADAMHA institutes in the transfer to the NIH. The language also addresses the positive impact of the transfer on the overall mission of the NIH:

The conferees do not intend the reorganization to diminish the important behavioral science portfolio of the three former ADAMHA institutes. Indeed, the conferees expect that the transfer of these three institutes will bring to all of the NIH institutes an increased appreciation for and emphasis on behavioral science and health services research. The conferees reiterate their strong support for psychological, behavioral and social research in the understanding of mental, addictive, and physical disorders.
NIH from Page 3

has been a real revolution in behavioral neuroscience. It’s informing our understanding of the causes and treatment of mental and addictive disorders. I think our institutes have become more biomedicalized. But I expect the merging of the institutes to not only enhance and expand NIH’s research enterprise, it should raise the potential to bring in new perspectives for our understanding of health and disease processes. Dr. [Bernadette] Healy [Director of NIH] included behavioral health in the NIH strategic plan as a critical health need—and the plan represents a full spectrum of research interests from basic neuroscience and behavioral science into behavioral medicine and behavioral health over the lifespan. Behavioral sciences really have a very firm place within the research mission of the NIH, one that will be appreciated and needed as we enter the 21st century.

Kraut: I hear more from people who are studying basic processes in language development, cognitive or social development, and social psychology—areas that not enough people recognize as having an important role in studying the disease process. Many of them feel that while it is acknowledged that biological research, in and of itself, is important, that acknowledgement doesn’t extend to say that research that is behavioral, in and of itself, is also important as part of the new NIH mandate.

Baldwin: It’s certainly part of our mandate now. And we certainly have no intention of doing less. We expect to be doing more. I think the initiative we started last year in the Office of Minority Programs as an NIH initiative, not an NICHD initiative—although NICHD has the lead on it—really was indicative of support for behavioral research, as you’ve described it, at the NIH. The excellent participation of the institutes is a good sign that behavioral research is not going to lose any ground at NIH. I believe it is probably the strongest I’ve ever seen it here, and there are no indications from Dr. Healy that it will not continue to grow and strengthen.

This merger is an opportunity for greater collegial interaction within NIH. Even before, though, we had a lot of co-funding activities and shared interests. But now we really are one and the same family and are all looking forward to having more colleagues in that family. That has effects all across the committees and activities. One of the things I hope we can do is present a different vision to the outside community of how the different institutes fit together. There are some areas where I think the outside researcher must be at least somewhat confused as to where the different programs’ interests lie, how they fit together and how they’re going to move forward. So I’m hoping that the transition activities will help us clarify that to the outside communities.

Kraut: The opposite of the concern was raising is that bringing the three research institutes from ADAMHA injects a critical mass of behavioral science into NIH.

Blumenthal: That’s right, that may strengthen the institutes. I think many of the institutes have recognized this as an important part of their agenda. There hasn’t been a critical mass, and I think that this will strengthen it and provide opportunities. One of the task force’s mandates is to examine ways in which we can enhance NIH behavioral science research.

Kraut: Has the task force met yet? Does it have a charge?

Blumenthal: It has not met yet. Its charge is to look into areas of science in each of the institutes for areas of cooperation, both external and internal, and to plan a series of celebrations at NIH as well as to serve as a forum. But until we have the task force constituted, I don’t think we can say for sure what the activities will be. We would hope to bring together the scientific and advocacy groups to speak with us about what their issues and concerns are, and to provide us with recommendations for future research initiatives. Some of the activities will be sharing information on what’s happening in the integration with the whole united community. Some will be outreach into the advocacy groups, and some may be scientific symposiums. We don’t want to go too far down that path until we have the task force empaneled and participating in planning those activities.

Kraut: When I talk to people about the move of the ADAMHA institutes, the typical question to me is, “So they’re actually going to the NIH campus?” And when I reply that I know of no plans to move anybody physically, they usually ask “What’s the big deal about this transfer?” So let me ask you, what really does it mean?

Baldwin: In the next few years a lot of people are going to move around on the NIH campus, but many of the people in the institutes now are not physically on the NIH campus. Our NICHD extramural programs have not been on the campus for 20 years, but that hasn’t made them any less a part of the NIH family. Many institutes have parts or all of the extramural programs scattered around. So I don’t think we want to overstate what being in the Parklawn Building means for this process. As I understand it, the offices of the directors [of NIMH, NIAAA and NIDA] will be on the NIH campus, but there are a lot of very complicated plans as to who’s going to move out of one building and into another, so I think you’re going to see a lot of changes in the next few years.

Blumenthal: The task force, I think, becomes symbolic of bringing together all the institutes and sharing each institute’s interests and then looking to future research needs in this area and deciding how we can work together to meet these needs ... and to see how the [NIH] strategic plan can be implemented under the task force.

Kraut: Is it fair to say that as the strategic plan has been crafted, with an eye towards this integration of NIH, that the three ADAMHA institutes have participated significantly in its development?

Blumenthal: I think the institutes have been involved, though it was unclear at the time whether they would become part of the NIH. Once that had been announced, then there could be a full representation of the research enterprise of the three in the strategic plan.
Kraut: Are there more interactions now among the three ADAMHA institutes, getting a position together to bring to NIH? Was there any kind of joint planning of that kind, before coming over?

Blumenthal: I'm not aware; I'm not sure what has been going on—I know there has been a lot of work to move to the new organization, and a lot of committee meetings at the policy and administrative levels. But I think it's a tremendously exciting development, and it's going to be good for the people we're serving, because we're finally putting the head back on the body.

Kraut: What about NIH? What has been the talk in the halls about the three institutes coming over?

Baldwin: For a year the talk was: "Is it going to happen? No, it's not going to happen. Yes, it is going to happen." So it's not something that's been sprung on people suddenly. It's been a long process. But for many of us who have had long and productive working relationships with one or all of the three institutes, the general feeling is that this lowers the barriers.

Many of us have had to deal with the fact that some of the outside community never understood why programs that looked so much alike had to be in different agencies—so in that way it's going to streamline things. And certainly, to speak for the behavioral community, we welcome the fact that the community of scientists will be larger within the NIH. I think it's a really positive move.

Obviously there are areas of shared programmatic interest that must be confusing to the outside community—they're sometimes confusing on the inside—as to how programs that seem a lot alike exist in different agencies or different institutes. But when you peel away that topical label, you find there are differences in what the programs want to accomplish or how they do so. There is never enough money to do everything you want. And when those people with shared interests get together, they can find ways to have their programs fit together in a complementary and avoid duplication. But they are each articulating different sides of an issue or pieces of a puzzle. You get a stronger program, you can make your money go further. And we're looking for ways to collaborate within the traditional institutes and now with the three new ones. There is a lot to be gained, and we want to be sure we take advantage of this moment of change to think through some of those issues.

I hope you offer the [Observer] readers the opportunity to be in touch with us or be in touch with you to share their ideas. I think that would be very helpful.

Kraut: Is there any downside to the integration? For example, one of the criticisms was that substance abuse and mental health will not have the visibility they had before.

Blumenthal: I don't see that. I think we've come a long way in the past several decades with a very strong and vibrant research enterprise, we have vigorous research advocacy groups. And I think we have established ourselves in the community; these issues are in the public's awareness as important public health issues. I see our being integrated into the NIH community as proof of how powerful both our research and advocacy have been.

Kraut: You're saying that this is a sign that the research enterprise in substance abuse and mental health has grown enough so that it can hold its own in any of the more traditional NIH areas?

Blumenthal: That's right. I think any peer review enterprise at NIMH, NIDA, and NIAAA will not be integrated at least in the early stages. I assume that some years down the road there will have to be a coming together.

Baldwin: In four years.

Kraut: Is your task force charged to plan for that or to look at the alternatives?

Baldwin: A lot of that will go through existing committees specifically addressing the peer review issue. Also, as you pointed out, the legislation allows the system to stay intact for a while. What we are doing will in some ways feed into the issues to be addressed in peer review, because we are looking at what those programmatic and substantive issues are.
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You can’t separate those from the question of what are appropriate review groups and how they are constituted and function. So it’s not as if these topics are divorced. But we would not expressly deal with the question of peer review.

Kraut: What are some of the tough turf issues to be resolved in bringing the institutes into NIH? For example, the people who are doing health and behavior here in NICHD may say “That’s our program—that’s what I do, what is NIMH doing with that area?”

Blumenthal: One immediate task will be to look at the definition of health and behavior as these three institutes come into this community. One could argue that the whole portfolio of NIAAA is health and behavior. Is it? I think those kinds of issues need to be discussed. I think we need to redefine what health and behavior is, how we look at it.

Baldwin: As you look at referral guidelines for NIH and NIMH, you find there are vast unresolved areas of overlap. Some of them have built up through tradition and history and the individuals involved, and maybe a specific legislative mandate. It’s fine for a program to say “That’s what we do,” but another program gets a legislative mandate to do it! These things grow up over time to where it looks like two, three, or even four institutes are all, on the surface, appearing to do the same thing. We must look at where, in fact, those programs could find some shared ground and clarify their areas in order to avoid program cutbacks or threats of such. In an organization as big and complex as the NIH you never resolve those entirely. But I think we could do better than we are doing now. If you reduced the ambiguity by 50 percent that would be a tremendous accomplishment. You don’t have to get down to where every single project has only one home, as the research community would feel threatened by that and it is not necessary.

Kraut: That’s a good point, because you do hear people say some programs will be collapsed.

Baldwin: We don’t want to let their funding requests rise or fall on the fortunes of that one program.

Blumenthal: Where different institutes support particular aspects of an issue, we can also develop cross-cutting initiatives. These would reaffirm the various pieces of that problem—and broaden the study of the issue—by clarifying individual institutes’ roles.

Baldwin: It doesn’t have to be an all or nothing game—one program doesn’t have to win entirely and another lose entirely. There are ways to get around the administrative barriers and mutually support areas that frankly are of interest to a couple of different programs. It can be done. You never get rid of all the shared interest or projects that could go to different places. You never eliminate that unless you set up
Member Profile

Edward Zigler: Setting a Heading for Head Start

“IT’s like telling someone to be a really good parent for one year when their child is age four, and then the kid will be wonderful forever,” says Edward Zigler.

Zigler is talking about the overselling and underfunding of Head Start. He is flailing politicians who misrepresent Head Start, raise impossible expectations about it, or play numbers games—like increasing the count of children enrolled while shortening the hours per day or months of enrollment.

Rear-Ending Head Start

He is concerned about Head Start itself falling behind, about the watering down of the program he created in 1965 and personally administered from an office in Washington, DC, for two years within the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. He was the first director of the Office of Child Development (now the Administration for Children, Youth and Families) under President Nixon. It’s a program he has never stopped shepherding, improving, worrying about, through 27 alternately lean and good years. Yet he is now implementing a new network of post-Head Start projects already running in 200 schools throughout the country.

Uncovering the Story

This month Zigler is publishing a book telling how Head Start survived (to some extent) the crises, the high hopes, the miracle workers, and the Reagan years. In it he tells what Head Start ought to be for the next generation. The book, Head Start, the Inside Story of America’s Most Successful Educational Experiment, is published by Basic Books and is co-authored by Susan Muenchow. She was a research associate and public education director at the Bush Center in Child Development that Zigler heads at Yale University. Muenchow is also a former reporter for the Christian Science Monitor.

Research Underpinnings

Zigler talks a lot about research in his book because, as a developmental psychologist and an APS charter member, he believes in the importance of research. But he also focuses on research because it was a menace that almost destroyed Head Start. The program suffered from after-effects of bad research for more than a decade, Zigler is quick to point out. He can’t forget that studies demonstrating so-called “fade out effects” of Head Start almost killed the program in the cradle.

Quality vs Quantity

Nevertheless, in two and-a-half decades about 11 million low-income children have passed through Head Start’s doors to stay for periods ranging from merely a summer to about two years. They received health screening and nutritious meals, and they learned to play in groups. Their parents have participated as volunteers, and about a third of the parents have found employment through Head Start. They got a strong dose, most of them, of Head Start’s two key ingredients: its broad services approach—not just preschool education but health care, social services to the family, nutrition, and on and on—and its great emphasis on parental involvement. More than 600,000 children are in Head Start today.

Yet 50 million children who qualified for Head Start in those same 27 years were left out, Zigler says, adding that America should be able to offer poor children “more than sweet nothings.”

But if Zigler cites numbers he doesn’t like number games. He says he has been “on a collision course with the Bush administration over number games,” and with Congress as well. He says their approach to Head Start today is: How many kids are eligible, what percentage are in the program, and how do we get the rest of the kids in?

“My position from day one,” Zigler says, “has always been that it is better to serve fewer kids and serve them well than serve a lot of kids badly. When Head Start started we had age three, four, and five in the program and a lot of full-day programs for those children, which you need if parents are going to get off of welfare and go into job training. But what the Reagan and Bush people have done is try to get more and more kids in the program with less and less dollars. Now they say you can only be in the program at age four. You can only be in the program for half a day—though there are some exceptions because of the community control aspect of the programs.”

Many program sites are dilapidated, and 47 percent of the teachers and staffers earn less than $10,000 a year, a fact Zigler particularly deplores. And there used to be one adult for every five
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children when Head Start began, but now the staff ratio is one to ten, according to Zigler.

"We should have been enriching the program, because it's tougher to be in poverty today than it was 27 years ago when Head Start began," Zigler says. "We didn't have today's tremendous drug problem, the tremendous violence problem, we didn't have as many children in single parent homes. So now instead of enriching the program we keep watering it down."

Expecting Miracles

Zigler often says, "Everybody loves Head Start," and he says it not infrequently with a steeley tone in his voice. From his office at Yale Zigler redefines the point: "I think there have been two problems about Head Start—either people hate it without reason, or they love it too much."

He sweeps past those who hate it. "But it bothers me when people love it too much," he says. "We've got to be really objective and realistic about Head Start."

"The idea that you're going to do away with poverty in America with the Head Start program is ridiculous. We can run a cost-effective program that will make a difference in people's lives and these children's lives. But to find a solution to poverty, you have to change enough of the ecology to really make a difference in a family—you have to have job training, you have to have housing, you have to do so many things."

The problems seemed more easily solvable in the balmy early years of President Lyndon B. Johnson's poverty program, with Head Start setting sail as a sort of flagship for the program.

That was also an era of naive environmentalist educators who believed that a child's mind was like a field waiting to be cultivated, Zigler says. The key to a great IQ harvest was the proper stimulation. This was the primary message of psychologist Joseph McVicker Hunt's much-noted 1961 book, Intelligence and Experience. At about the same time, Benjamin Bloom, a cognitive psychologist, found that a child's learning was half over by the age of four, a conclusion he came to by correlating IQ scores at different ages and that he reported in his book Stability and Change in Human Characteristics.

These two books set the philosophy of the time, according to Zigler. "Together they said that very little intervention would have a very large impact. And they said the impact would be largely on cognitive functioning," Zigler says. "Today, the idea that you could take kids out of the slums and give them a six-week program and expect long-term effects seems ridiculous."

"But back then, under the pressures of people like Hunt and Bloom, great scholars in our field, people said, 'Yes, you can do that' and the popular media gave life to this idea."

A Science Base

"Well, it was obvious to me 27 years ago that you have got to appreciate our literature in child development, the science of our field. What those other people were suggesting was an inoculation model. Do something for six weeks and you'll inoculate a kid forever! But what they missed was that you have to think of the child as going from stage to stage, and at each stage of the development the child needs environmental nutrients to optimize the development at that stage. Yes, the first four years are important. As are the next four years. And the four years after that, too!"

"We always want to get off on the cheap in this country," Zigler said. "That's not where we ought to be going. We should be realistic about what it takes and devote the necessary resources."

Getting back to the research issue, Zigler says "We had a big fight in the early days of Head Start as to whether we would have any research or evaluation of Head Start at all. Of course Urie Bronfenbrenner, Ed Gordon, and I, the research types on the planning committee, were very much in favor of research. But some of the others argued, 'What do you need evaluation for? You're going to feed the kids and fill their teeth, what's there to evaluate?' We did, however, do an evaluation the first summer, and psychologists played a big role."

Zigler worked directly on developing the research measures for that first program in 1965. There were 560,000 kids right at the start, but the measures were awful, said Zigler. "Everything was done too quickly. We couldn't even get the pre-scores. In fact, to this day I don't think that data has been analyzed. It was just done too badly."

"At least we won the fight for Head Start always to have an evaluation component. But that almost turned out to be a Pyrrhic victory, because in 1969 the Westinghouse study almost put an end to Head Start. That study said, well, the children have some benefits when they leave Head Start but it fades out after that. It was a piece of science that almost destroyed Head Start."

Interestingly, Zigler and other's commitment to research almost cost them the program in these early years, but their stubbornness later turned out to save the program. As Zigler recounted, "Right after the Westinghouse report we had a new Administration, the Nixon Administration, and they weren't in love with Head Start. I was in Washington trying to keep Head Start alive and some thought the Nixon people were going to use the Westinghouse report to close the program down."

"But many good scholars started weighing in with good critiques of the Westinghouse study, The best critique of all, according to Zigler, was by the premier methodologist Donald Campbell, an APS William James Fellow. "Don pointed out all the weaknesses in the Westinghouse report, showed how it underestimated by far the benefits of the program, and that kept us alive. Those critiques, the fact that the parents loved the program so much and that it had adherents in the civil rights movement allowed us to keep it alive in the face of the Westinghouse study."

Then in 1980 solid good research saved Head Start and turned the program around, Zigler said. Until that time, everyone still
had lingering reservations about the effectiveness of Head Start because of the Westinghouse study. After 1980 “it seems that everybody loved Head Start because we finally had evidence that Head Start programs did indeed have long-term effects,” and the program got a major funding boost.

Zigler says the research in question was a collection of 12 longitudinal projects brought together by the Cornell Consortium under Irving Lazar. Included were studies by Merle Karnes in Illinois, Kuno Beller in Philadelphia, Martin Deutsch in New York, Ira Gordon in Florida, David Weikart in Ypsilanti, Frank Palmer in Harlem, Susan Gray in Nashville, Louise Miller in Louisville, and others.

“We took the 12 longitudinal data bases and under the direction of Irving Lazar we crosswalked all those studies and found that high quality Head Start programs did indeed have long-term effects.”

The Ypsilanti study showed benefits much later in life than the other studies did, Zigler said, comparing their Head Start kids with control groups. “And they did a randomized experiment, which is a very strong design,” Zigler said.

Looking Ahead

Looking ahead, Zigler notes that presidential candidate Bill Clinton has gone on record for full funding of Head Start. “I’m talking with the Clinton people now about how to recapture the quality of Head Start and how to have programs that meet the needs of Head Start parents so the parents can get back to work,” he said in the late October interview with the APS Observer. “But I haven’t had any luck with the Bush people,” he said.

“I’m still a sort of protector of Head Start,” he said, “but I consider it a dream unrealized.” Zigler has “very high hopes” for Clinton because he knows Clinton’s record in Arkansas for preschool education and family support. Furthermore, Hillary Clinton has said she is going to become the White House counselor on children’s issues, Zigler notes.

What are the most urgent steps he recommends to recapture the elan of Head Start? “First we’ve got to do something about the low pay and training of Head Start people. Some of them have been working at their Head Start center project for 15 years and are still making a minimum wage. We have people who have been in Head Start for a quarter of a century and don’t have any retirement whatsoever put aside. It’s a case of poor people subsidizing other poor people with their labor.”

“And if you go and visit Head Start centers, some of them are awful—the wiring is coming off the ceilings. That gives children a message. You can’t put children into a setting that is so environmentally impoverished. You give them the message that they are not worth very much,” Zigler said.

**We should have been enriching the program, because it’s tougher to be in poverty today than it was 27 years ago when Head Start began.**

EDWARD ZIGLER

And, it’s not every day that a psychologist is featured in a major editorial in The New York Times ...

The New York Times EDITORIALS/LETTERS TUESDAY, JUNE 30, 1992

For Head Start, Two Steps Back

Head Start is, in a sense, the motherhood and apple pie of Government programs. Everybody, rightly, is crazy about it—the President and parents, Congress and local politicians of every persuasion. But what all this love adds up to, Prof. Edward Zigler of Yale wrote on The Times’s Op-Ed page last week, is “public whispers of sweet nothings. When political push came to budgetary shove, Head Start lost.”

Dr. Zigler, an originator of the program, was referring specifically to the fact that Congress has now dropped $250 million from its emergency urban aid bill, money that would have kept centers for 220,000 children open this summer. He might have added, “So what else is new?” Because when it comes to politicians putting money where their mouths are, Head Start often comes up a loser.

The figures look good. President Bush, for instance, has been applauded for proposing a $600 million increase in next year’s budget. But as Dr. Zigler points out, that still leaves Head Start $3 billion short of the goal of the 1990 Head Start reauthorization act—to have every eligible child enrolled by 1995.

Two million poor youngsters are eligible for Head Start, but the program serves 621,000. Most are enrolled for only one year, yet Head Start aims to help children who are 3 and 2, not just 4- and 5-year-olds. Furthermore, by reducing the funds for quality control, Mr. Bush risks diluting the program’s effectiveness.

Head Start monitors the health as well as the learning of poor children and makes parents part of the process. If Congress wants to prove it loves Head Start as much as it claims, the program will play a really big part in the next urban initiative.

One small victory for Head Start occurred in September, however, the passage of the Head Start Improvement Act and its signature into law by the President. Now, for the first time, Head Start centers can use federal money to purchase center locales. Previously, they could use such funds only to rent space, "as if it were an experimental program that might go out of business any week," Zigler said.

Future Start

Now Zigler is working on something he calls the School of the 21st Century. He describes it as follows:

"Have kids in school at age three. Have the day long enough to match the workday of mothers and fathers and thus combine schooling with day-care. Keep it going during summer and other vacation periods. And, for children aged six to 12, have before-school and after-school care so there are no latch-key kids."

The schools also have home visitation programs like Head Start's to help parents educate their own children, and they use the school buildings as a place where families can come together and form support groups.

Day-care is so poor in America today it is compromising children's growth and development, Zigler asserts. One aspect of Zigler's School of the 21st Century is networks of so-called family day-care, where a woman typically takes care of five or six children in her home. The hub of the network in the school is used to train and support family day-care mothers.

Programs with many of these "21st Century" features already exist in many parts of Missouri, according to Zigler, and some exist in experimental form in about 30 other states, for about 200 schools in all. D.K.
Quick, where is your 1992 APS Membership Directory?
Has a colleague borrowed it again?
Why not order a copy for your department today?

If you're tired of retrieving your APS Membership Directory from the clutches of Directory-less colleagues, it's time to order your department a copy of this invaluable reference.

In addition to the nearly 14,000 APS members listed in the 1992 Directory, the new enhanced format of the Directory includes listings of:

- Nearly 800 graduate and undergraduate departments of psychology and related areas! This information is not available in any other single source!
- An affiliation index that easily allows you to locate your colleagues at other institutions.
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TOTAL ___________________________
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PO Box 90457
Washington, DC 20090-0457

One Easy Way to Reach the Most Qualified Job Candidates For Your Position Openings:
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- Postal mail:
  APS OBSERVER, Lee Herring, Editor
  1010 Vermont Ave., NW, Suite 1100
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  Tel.: 202-783-2077
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1010 Vermont Ave., NW, Suite 1100
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**People**

*Recent Promotions, Appointments . . .*

APS Charter Fellow **Jefferson M. Koonce** has taken the position of **Director of the Center for Applied Human Factors and Aviation at the University of Central Florida**. Koonce was formerly a professor at the Aviation Research Laboratory at the University of Illinois. Koonce received his PhD in 1974 in engineering psychology from the University of Illinois.

**David Malcom**, an APS Charter Member, was appointed **Associate Dean at the College at Lincoln Center of Fordham University** in July. He has been an Assistant Professor of psychology for seven years in the Social Science Division of the college. His general field of interest is biopsychology and is especially interested in animal learning. Malcom received his PhD in 1977 from the City University of New York.

**Lee L. McCann**, APS Member and a professor of psychology, has been named **Associate Vice-Chancellor at the University of Wisconsin-Oshkosh**. McCann is three-time president of the Faculty Senate and a member of the faculty since 1966, the year he received his PhD from Iowa State University. He was chair of the psychology department from 1976 to 1988 and was chair of the Social Science Division in the College of Letters and Science from 1979 to 1988.

**Ben B. Morgan, Jr.**, Professor of Psychology and an APS Charter Fellow, has been appointed **Associate Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Central Florida**. Morgan's chief responsibilities will be graduate education and research. He has conducted human performance assessment research for more than twenty years, while teaching and providing graduate research training in two of the nation's leading PhD programs. He has served as Director of three separate research laboratories and a center for applied research. His best-known investigations include studies of the performance affects of stresses such as continuous work, sleep loss, illness, the recovery of performance from decrements caused by these stresses, the acquisition of complex skills, and team performance in training. His most recent publications are on the evolution and maturation of teams during training, and the processes that contribute to team development, and decision making. Morgan established the widely recognized Team Performance Laboratory at the University of Central Florida. He was the Director of the Center for Applied Psychological Studies (1981-1985) at Old Dominion University, Director of the PhD Program in Industrial and Organizational Psychology (1982-1985), and Chair of the Department of Psychology (1985-1987).

APS Charter Fellow **Carol Nagy Jacklin** was appointed **Dean of the Division of Social Sciences and Communication in the University of Southern California's College of Letters, Art and Sciences**. She is the first woman ever to hold the position and began her five-year term in July. Two of her major priorities in her new post include external fundraising and issues relating to ethnic diversity. Prior to this position, Nagy Jacklin served as Chair of the Department of Psychology and as Professor in the program for the Study of Women and Men in Society at the University of Southern California. She received her PhD in 1972 from Brown University and received her undergraduate and master's degrees from the University of Connecticut. From 1972 until 1983 she worked at Stanford University as a research associate and senior research associate. She co-wrote the influential text *The Psychology of Sex Differences* and is currently at work on a longitudinal study of gender differences in children. Another area of research interest has included endocrinology.

APS Member **Coleen Thornton** has been appointed **senior human factors engineer** in the Advanced Design Division at Lockheed Aeronautical Systems Company in Marietta, Georgia. She will be working on flight station redesign of the C-130 aircraft in order to automate and reduce the crew complement. Given that she will receive her PhD next month from Old Dominion University in Norfolk, Virginia, that's quite an accomplishment! Her dissertation studied the effects of automation on crew coordination, workload, and performance and was funded through the Team Performance Laboratory at the University of Central Florida by the Naval Training Systems Center.

**People News Suggestions Welcomed . . .**

The Editor invites readers to submit announcements of noteworthy promotions, appointments, and the like for possible publication in the People news section of future Observer issues. Send suggestions to APS Observer, 1010 Vermont Ave., NW, Suite 1100, Washington, DC 20005-4907.
very rigid and arbitrary boundaries and I know no one who wants to do that. It makes the system a little more rational. I think the end result will be strong support for those shared areas and a clearer picture of how different institute programs fit together. I think some in the research community will be surprised as they learn about programs they didn’t know about before.

Kraut: That’s one of my hopes. Traditionally psychologists have looked to NIMH, NIAAA, and NIDA and a few NIH institutes such as NICHD, the Heart, Lung and Blood Institute, and the Institute on Neurological Disorders and Stroke. But I hope more start to look at the Eye Institute, the Deafness Institute, the National Center for Nursing Research, and the Cancer Institute. Those places all fund behavioral science now.

Blumenthal: Absolutely. And what the task force will do is say, Look, behavior is a key health area within the NIH. We’re focusing on it. Let’s strengthen each of these portfolios. And let’s create some cross-cutting initiatives. So I really think it’s going to enhance the behavioral work, make it a priority area. Not that it wasn’t before. But it will be enhanced, it will be very visible.

Baldwin: We hope to be invited to national meetings of your society and others, to give us a chance to talk more directly with the scientific community about what it means particularly to them—how the merger is going, and what the future appears to hold. D.K.

Student Research Competition

The APS Student Caucus (APSSC) would like to invite all student members to submit an entry to the third annual APSSC Research Competition. The Research Competition is designed to encourage and acknowledge outstanding student research. Three graduate students and one undergraduate student will be selected to present their research at the 1993 APS Convention in Chicago, and each will receive a cash award of $250.

The competition is open to graduate and undergraduate student members of APS. The student applicant must be first author on the project, and an additional version of the entry must be submitted in accordance with the procedure outlined in the APS Call for Proposals (see the insert in the September, 1992, APS Observer and in the mail). Submissions for both the Research Competition and convention posters must be postmarked on or before January 8, 1993.

Application

The application for the APSSC Research Competition differs from the APS Call for Proposals. Each applicant must submit an entry of his/her project, not to exceed 1,500 words. Entries should be doubled-spaced. The project’s title, without the applicant’s name, should appear at the top of each page for anonymity during the judging. Entries must include the following:

Page 1:
(1) a title page with the applicant’s name, school, address, and phone number;

To enter the Student Research Competition, send four copies of the entry and letter of recommendation to: Paul Reber, Department of Psychology, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, PA 15217. Those students chosen will be contacted in early April. Any inquiries should be directed to Paul Reber at 412-268-8115 or via email at Reber@PSY.CMU.EDU

Pages 2 and beyond:
(2) the purpose and rationale of the study; (3) the methodology; (4) important results (with appropriate statistics and reliability values); and (5) conclusions and implications.

A one-page letter of recommendation from a faculty member involved in the project is also required. This letter should include the following points:
(1) the purpose or goal of the project; (2) the student’s role and extent of his or her involvement in the project; (3) the student’s significant contribution to the project; and (4) the student’s general understanding of the research topic.

Research Evaluation

Judging will occur in two phases. Initial judging will be based on the project itself. Applicants will be kept anonymous at this phase. The top ten entries will then be re-evaluated with the letter of recommendation. Awards will be given to the top three graduate projects and to the top undergraduate project.
Let Us Introduce Ourselves . . .

We would like you to know about your executive council and committee chairpersons. Brief information about us with comments about APSSC are below. Contact any of us should you desire to talk about an issue or just become acquainted.

President
Bonnie Eberhardt: I am a student in the experimental program at Pennsylvania State University (home of the Nittany Lion). I am preparing for my qualifying examinations preceding my doctoral dissertation, so I am beginning to see light at the end of the tunnel. My career interests include examination of biorythms related to atypical depression, postpartum psychoses, and infantilicide; and mental health delivery systems for parole populations. I would like to continue research in these areas in academia or within the department of parole and probation.

I have been involved with the APS student caucus for three years now. I have enjoyed interacting with the professional community, who inspired my interests, and being a part of a group actively promoting psychology as a science.

Graduate Advocate
Kenn White: My ultimate goal is to do clinical research in cognitive neuroscience, perhaps with brain-damaged children and adults with Alzheimer's and Parkinson's diseases. I would also like to teach on the graduate level. I am presently completing my PhD in child development and neuroscience at the University of Maryland where my research uses neuropsychological measurement to focus on individual differences (e.g., anxiety, impulse control) and the mediation of these factors on memory and judgment. I have enjoyed APS in a number of ways, mainly as an opportunity to meet world-class researchers from a wide variety of disciplines, although I have also enjoyed a tremendous level of support and communication with other student affiliates.

Student Notebook Editor
Dianna Newbern: I am beginning my third year in an experimental program at Texas Christian University with a research emphasis in cognition. I am interested in exploring individual cognition during interactions related to the exchange of information (e.g., dyadic collaboration or studying) with eventual extensions to cross-cultural situations. I hope to work in a university or research setting.

I have appreciated being a part of APS, such as being able to attend conventions where we can see and listen to those individuals who have achieved recognition. I also greatly appreciate the support and consideration given us students by the professional membership represented by the board of directors and by those in the national office. Even though we are students, we are recognized as a viable part of the organization, which is great encouragement to join and to become involved as much as we can.

Secretary
Kathy Morgan: I am a brand new (barely one month) PhD in comparative psychology at Wheaton College in Massachusetts where I teach a variety of courses in psychobiology. I keep busy with applied research in animal behavior at several local zoos, and with more basic investigations of the effects of social experience and stress on the development of temperament in non-human animals.

I became associated with APS because I was looking for a national organization but had been put off by the bureaucratic nature and high cost of APA. I saw APS as 'the' national organization for students. I recommend APS as a high-profile, professional organization with two world-class journals at a low price. APS also continues to have very reasonable convention rates for students and encourages student participation in national policy-making. The opportunity to be heard and make a difference is great.

Treasurer
Paul Reber: I will receive my PhD in 1993 from Carnegie Mellon University. My general research area is cognition with specific emphasis in human problem solving. I have accepted a post-doctoral fellowship with the University of California-San Diego. I will be working with Larry Squire in human memory and neuropsychology. I think it is important to belong to professional organizations, and in particular, APS. APS provides contacts with other professionals and a format that allows me to stay abreast of current research that may affect research I might be involved in.

Mentorship
Steve Fiore: I am a first-year graduate student at the University of Pittsburgh. My research interest is in cognition, specifically in spatial reasoning and navigation. My background includes several years in marketing and advertising which is based on trying to understand decision-making behaviors, so I have always been interested in psychology. I am returning to school because I wanted more from life than just finances, so I earned another undergraduate degree (this time in psychology) and here I am today.

See Student Notebook on Page 37

See the call on the previous page for submissions to the annual APSSC Research Competition.
Journal Changes For Students

The Journal of Psychology and the Behavioral Sciences (JPBS) recently modified its orientation regarding submissions. Graduate and undergraduate students are now offered the opportunity to publish in this recognized academic journal. JPBS is accepting manuscripts in clinical, cognition & human learning, emotion & motivation, experimental & general, health & community, industrial/organizational, and social & personality. For information and a publication manual: John Brandi, PhD, Faculty Editor, JPBS; Dept. of Psychology; Fairleigh Dickinson University; Madison, NJ 07940

Simple Process Starts a Chapter

Many schools have contacted Kim Delemos, Chapter Recruitment, to inquire about starting an APS student chapter on their campus. Welcoming those inquiries, we hope to soon add more chapters to our ranks. Kim has mailed information packets to schools including: Univ. of Central Florida; Univ. of California-Berkeley; Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison; Univ. of Tennessee-Knoxville; Fisk Univ.; Howard Univ.; and Cornell College.

The process to establish a chapter is rather simple and the requirements are few. Students interested in starting a chapter should check with their faculty to locate a member of APS who is willing to serve as a sponsor. That faculty sponsor, or a student, should contact Kim for an application packet. The packet contains our mission statement, a list of officers, and a form to be read and signed by the sponsor and five students who have applied for APS student affiliate status. Mail the application to Kim, and if all is in order, your chapter will be approved and a certificate mailed to the sponsor.

Chapter benefits include financial assistance in sponsoring your own conferences, recognition by APS itself, contacts with other chapters, a forum through which needs can be represented, and various contests (like last year's recruitment contest with a $500 prize). This section of the "O" (Observer) has been given to us and we use it to recognize the accomplishments of chapters as well as to communicate with each individual. If you are a member of a chapter and would like some input about activities or events you are planning please contact Bill Dockett who is coordinating chapter activities and giving a helpful hand wherever he can [see box at right].

NETTALK . . .

The 'net' is an electronic mail system created for students. Subscribe to the system at no cost, and participate in discussions that are posted by other students. The system is a quick and efficient way to disperse information about the student caucus and our interests (e.g., congressional legislation, postdoc positions). You will need access to a mainframe computer account that permits access to Bitnet or Internet. Then just send the following message to LISTSERVER@MCGILL1.BITNET: ADD APSSCNET Youruser!Dcode Yourfirstname Yourlastname Youruniversity. You will soon receive information about the network and some introductory details. Join us in cyberspace!
Organizational Profile

Society of Multivariate Experimental Psychology

ORIGINS AND PURPOSE

Founded in 1960, the Society of Multivariate Experimental Psychology is dedicated to "the development of psychological theory and knowledge in that part of experimental psychology which naturally involves multivariate designs and associated special forms of analysis." That is, the primary goal of the Society is to encourage methodologically sophisticated empirical research using multivariate designs in all areas of psychology. This general purpose is served by encouraging research and teaching in its areas of interest, by providing opportunities for discussion and communication among members, and by supporting substantive and basic research using multivariate forms of analysis. To further these goals, the Society holds an annual Fall meeting, publishes the journal Multivariate Behavioral Research, and encourages the formation of other societies with similar purposes, such as the European Society of Multivariate Experimental Psychology.

MEMBERSHIP

The Society has three membership categories: active, inactive, and emeritus. Active members must attend annual meetings and present papers at least once every three years; failure to do so leads to inactive status. Emeritus members have all of the rights and privileges of active members but are 65 years of age or older. Membership is limited to 65 active members, who must be nominated by other active members and then be elected by a vote of active members.

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

Board of Trustees

Stanley A. Mulaik, President (1991-92)
School of Psychology
Georgia Institute of Technology
Atlanta, GA 30332

Keith F. Widaman, Secretary-Treasurer
Department of Psychology
University of California
Riverside, CA 92521

J. J. McArdle, President-Elect (1992-93)
Department of Psychology
University of Virginia
Charlottesville, VA 22903

Patricia Cohen, Local Arrangements Chair
Box 47
722 West 168th Street
New York, NY 10032

Herbert W. Eber, Past-President (1990-91)
and Managing Editor
Psychological Resources, Inc.
74 Fourteenth Street
Atlanta, GA 30309

Editor, Multivariate Behavioral Research

Stanley A. Mulaik, Editor
Multivariate Behavioral Research
School of Psychology
Georgia Institute of Technology
Atlanta, GA 30332

BACKGROUND

The Society was established in 1960 by Raymond B. Cattell and a small group of his colleagues. Past presidents include Raymond B. Cattell, Saul B. Sells, Chester W. Harris, Robert C. Tryon, Donald W. Fiske, Jacob Cohen, Harry H. Harman, Lewis R. Goldberg, Douglas N. Jackson, John L. Horn, Peter M. Bentler, Jerry S. Wiggins, Jack Block, J. Douglas Carroll, Henry F. Kaiser, William Meredith, and Norman Cliff.

Annual Meetings. According to the charter of the Society, annual meetings are to be kept small, to encourage thorough discussion of papers presented at the meetings. As a result, attendance at annual meetings is restricted to members of the Society and occasional invited guests.

Awards. Since 1972, the Society has awarded annually the Raymond B. Cattell Award for early career achievement. Previous winners include Peter M. Bentler, John R. Nesselroade, John L. Horn, Paul B. Baltes, and Robert J. Sternberg. Since 1990, the Society has awarded annually the Saul B. Sells Award for lifetime achievement. The winners to date have been Paul Horst, Ledyard R Tucker, and John L. Horn.
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Travel Awards/Volunteers

Aki Caramanos: As a student at McGill University-Montreal, Canada, my general research area is human neuropsychology and my master’s thesis will focus on clinical diagnosis. I hope to continue research and perhaps teach after completion of my studies.

APS is an organization that is very good to students: you receive journals and can attend conferences where you can meet and interact with people in almost every area of psychology today.

Student Chapter Recruitment

Kimberly Delemos: I am a fifth-year student in the experimental and biological program at the University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill. My research involves psychophysical investigation of the mechanisms of vibrotactile adaptation. I hope to develop valid psychophysical methods to screen for neurological disorders.

With the help of some other enthusiastic students, I have recently started a student caucus chapter at UNC. It promises to be a fun and educational experience, and I encourage students at other schools to form chapters as well.

Chapter Co-Chair/Psi Chi Liaison

Bill Dockett: I am an undergraduate at the Southern University at New Orleans in an associate degree program in substance abuse. I am concurrently working on a bachelor degree from Xavier University [Louisiana], majoring in psychology. I hope to continue school and obtain a doctorate in clinical psychology with an emphasis in substance abuse issues for my private practice. I believe APS gives us students a chance to network with peers and professionals in many fields. We also have input on national issues, and I appreciate being a part of the caucus.

Letters to the Editor

Sweetly Brief

Dear Editor:

Psychological Bulletin editor Robert Sternberg’s otherwise instructive article, “How to Win Acceptances by Psychology Journals: 21 Tips for Better Writing” in the September, 1992, Observer, can be easily condensed: Know your topic well and communicate it clearly and succinctly. In its present form, paradoxically, it disregards the elegant Biblical adage: “Be brief, say much in few words…” (Ecclesiastes 32:8).

Benjamin Kleimnuntz, PhD
Professor of Psychology
Department of Psychology
University of Illinois-Chicago
Chicago, IL 60680

Science by Anecdote?

Dear Editor:

I was surprised to read in the article, “Remembering ‘Repressed’ Abuse” (Observer, July 1992), as well as to hear in the symposium at the APS convention upon which the article was based, that the majority of “evidence” offered in favor of “false memory syndrome” was anecdotal. Ironically, the only Letter to the Editor in the Observer in response to the article (Ansbacher’s letter, September 1992) also relied on anecdotal evidence to demonstrate “false memory syndrome” — this being a story from Alfred Adler’s autobiography.

I agree that anecdotes can tell a punchy story, but since when have we used them as scientific evidence? This habit can become especially dangerous in an applied domain where lay people then use this “evidence” to defend accused perpetrators of child sexual abuse in courts of law.

The point of this letter is to make clear that among psychologists studying memory, there is no such thing as “false memory syndrome.” A search of the PsycLit database (January 1974 - September 1992) yielded zero references citing "false memory syndrome.” Yes, there is some relevant research on the suggestibility of memory, but no evidence for a “syndrome” involving the fabrication of repressed memory for traumatic events, as was presented at the APS symposium.

In fact the term “false memory syndrome” (FMS) was apparently coined by the “False Memory Syndrome Foundation.” According to their brochure and newsletter, this Foundation seeks to understand the “truth” about FMS, and provide counseling and legal assistance for the “primary and secondary victims” of FMS (i.e., the accused perpetrators of incest and sexual abuse and their victims). However, even the name of the Foundation belies their objectivity; their primary agenda is to undermine the credibility of people who in their adulthood remember incidents of sexual abuse from their childhood.

Clearly there is a need for some serious researching the area of repressed memory for traumatic events and I hope that this cry serves as our call to action. But until the data are in, at least some data, let’s stick to the standards we cognitive psychologists are famous for and remember that silence is golden!

Kathy Pezdek, PhD
Department of Psychology
The Claremont Graduate School
Claremont, CA 91711

[Editor’s Note: Try searching the literature for references to the concept of “confabulation,” a term used in the PsycLit database since 1973, classified there as a behavior disorder, and defined as “Giving untruthful answers to questions about situations or events that are not recalled due to memory impairment. Confabulation is not a conscious attempt to deceive.”]