Accomplished at 5, APS Remains on Track

APS Turns 5, and Attains 15,000 Members

There We Go!” shouted the October 1988 headlines of the inaugural issue of the APS Newsletter, soon to become the APS Observer. Nearly 1,200 charter members were on-board in August 1988 when the American Psychological Society was off and running like a steam locomotive!

The young Society was rolling fast and has not stopped since. Each week picked up another 150 to 200 new members. APS opened a logistics office (complete with a toll-free telephone number) in Norman, Oklahoma, in 1988 and then a national policy office in Washington, DC, a year later. Today, APS has grown to slightly over 15,000 members and since spring 1990 has moved all remaining operations to Washington.

Full Steam Ahead

In 1988, APS’s first journal, Psychological Science, was already on the drawing board. Speakers and poster presenters were signing up for the first national convention, set for June 1989 in Alexandria, Virginia, near the nation’s capital. And, in 1992, APS’s popular second journal, Current Directions in Psychological Science, began publication.

Nancy Wexler Wins Lasker Medical Research Award

APS Fellow Receives Prize for Work on Huntington’s Disease

NEW YORK CITY, OCTOBER 1—In the March 26, 1993, issue of the journal Cell, in a paper with 58 authors, the genetic basis of Huntington’s Disease was announced. At a ceremony, one of those authors, Nancy S. Wexler, was awarded the 1993 Albert Lasker Public Service Award for her part in the research and for “mobilizing research, policy development and scientific advocacy in the worldwide effort to find a cure” for this disease.

Keynote speaker First Lady Hillary Rodham Clinton praised Wexler and two other Lasker award winners (protein scientist Günter Blobel, ...
Balancing Unity and Diversity: Reflections on The Five-Year History of APS

Steven C. Hayes
University of Nevada

APS was five years old this past August, and the Society has been enormously successful, as measured by growth and impact. APS has fought for scientific values, especially in the area of the funding of psychological science, and the national psychological research agenda articulated in the Human Capital Initiative (HCI) is a magnificent example of what we have been able to do. Almost all psychological scientists would agree that APS is a strong voice for many of the concerns of scientific psychology.

We can look back with pride over the last five years. APS set out to be an activist psychological organization that crossed all sub-disciplinary boundaries, applied and basic, and was united by its commitment to scientific values and the public good. On many levels APS is on track. For example, early this year the APS membership approved changes to the bylaws recommended by a formal review committee. This first set of changes to the APS charge stemmed from the APS founders having mandated—in the APS bylaws—a recurring in-depth review of the bylaws to make certain that APS remains on task. On another level, though, I believe it is worth asking ourselves how much more we could be doing.

United

When APS was first organized, we deliberately concentrated our energies on non-controversial problems. For example, it was at the second meeting of the APS-initiated Summit of Scientific Psychological Societies that the Human Capital Initiative (HCI) emerged. Several equally worthwhile possibilities were explored at the first such Summit, but they were also more controversial. As a young organization, developing the HCI national research agenda for behavioral science made sense. Similarly, we adopted an efficient governmental structure and a convention program that avoided addressing potential divisions within our own ranks. It was of primary importance that we emphasize the

Reminder ...

Return your 1994 annual dues form and payment to APS ASAP.
Doing so will help improve the accuracy of your listing in the 1994 Membership Directory and will save your Society money!
Senate Talks Turkey 
On Behavioral Science

In keeping with the images of abundance that mark the Thanksgiving season, two US Senate appropriations reports have turned out to be horns of plenty for behavioral science. Read on, pilgrims, and see why psychology researchers should be especially thankful this year.

NIH Behavioral Office 
Strongly Supported

In recent editions of the Observer, we have reported on a new Office of Behavioral and Social Science Research (OBSR) at the National Institutes of Health (NIH). The Office was created by Congress earlier this year, and its initial mission is to lead an assessment of the current behavioral science enterprise across the entire NIH. Later, the OBSR will continue to monitor NIH’s behavioral science activities and help ensure that the agency is providing adequate funding for research in those areas.

The Office, which is under the NIH Director, has now been given a major boost by the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee that oversees NIH’s budget. The Subcommittee, chaired by Sen. Tom Harkin (D-IA), discussed the new Office in its report issued as part of the fiscal year (FY) 1994 NIH budget. In that report, the Senate voiced strong support for the OBSR, and for behavioral science more generally. Expressing concern about NIH’s history of ignoring past congressional directives on behavioral research, the Senate report asked NIH to move quickly to implement the new Office and directed that sufficient funding be provided to staff the Office, begin the assessment study, and ensure extensive consultation with outside groups as NIH undertakes these activities.

Among the more unique aspects of the Senate report is its designation of specific areas of behavioral research for increased NIH attention, saying that “[w]hat distinguishes these areas of research is that they focus primarily on the whole person, many times in the context of the family or social structure.”

The congressional language was initiated by APS. The relevant excerpt from the report is reprinted below.

Office of Behavioral and Social Science Research—The Committee supports the creation of the newly authorized Office of Behavioral and Social Science Research within the Office of the Director, and looks forward to reviewing the Office’s report on behavioral research at NIH, required by NIH authorizations to be submitted by February 1, 1994. The

NSF and the Human Capital Initiative

For the second year in a row, a Senate funding panel has directed the National Science Foundation (NSF) to incorporate the Human Capital Initiative (HCI) in planning its behavioral and social science research activities. The details are complex, but the bottom line is that Congress is supporting the HCI and is in turn encouraging NSF’s systematic use of it over the long term.

The directive came from the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee that is responsible for NSF’s budget as part of the panel’s annual funding instructions to the agency. The Subcommittee, chaired by Sen. Barbara Mikulski (D-MD), directs NSF to move forward with implementing the HCI in fiscal year (FY) 1994 and report back to the Senate by the end of the fiscal year on what steps were taken. The Mikulski panel further specified that NSF is to outline in its report the agency’s plans for using the HCI in funding future projects.

As we have reported for the past several years, the HCI is a national behavioral science research agenda developed under the auspices of APS by representatives of 70 psychology organizations. Among other things it is designed to be used by Congress and federal research agencies as a guide for behavioral science funding.

The 20 Percent Solution

Last year, the NSF had been directed by the Senate Subcommittee to incorporate the HCI in planning its behavioral science research agenda. In response, NSF made a commitment to “set aside 20% of the increase requested for FY 1994 for the Social, Behavioral and Economic Research Subactivity, to support basic research projects related to the [HCI].” (See May 1993 Observer.)

The effect is that the Senate will hold NSF to its commitment of funds to the HCI and is expecting the agency to make this an ongoing priority. In both instances, the language followed APS’s discussions with Senate staff.

SEE NIH ON PAGE 36

SEE NSF ON PAGE 36
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Emotional First Meeting

The opening session of that first APS convention stands out for some members as an emotional high point in the first year of the Society. Even today APS Past-President Janet Spence speaks with awe of the first business meeting she opened at that convention: "It was one of the most stirring experiences I have ever had. The air of excitement and enthusiasm was almost palpable. The room was jammed. It must have been the only business meeting in the history of any society that everybody attended. George Miller gave the opening address. It was really fantastic."

APS: On Track and on Time?

McGaugh, of the University of California-Irvine, was elected APS President that year and thereupon declared, “A membership target of 15,000 seems reasonable—let’s work together to achieve it.”

With today’s membership over the 15,000 mark, McGaugh now says, “This is just an absolute and clear validation of the assumptions of the founding folk that there was a desperate need for this organization. How else can you get 15,000 people to sign up in a five-year period of time?”

The Observer spoke recently with Spence, McGaugh, and more than a dozen other APS members and friends of APS in the federal government’s research funding agencies about how APS has developed in those five years. We asked questions such as: Is today’s APS what you hoped for or looked for back then? What difference has it made to have APS alive and working? Why did you come aboard when you did? What attracted you, what attracts you to APS? How do you account for APS’s growth?

Bridging Levels of Analysis

The answers came at two distinct levels. At the first level respondents cited most often the APS journals, annual convention, and APS-convened behavioral science summits. The latter have been credited with galvanizing disparate psychology organizations and psychology subdisciplines to achieve feats such as the development of the Human Capital Initiative, a venerable national psychology research agenda. At the 1992 summit, national accreditation procedures governing psychology departments were examined with an eye toward changing the now outdated system that adversely affects the economics and science of the discipline of psychology.

Many respondents approached by the Observer heartily endorsed the formidable political clout APS has demonstrated in the federal arena. Shaping the language of federal legislative reports, spurring the creation of the National Institutes of Health’s (NIH) Office of Behavioral and Social Research and the National Science Foundation’s Social, Behavioral and Economic Science directorate, and generally pushing toward a better match between federal funding and psychology’s research potential, APS has made its mark as the “little engine that could.”

Other respondents cited APS’s effective emphasis on applied psychology and the search for solutions to practical problems in the real world, notably in the Human Capital Initiative (HCI). Others noted APS’s nurturing efforts to be open and encouraging to students and younger scholars, the future of psychology.

Homeward Bound

But at a second and perhaps deeper level, almost all those interviewed cited scientific psychologists’ need for what many simply called “identification” and “a home.” That’s what they said they found in APS, whether they were very active in the Society or not. And several added that APS seemed to be reversing a trend that saw researchers casting aside the “psychology” label of their core behavioral discipline and adopting the labels of other fields. Others found that APS was stimulating a deeper awareness of psychology’s essential scientific roots throughout the discipline, specifically in some other psychology organizations.

Making Steam, Boosting Esteem

Brad Bushman, one of the youngest respondents to the informal Observer survey, was a year away from his PhD when he first made contact with APS five years ago. Now teaching at Iowa State

I've often been asked if the Human Capital Initiative will create a drive within APS toward real-world issues and thereby move members of APS and the other associations involved in more applied directions. I would say it certainly can.

For instance, in the drug abuse area there are now millions of dollars for treatment programs. A lot of research previously had been oriented solely toward biological research without a lot of treatment work. Now the funding has changed and some of the researchers in that field have gotten involved in treatment research. And I see that possibly happening elsewhere.

MILT HAKEL
BOWLING GREEN STATE UNIVERSITY
CHAIR, HUMAN CAPITAL INITIATIVE

SEE FIVE ON PAGE 14
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From the CHRONICLE of Higher Education

Top Ten Reasons Why NIH Doesn’t Want To Fund Behavioral Science ... And Why They’re Wrong!

What is the story with NIH and behavioral science? The evidence grows year after year that the biggest health risk in our nation is unhealthy behavior. Yet, year after year, NIH has to be dragged kicking and screaming to include behavioral factors in health on its agenda at all, much less among its priorities.

Now don't get me wrong—it's not as if NIH officials are out railing against behavioral science. But there is an undeniable institutional bias that excludes behavioral research and behavioral researchers from the programs and policies of our national health research enterprise. Why? I thought you might ask that ... so, as a public service—and with apologies to David Letterman—here is a list of “top ten” reasons that in one form or another have been used to justify NIH’s policies toward behavioral science research. And, of course, why they’re wrong.

10. Behavior Isn’t a Health Issue.

Huh? Since the late 1970s, official report after official report has documented the enormous impact of behavior on health. Some came from the Surgeon General, some from the National Academy of Sciences, some from Congress. They all have said things like: “Seven of the ten leading causes of death in this country are due to behavior”; or “Behavior accounts for 50 percent of all premature mortality.”

Even so, I am willing to bet that you don’t need convincing that behavior affects health. It is evident in the Sunday paper, the evening news, and, sadly, perhaps even closer to home. Smoking, drinking, heart attacks, teen pregnancy, AIDS, drugs, violence—all are tied to behavior. And yet, what is obvious to most Americans seems to be easily overlooked by NIH officials.


This is the “moral fiber” argument: The source of unhealthy behavior is a weak or immoral character. At best, this view is unbelievably naive, and at worst, it reveals a cold lack of compassion. Regardless of its origins, the “just say no” policy ignores the realities of addiction and mental illness, as well as the complex roots of motivations, belief systems, personal relationships, how we make choices, and other aspects of individual behavior.

8. Congress Hasn’t Asked NIH To Fund Behavioral Science.

Au contraire. In fact, it is the history of NIH’s responses to congressional directives on behavioral research that most clearly illustrates the Agency’s resistance. For many years, congressional appropriations committees have directed NIH to increase the overall level of support for behavioral research, estimated now and for the past ten years to be approximately 3 percent of the NIH annual budget. (The figure should be more like 10-15 percent.) Congress also has encouraged behavioral science initiatives at individual Institutes mainly through language in the reports that it sends as part of NIH’s annual appropriations. Many institutes have ignored the behavioral provisions in such reports, with the notable exceptions of the National Institute on Aging and the National Institute on Child Health and Human Development.

Congress has just created a new NIH-wide Office of Behavioral and Social Science Research, charged with identifying promising areas of behavioral research that can help address
CAPITALIZE SCIENCE AT 1994 CONVENTION

APS returns to its hometown in triumph with its 6th Annual Convention, June 30-July 3, 1994, at the Sheraton Washington Hotel. Just a few months ago, APS's special combination of integrative sessions, diverse poster presentations, and enthusiastic attendees resulted in a successful Chicago meeting, and we plan to outdo ourselves here in Washington next year in '94. (Our 1991 convention in the nation's capital attracted over 2,100 participants.) The APS meeting will feature select addresses and symposia by distinguished scientific psychologists, hundreds of poster presentations highlighting cutting-edge research, special opportunities to confer with federal agency personnel about research funding, and, in our Exhibit Hall, the latest in psychology-related publications, equipment, and other tools to assist you in your research and teaching endeavors. Now, that's science with a capital "S"!

Here is the first sampling of the many presentations planned by the Program Committee ... but don't forget to get in the act yourself! The Call for Submissions (published in the September Observer and mailed to all members last month) has a deadline of January 8, 1994, for proposals; call the APS Office at 202-783-2077 to ask questions or to request additional copies. The new APS Teaching Institute (see box on opposite page) also offers opportunities to share your expertise with colleagues; its Call for Submissions was published in the September Observer and is reprinted on page 39 of this issue.

KEYNOTE ADDRESS

Urie Bronfenbrenner, a recent James McKeen Cattell Fellow Award winner, will deliver the Keynote Address on the evening of Thursday, June 30. Bronfenbrenner accepted the invitation to speak at the APS Convention with delight, welcoming the opportunity to express his "conviction that despite growing specialization, psychology does have some unity as a way of looking at how human beings develop." He also expressed his admiration for APS as an organization that is "still saying that psychology is a science, it is evolving, and it is going somewhere."

Urie Bronfenbrenner
Cornell University

Psychological Science in Developmental Perspective:
Reflections of a Participant Observer

From the viewpoint of a participant in psychological science for more than half a century, I examine the evolution of theoretical paradigms in the field as reflected over the years in systematic studies of behavior and psychological structure in human beings at different ages from infancy through old age. The results of these analyses suggest possibilities for convergence and integration in theoretical and operational models for the future, both in our basic science and its applications.
**Invited Addresses**

**Patricia Cain Smith**  
Bowling Green State University

**Satisfaction, Stress, and Sickness: Correlation, Causation, and Clarification**

Job stress and job dissatisfaction are distinct. Intercorrelation of global self-report measures is consistently low and their correlations differ with facet and, arguably, physiological measures. Psychometric "cleansing" of measures (and constructs) clarified the distinction. Differences in affect, arousal, and control are posited.

**Howard Gardner**  
Harvard University

**Understanding the Highest Levels of Creativity: Can One Venture Beyond the Case Study?**

Exceptional performances have generally been studied in an experimental (nomothetic) fashion, though there have been instructive case studies (idiographic) as well. In this talk, I outline a new approach to the study of creativity and present preliminary findings from a parallel study of outstanding leaders of this century. Through a systematic accumulation of case study materials, it should prove possible to build a bridge between the usually separate nomothetic and idiographic approaches.

**Robyn M. Dawes**  
Carnegie Mellon University

**The Prediction of the Future Versus an Understanding of the Past: A Basic Asymmetry**

For "unusual" antecedents and consequences, conditioning on consequences yields greater statistical contingency than does conditioning on antecedents—an asymmetry exacerbated by search and reliance on memory. Researchers comparing groups and clinicians inferring diagnostic characteristics and "causal histories" of clients thus overestimate predictive contingency. Examples abound, most recently concerning child sexual abuse.

**Howard Eichenbaum**  
State University of New York-Stony Brook

**The Hippocampus and Declarative Memory in Humans and Animals**

Findings on human amnesia support the view that "declarative" or "explicit" memory depends critically on the hippocampal region. This presentation summarizes the development of an animal model of declarative memory, based on behavioral and neuropsychological studies, as well as a preliminary understanding of the hippocampal circuits and coding mechanisms that underlie this form of memory.
INVITED ADDRESSES

FROM PREVIOUS PAGE

P.R. Jeanneret
Jeanneret & Associates, Inc.

*Accommodation—State of the Research and Practice When Complying with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990*

The research knowledge and current practice supporting the accommodation of individuals who are protected by Title 1 of ADA will be examined with respect to three primary categories: the job application process; the work environment; and the benefits and privileges of employment. Attention also will be given to accommodation models and expectations created for both individuals with disabilities and organizations offering them employment.

Steven F. Maier
University of Colorado-Boulder

*Anxiety, Serotonin, the Dorsal Raphe, and Learned Helplessness*

Research distinguishing between conditioned fear and anxiety on behavioral and neurochemical levels will be reviewed. Serotonergic projections from the dorsal raphe nucleus will be highlighted as a key feature in this distinction. Experiments will then be described which indicate that uncontrollable aversive events uniquely activate the described anxiety circuitry, and that learned helplessness effects may be mediated by these systems.

Shepard Siegel
McMaster University

*Learning and Homeostasis*

Homeostatic responses mediating adaptation are elicited not only by physiological disturbances ("reactive homeostasis"), but also signals for such disturbances ("predictive homeostasis"). Most evidence for predictive homeostasis has been obtained in studies of drug tolerance, but there is increasing evidence that anticipatory responding contributes to adaptation to a variety of nonpharmacological stimuli.

William P. Smotherman
Binghamton University

*Fetal Experience: Learning and the Endogenous Opiate System*

Study of rodent fetuses has traced the developmental origins of learning and memory to the prenatal period. The rat fetus provides a simple mammalian system for investigation of how associations are acquired and memories are stored within an incomplete nervous system that undergoes constant and rapid change during ontogeny. Stimuli such as milk and an artificial nipple evoke responses from fetal subjects, including activation of the endogenous opioid system, and can support fetal learning through their association. The use of ecologically relevant and developmentally appropriate sensory manipulations to study fetal learning provides a means for quantitative assessment of the integrated output of the developing nervous system in the intact animal.

Steven Pinker
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

*Words and Rules*

Language works by two principles: the arbitrary sound-meaning pairing underlying words, and the discrete combinatorial system underlying grammar. These principles implicate distinct systems: associative memory and symbol-manipulating rules. I present supporting evidence from three disciplines (cognitive psychology, linguistics, neuroscience), based on a case where the two systems compete: irregular ('break-broke') and regular ('walk-walked') inflection.
CALL FOR NOMINATIONS

APS Board and President-Elect

The APS Elections Committee seeks nominations to fill two upcoming vacancies on the APS Board of Directors and the position of APS President-Elect. Board members serve four-year terms, and the President-Elect serves a one-year term and assumes the presidency at the end of that term. Send names of nominees by December 23, 1993, to APS Elections Committee Chair Janet T. Spence. Self-nominations are permitted.

Both the President-Elect’s term and that of each of the two APS Board of Directors positions begin at the end of the June 1994, APS convention. Marilynn B. Brewer, of Ohio State University, is the current president. Board members whose terms are expiring in 1994 and for whom replacements are being sought are Elizabeth Loftus, University of Washington, and Claude Steele, Stanford University. The other four elected Board members include: Elizabeth Capaldi, University of Florida; Kay Deaux, City University of New York Graduate School; Sandra Scarr, University of Virginia; Richard Weinberg, University of Minnesota.

In the spaces below, you may name up to two individuals to serve on the APS Board and one individual to serve as APS President-Elect. Elections will take place in early 1994.

Be sure to include address, phone number(s), and email address, and, if possible, a current vita of the nominee(s).

I nominate the following for the APS Board:

(1) Name
Address
City State Zip
Phone
Email

(2) Name
Address
City State Zip
Phone
Email

I nominate the following for APS President-Elect:

(1) Name
Address
City State Zip
Phone
Email

Send Nominations by December 23, 1993, to:

Janet T. Spence
Department of Psychology
University of Texas
Austin, TX 78712

Your name: ____________________________
Phone: _____________________________
Dana Foundation Pushes Neuroscience

Rejuvenating an Aging “Decade of the Brain” ...

APS Members Are Tapped in Brain Initiative Renewal

Into its fourth year, the congressionally anointed and presidially proclaimed “Decade of the Brain” (begun in 1990) is approaching mid-life crisis, and the Dana Alliance for Brain Initiatives aims to do something about it.

The fresh infusion for the Brain Decade is being provided by the Charles A. Dana Foundation through the Alliance, formed in April 1993 to unite leading researchers, research institutes, and political leaders behind a specific set of 10 research objectives for the decade.

At a public unveiling of the Alliance, three APS Fellows were among the scientific presenters and moderators: Nancy Wexler, Columbia Univ.; Ellen Frank, Univ. of Pittsburgh (see article on opposite page); and Larry Squire, Univ. of California-San Diego (see related story at right).

The Dana Alliance, guided by James Watson (of human genome fame) and chaired by Dana Foundation CEO David Mahoney, includes among its objectives the identification of genes responsible for vulnerability to brain disorders (e.g., Huntington’s and Alzheimer’s diseases, ALS); development of drugs and treatments for specific diseases and central nervous system injuries (e.g., MS, spinal cord injury, stroke); development of agents to block the action of cocaine and other addictive substances; and elucidation of neuronal mechanisms involved in learning and memory.

The Alliance is a science advocacy arm of the Charles A. Dana Foundation, founded in 1950 with assets now exceeding $223 million. The Alliance has committed $25 million to foster breakthroughs in the 10 areas, and it also is working to promote public understanding of brain research and mental illness. The Alliance estimates that some 50 million Americans are affected by brain-related disorders at a cost of some $300 billion a year.

More than 100 researchers, neuroscientists, and science leaders, including four Nobel laureates, are members of the Dana Alliance. Among them are several APS members: Ellen Frank, Univ. of Pittsburgh; Barry Gordon, Johns Hopkins Univ.; Jordan Grafman, NIH; Brenda Milner, Montreal Neurological Institute; Richard Mohs, Mount Sinai School of Medicine; and Paula Tallal, Rutgers Univ.

Establishing Research Consortia—Memory Loss and Aging, and Depression ...

APS Members Are Tapped for Dana Consortium

APS Charter Fellow Richard Mohs, director of the division of psychology of the Mount Sinai School of Medicine, in addition to being a member of the Dana Alliance for Brain Initiatives, is a principal investigator (PI) in the Dana Consortium on Memory Loss and Aging. Mohs is one of some 20 program PIs in this research consortium to which Dana is devoting a total of $8.4 million over three years to focus on what produces memory loss in otherwise healthy people and to identify effective therapies or preventions.

The memory loss consortium consists of five institutions: Harvard Medical School, Johns Hopkins University, Mount Sinai Medical Center, The University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, and Columbia University College of Physicians and Surgeons.

A second consortium will receive a three-year grant of $2.5 million, beginning in October 1993 to focus on identifying the genetic basis of manic-depression.

While not directly related to the Dana Alliance, the Dana Consortia, together with the Alliance, are designed to help advance neuroscience for the purpose of alleviating suffering from central nervous system disorders and damage.

Rewarding Innovative Ideas ...

Larry Squire Receives $50K Award

APS Charter Fellow Larry Squire received one of this year’s four Charles A. Dana Foundation Awards for Pioneering Achievements in Health and Education. The $50,000 award and a medallion were conferred at a ceremony at the Museum of Modern Art in New York on November 3 for his research in the multiple brain systems of human memory.

Squire is professor of psychiatry and neuroscience at the University of California-San Diego. The award cited Squire as among the first researchers to demonstrate that human memory is not a single mental faculty but comprises multiple brain systems independently responsible for two kinds of memory. His research lays the groundwork for further understanding of how memory is affected by disease, trauma, and aging, the award citation stated.

This is the eighth year that the Awards for Pioneering Achievements in Health and Education have been made. Five awards are given annually and are selected by a jury of leaders in education and science. Fifteen awards have been presented for achievements in health and 12 have been presented in education.
A cascade of stresses are implicated in women's vulnerability to major unipolar depression, which they suffer at rates approximately 2.4 times those for men, according to Ellen Frank of the University of Pittsburgh Medical School.

She offered a whirlwind tour of what has been learned about biological and psychosocial mechanisms underlying major depression in women. Speaking at a symposium sponsored by the Institute of Medicine and underwritten by the Dana [Foundation] Alliance for Brain Initiatives, Frank was one of three APS Fellows chosen to participate in the May 1993 unveiling of Dana’s efforts to renew the 1990s as the Decade of the Brain (see article on opposite page).

Counter-Intuitive Research Results

Frank said that early research on hormonal explanations of women’s depression found “no evidence that hormones explain the increased depression in women, or distinguish depressed from non-depressed subjects of either sex, or distinguish those at high risk for development of depression.” “However, dramatic change in the amount of hormones is associated with depressive symptoms and syndrome,” she said, noting the well-documented increase in depressive symptoms after childbirth and just before menstruation.

Frank said it has also been suggested that women’s multiple roles are involved in the development of major depression. A counter-intuitive finding is the fact that the multiple roles in marriage, work, and family can also have a protective effect, providing various opportunities for support, research has revealed.

Frank cited recent investigations—in genetics, chemical and hormonal change, and circadian rhythms—that tracked differential rates of depression in women and men, as well as psychosocial research examining factors such as social support, sexual abuse, and multiple roles for their impact on major depression in women.

Genetic studies show greatly increased probability of unipolar disorder in the relatives of unipolar patients over what is expected in normal controls, Frank said. But when sex differences are investigated in relation to genetic transmission of the disorder, the risk to relatives of male and female subjects is found to be virtually identical.

Brain and Neuropeptide Activity

Functional brain imaging has shown activation of both the prefrontal cortex and the amygdala in a highly selective group of depressives with what may be considered a pure strain of the disorder, Frank said. “What is most interesting about these data is the fact that the prefrontal finding seems to be specific to the depressive state in these depressed patients but that the amygdala [activity] was present in the remitted state as well, suggesting that this is a persistent phenomenon in individuals with pure depressive disorder.”

Cortisol levels have been the focus of much investigation, Frank pointed out, noting that 24-hour cortisol is significantly higher in the depressed state. This reflects a failure to suppress cortisol in the first half of the night, she said, and it has dampening effects on biorhythms and shows strong pulsatile variations.

Sleep Abnormalities and Confusion

Sleep studies have shown that in highly depressed patients there is little delta-wave sleep and “sleep onset rapid eye movement,” which Frank said may be a marker of major depression. The sleep of normal controls, on the other hand, typically shows a gradual decline in delta-wave sleep through the night and starts rapid-eye-movement sleep about two hours after falling asleep.

What is difficult about understanding the biological correlates of depressive illness, explained Frank, is that stress is so tied to the onset and maintenance of depressive symptoms that “many biological parameters are sensitive but few are specific.” Confusing matters further is that many of the biological correlates of depressive illness (e.g., changes in sleep) appear to be persistent rather than associated only with the depressive episode. “But we don’t know when they become persistent. Were they present prior to the first episode, or do they represent scars of the previous episode?”

Psychosocial Risk Factors

Turning to the psychosocial factors that behavioral scientists have implicated in depressive illness, Frank said it is interesting that most of them tend to focus on women and aspects of women’s lives. She presented a list of these factors taken from a review of women’s depression done by a task force in 1990. It included childhood adversity, gender stereotyping, marital distress and violence, marital disruptions, and multiple role responsibilities.

To illustrate the impact of sexual...
HCl Aging Initiative To NIA, Congress

The timing couldn’t have been better. A new Director just arrived at the National Institute on Aging (NIA) and was just learning what the important research issues in aging are. The Human Capital Initiative on Aging, the APS-coordinated national research agenda-setting process for aging research, was just completed and the resulting document, Vitality for Life: Psychological Research for Productive Aging, was being widely circulated. The two were joined in a meeting on the NIH campus at which representatives of APS, the American Psychological Association (APA), the Gerontological Society of America (GSA), the Division of Adult Development and Aging, and the Federation (of Behavioral, Cognitive, and Psychological Sciences) presented the Aging document to the NIA Director, Richard Hodes, and his staff, and discussed how it could guide NIA behavioral and social science priorities.

Depression from Page 11

abuse, Frank cited a study of inner-city London women with two or more children. Those with a history of sexual abuse had a 64% likelihood of developing depression over a three-year period while those with no history of sexual abuse had a 26% likelihood.

In a social support investigation, the same London researchers studied how the onset of depression was influenced by women’s ability to confide in their husband and receive crisis support from him in the face of stressful life events. Women who did not have a confiding relationship with their husband experienced high rates of onset. But women who were most vulnerable to depression were those who had a confiding relationship and who expected crisis support but did not get it, Frank noted.

A study of more than 1,000 Los Angeles women measured depression risks, and found that a woman who does not work outside the home and who has a stressful marriage has a risk of developing major depression 5.5 times greater than an employed woman who has no marital or work strain.

Contrary to expectations, this same research showed that risks of depression are lower for women who have strain in both their employment and marriages, than for women who are not employed and have stressful marriages, Frank pointed out. “This suggests that the multiple roles that have been implicated in the development of major depression may actually have a kind of protective effect, at least in that one can turn in various directions for support,” Frank said.

In-Step with Depression

She offered a model that brings together interactively the series of biological mechanisms and psychosocial mechanisms. She sees genetic vulnerability as setting the stage on which stress—in the form of psychosocial stress and dramatic changes in hormonal status—lead to neurotransmitter dysregulation. This dysregulation can lead to circadian rhythm disturbances and then to the behavioral disturbances that are called depressive symptoms or syndrome. A back and forth action then appears to ensue between the circadian rhythm disturbances, the behavioral disturbances, and the neurotransmitter dysregulation.

Frank concluded that “where women’s excess vulnerability comes is in the area of stresses that are internal and biological and psychosocial, playing through this whole cascade leading to the symptoms of major depression.”

Frank’s session of the symposium was held at the National Academy of Sciences and chaired by APS Fellow Nancy Wexler of Columbia University. APS Charter Fellow Larry Squire, University of California-San Diego, presented research on the multiple brain systems involved in human memory in another session of the symposium. D.K.

Hodes’ first comments to the group were about the document being so useful, particularly during his first few months at the helm of NIA, the nation’s premier funder of aging research in all disciplines. The subsequent dialogue touched on issues such as using the document to craft future NIA Requests for Applications (RFAs) and Program Announcements. Although no funding was committed, there were promises made that additional meetings on these issues would take place.

Senate Aging Committee Is Interested

The NIA meeting was not the first time the Institute had received the Aging document. Several weeks before the meeting, Senator David Pryor (D-AK), the chair of the Senate Special Committee on Aging, sent Hodes the Human Capital Initiative on Aging report, asking that he use the recommendations in the document in developing NIA’s research agenda. In addition to commending the report for its “comprehensive approach to quality aging research,” Pryor requested Hodes’ reaction to the report and thanked him for his participation in “this important project.”

See letter on opposite page ...

Whirlwind Hill Visits

A day of congressional “Hill” visits followed the meeting with NIA. The group who met with NIA and Hill staff included Denise Park (Univ. of Georgia), John Cavanaugh (Univ. of Delaware), Michael Smyer (Pennsylvania State Univ.), Sherry Willis (Pennsylvania State Univ.), Alan Kraut (APS), Betty Willis (APS), Pat Kobor (APA), David Johnson (Federation), and Paul Kerschner (GSA). In meetings with key staff from both the House and Senate Appropriations Committees and the Senate Special Committee on Aging, there was strong support expressed for the research agenda outlined in the report and a sincere interest in helping promote it through the congressional process. The group will be working with members of Congress over the next few months to ensure the aging initiative receives the attention it deserves during the FY 95 appropriations hearings for NIA in the spring. ♦
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Knowing of your appreciation for the important role behavioral science plays in addressing many issues associated with aging, I want to bring to your attention the attached document, "Vitality for Life: Psychological Research for Productive Aging."

The document is part of the Human Capital Initiative, a national research agenda that targets six problem areas facing the nation—Aging, Literacy, Productivity, Substance Abuse, Health, and Violence—and outlines ways in which behavioral science research can contribute (see page four of the document for details).

"Vitality for Life" represents the efforts of 25 different behavioral science organizations, plus representatives from the American Association of Retired Persons (AARP), the National Institute on Mental Health, the National Institute on Aging, and the National Science Foundation. This specific report is aimed at sustaining human vitality across the adult life span into old age. I commend those who contributed to this report for their comprehensive approach to quality aging research. All too often the degenerative consequences associated with aging overshadow the preventive steps that can and should be taken throughout our lives to maximize human potential.

It is my understanding that later this month you will be meeting with representatives of the groups who helped develop the report. I am interested in your reaction to the report, and I am hopeful that you will give serious consideration to the recommendations in "Vitality for Life" as you develop your Institute’s research agenda.

Many thanks for your consideration of this request and for your Institute’s participation to date in this important project. As Chairman of the Special Committee on Aging I look forward to working with you and your staff on areas of mutual interest.

Sincerely,

David Pryor
Chairman
APS has become the organizational home for scientific psychologists. It changed the attitudes of psychological scientists about the importance of a national organization to represent their interests. Many scientists had become extremely jaded and cynical about the possibility of representation of their interests nationally. That attitude has been changed because of the effectiveness of APS ....

APS has created a new consciousness that psychological science is alive and well. Before APS, psychological scientists were a depressed group, in my opinion, because there wasn’t any real home for them, not any place they could turn to. I think there is now a revitalized interest in psychological science that will have a prolonged impact on higher education, national policy, and a number of other areas ....

JAMES L. MCGAUGH
UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA-IRVINE
APS PAST-PRESIDENT

FIVE FROM PAGE 4

University, Bushman says, “I remember the start-up meeting in Atlanta, Georgia, in 1988. I went to the APA convention with Harris Cooper, my advisor at the University of Missouri. That’s where I was introduced to APS. I became a student affiliate member at the start. As a scientific psychologist, the attraction of APS is its emphasis on science.” Bushman’s review of research on causal relations of drugs and violence appears in this October’s Current Directions (CD).

Sandra Scarr, one of APS’s founders and Co-Editor of CD, talked about APS then and now. “When we started our new organization no one was sure it would succeed,” she said, “and certainly there were many people who thought it would be very difficult to get the new organization funded and off the ground. We took a lot of risks because we wanted a real organization and wanted journals. And now here we are with two journals and a highly effective and financially sound organization. I don’t think there is a science organization in history that has grown as fast and well as APS.”

Milt Hakel, another founder and Chair of the HCI Coordinating Committee, reviewed APS’s five years of life and said, “APS has more than lived up to the hopes I had for it. I had hoped for a collaborative spirit and collegiality, and an immunity to the divisiveness, turf fighting, and continual uproar that characterized the past. This place is fun to be at. People are excited about ideas in research, and APS really gives a home for that. From the scientist’s perspective, the emotionally wearing ‘you-win-I-lose’ mentality that operated elsewhere in organized psychology is not found at APS.”

Virginia O’Leary, chair of psychology at Indiana State University and another one of APS’s “founding folk” commented that before “the first year was up, APS had achieved its own identity, a strong personality of its own. It was not anti-anything or a subset of any other group but was an independent voice for psychological science .... I remember the first annual convention as the time when APS transformed from being what I thought of as a miracle to being a formidable force of its own.”

Entrainment

Alan Leshner, deputy director of NIMH and an APS Charter Fellow, recalled his speech to an APS behavioral science summit which warned that NIMH and other government funding agencies were on a running train, making decisions about the direction that research takes, and the question is not whether that train is running but “whether you [research psychologists] are on that train.”

Now Leshner says, “APS has not only gotten on the train but also has helped steer it in a direction where behavioral science is receiving the highest level of attention in government agencies that it’s had for its entire lifetime. In five short years APS has become a major force in Washington and has had dramatic effects on the nation’s science policy agenda and in increasing a focus on behavioral science research.”

Leshner is not alone among federal agency staff who believe APS has made indispensable contributions to federal policy. Among those who are not APS members, Duane Alexander, Director of the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD), commented that “APS has been very effective in developing congressional support for issues of critical concern to NICHD.”

Bonnie Strickland, another well-known APS founder, reviewed some APS milestones saying, “We scientific and applied psychologists founded APS following 15 years of unsuccessful
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unity that exists within the discipline of psychology. This too made sense in the context of the Society’s youth and the nation’s need for serious applications of psychology’s scientific resources.

And Divided
But some of these decisions were made for strategic or tactical reasons, and over time they can become fundamental, if we are not clear about our core values and purpose. I fear this is already happening.

I will examine these issues as examples of the challenges we face: mounting a comprehensive activist agenda in the area of applied science, bridging the applied-basic interface within scientific psychology, and finding a way to include intellectual minorities. For APS to be all that it can be, each of these problems needs to be solved.

The Interface Between Applied and Basic Science
I believe a perception is emerging that APS is primarily a basic psychology organization. This perception is not accurate, but it could become so if we are not careful.

The Applied History of APS
Applied psychology has figured strongly in APS’s history. APS was in large part a creation of scientist-practitioners. The majority of ASAP members were applied, as were most of the core group of APS founders. For example, the APS bylaws were written by three clinical psychologists, two applied social psychologists, and an I/O psychologist. In fact, when the name “American Psychological Society” was first proposed, the proponent wrote in big letters on the board: “A P S—where Applied Psychological Science happens.” And in those early days the newsletters often included passionate discussions of many clinical concerns. Basic scientists were very important, but applied scientists were at least equally important in APS into the 1990s.

There was a reason for this heavy applied involvement. The changes in the American Psychological Association (APA) that led to the APS revolution had a direct and painful impact on scientist-practitioners within APA, perhaps even more dramatic that the impact on basic scientists, many of whom had already left APA. The scientist-practitioners saw disciplinary values being subjugated to monetary values. They longed for a day when scientific values dominated in the delivery of psychological services. They feared the growing intrusion of guild interests into academic training standards and licensing requirements, realizing that the control of training and employment ultimately meant control of the discipline itself. The scientist-practitioners wanted a society that would address these concerns, as well as the broader concerns of scientific psychologists everywhere.

Applied Psychologists and the Structure of APS
APS still has a strong applied membership base, and APS struggles with issues of applied relevance such as accreditation, but it looks more and more like a basic psychology organization over time. Paradoxically, this is partly because applied psychologists had a big hand in organizing APS.

The Bardon plan for APA reorganization envisioned two assemblies: scientific (which would include both basic and applied scientists) and professional practice. Defeat of this plan led within hours to the formation of ASAP. The subsequent APA reorganization plan by the Group on Restructuring APA (GOR-APA) envisioned assemblies for basic science, applied science, professional practice, and other areas (e.g., public interest).

Defeat of the GOR-APA plan led within hours to the transformation of ASAP into APS. There were two models to choose from. APS could have two assemblies (basic science and applied science) or be an undifferentiated group.

The later was chosen—indeed the applied psychologists who wrote the APS bylaws (myself included) barely considered the two-assembly model. Applied scientists think of themselves as scientists, even though they may also be practitioners. They like being in one undifferentiated group with basic scientists, because it appeals to this identity. It is not a surprise that the Bardon model was writ large in APS; APS would be the “scientific assembly” and would include both basic and applied scientists. APA could function as the practice assembly.

But the need to emphasize areas of immediate agreement early in the history of APS created an inherent asymmetry. The activist agenda of basic scientific psychology, such as increasing funding for psychological science, is easily understood and embraced by all scientific psychologists, basic and applied. The activist agenda of applied scientific psychology takes time to differentiate from guild issues. For example, at the first APS Summit some basic psychological scientists gave a strongly negative reception to a break-out group report about how scientific knowledge should lead to scientifically based standards of care. It must have sounded to these basic scientists’ ears like a political or guild issue, even if the report was about how to ensure that the most empirically based treatments are delivered to the public.

The crucial distinction involved can be worked out with time, but the one-assembly governance structure, especially without subordinate Divisions, Assemblies, or even Special Interest Groups, does not ensure that this work will be done. Nothing in the structure of APS demands that we understand, resolve, or even recognize our many differences. Nothing in the structure of APS ensures that we will work to bridge the interface between applied and basic scientific psychology on the basis of shared scientific values.

AAAPP
In 1990 a group of scientist-practitioners formed the American Association of Applied and Preventive Psychology. It holds an annual meeting concurrent with the APS convention, has become an affiliate organization of APS, and is a strong ally. The existence of AAAPP has removed some of the pressure, but to me it is unfortunate that this group is outside of APS rather than within it.

Protection of Intellectual Minorities
The trend toward undifferentiation was continued throughout APS. For example, we set up a convention with a very small number of tracks, and we avoided Special Interest Groups and...
People

Recent Promotions, Appointments, Awards . . .

Phillip L. Ackerman was elected a Fellow of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society in October 1993. Ackerman is an APS Charter Fellow and is Professor of Psychology at the University of Minnesota. His research concerns the relations between cognitive/intellectual abilities and individual differences in skill acquisition and skilled performance, and personality-ability relations. He received his PhD from the University of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign in 1984.

Deborah A. Boehm-Davis, an associate professor of psychology and Assistant Provost for Research and Graduate Studies at George Mason University, assumed the presidency of the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society in October 1993. Boehm-Davis is an APS Charter Member. She received her PhD in cognitive psychology in 1980 from the University of California-Berkeley and has worked on applied cognitive research at General Electric, NASA-Ames, and Bell Laboratories prior to joining George Mason University in 1984. Her research interest (effect of information on performance efficiency) has steered her toward studies of user comprehension and computer use and studies of cognition in drivers and pilots.

APS Member François Y. Doré, of the University of Laval's School of Psychology, has been appointed Editor of the International Journal of Psychology (IJP), the official journal of the International Union of Psychological Science. IJP provides a world-wide perspective on the whole range of current psychological issues and research. It publishes reviews as well as empirical contributions, and reports on national and international developments in psychology. It is published by LEA, Ltd.

Michael Lewis, an APS Member, was named University Distinguished Professor by the Board of Trustees at the University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey (UMDNJ). Lewis, an internationally known developmental psychologist at the Robert Wood Johnson Medical School, is the fifth faculty member to receive the honor in the 23-year history of UMDNJ. He is director of the Institute for the Study of Child Development in the New Brunswick medical school's Department of Pediatrics. Among his many accomplishments, Lewis is a pioneer in devising innovative methods for measuring children's attentional functioning and predicting dysfunctional and normal development. Further, he has developed computer-based methods for measuring how and when infants learn.

Gilbert Meier and Teresa Levitin are the new referral officers for research applications assigned for peer review to the National Institute of Mental Health, the National Institute on Drug Abuse, and the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. As referral officers, they are responsible for assigning grant applications to the appropriate study sections for initial peer review. Meier remains the Scientific Review Administrator (SRA) for the AIDS study sections on epidemiology, behavior, and neuroscience. Levitin remains the SRA for the Human Development and Aging-1 Study Section. Both Meier and Levitin are Charter Members of APS.

Paul E. Meehl, a clinical psychologist and practicing psychotherapist, received the 1993 Joseph Zubin Award at the October 1993 meeting of the Society for Research in Psychopathology. The award is for Distinguished Contributions to Psychopathology. Among many other honors, Meehl is an APS William James Fellow, member of the National Academy of Sciences, and is Regents' Professor of Psychology, Emeritus, at the University of Minnesota. His current work involves the development of new taxometric methods for classification and genetics of psychopathology and the elaboration of his widely recognized theory of schizophrenia.

APS Charter Fellow H. McIlvaine (Mac) Parsons, Manager of the Center for Human Factors at the Human Resources Research Organization (HumRO) in Alexandria, Virginia, received the President's Distinguished Service Award from the Human Factors and Ergonomics Society (HFES) in October 1993. This annual award is the Society's top honor and is given for "career-long contributions that have brought honor to the profession and to the ... Society." Parsons is a past president of the 5,400-member HFES and has been active in the field for 43 years in both managerial and technical positions. His areas of interest include human performance, human-machine design, training, system development, and relevant motivational factors. He has helped develop a theoretical framework for human factors science based on operant behavior analysis. In addition, Parsons has been instrumental in the introduction of human factors principles and data to high-technology applications such as robotic systems and automation in the workplace.

APS Members Promoted to Full Professor

At least four APS members were recently promoted to Full Professor. Among them were three APS Charter Members (Crouter, Warren, and Wilson) and one APS Member (Nishita):

Ann C. Crouter, Pennsylvania State Univ. Dept. of Human Development and Family Studies
J. Ken Nishita, San Jose State Univ. Dept. of Psychology
Amye Warren, Univ. of Tennessee-Chattanooga Dept. of Psychology
Timothy D. Wilson, Univ. of Virginia Dept. of Psychology

People News Welcomed . . .

The Editor invites submissions of 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, # 1100, Washington, DC 20005-4907
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Human Performance Pioneer
Earl A. Alluisi (1927-1993)

"Pay your dues, be all that you can be, live the enjoyment of hard work, enjoy the satisfaction of occasionally doing something really good, strive always for high-quality professional output, and lower standards for no one or thing! Enjoy 'la dolce vita,' do always what you believe is the right thing, and harbor no regrets at the outcome: 'che sara, sara!'

These were the principles on which Earl Alluisi patterned his personal and professional lives. He taught them to his children, instilled them in his students, and lived with great intensity, joy, and pride. Those who knew him well have been influenced forever by his constant demand for excellence, hard work, professionalism, and doing the "right thing" in the "right way."

In most instances, doing things the right way, according to Earl Alluisi, meant doing things "his way;" namely, with great gusto and energy, with careful attention to detail, with extremely high standards of excellence, and with a sense of always enjoying the process. In this typical "Alluisi" style, Earl battled the cancer that attacked his body for more than 20 months. For many of those months his friends had hoped that his vigor and systematic approach to fighting the cancer would prevail for him. Unfortunately, he finally succumbed on August 14, 1993.

Earl was born (June 11, 1927) and reared in Richmond, Virginia. He served a tour of enlistment in the US Army before entering The College of William and Mary, where he studied under Edgar M. Foltin and Stanley B. Williams. As he completed his BS in psychology (in June of 1949), a new area of psychology, "human engineering" or "applied experimental psychology," was just beginning to develop, and Earl was keenly interested in it. The father of this new field, Paul Fitts, had just gone to The Ohio State University, so Earl went there to study with Paul and other notables such as John Kinzer, Sam Renshaw, Herbert Toops, Bob Wherry, and Delos Wickens.

Earl’s studies were interrupted when the Army reserve unit he commanded was activated during the Korean Conflict. However, he returned to Ohio State and completed his doctoral studies in December of 1954. He continued to serve in the Army reserves until 1978, when he retired with over 41 years of service.

After completing his PhD, Earl worked successively (and successfully) for Paul Fitts’ Aviation Psychology Laboratory at The Ohio State University, the Lockheed Missiles and Space Division in Palo Alto, California, the Stanford Research Institute-taking courses in theatrical production, drawing, painting, diction, and stagecraft—and the University of Chicago—taking senior and graduate courses in physics and mathematics. He received both his MA and PhD in psychology from Stanford University. Once again, however, his wide breadth of interests was demonstrated in his chosen minor area sequence during his doctoral program: Asiatic and Slavic Studies, including Russian language.

Following completion of his studies at Stanford, John conducted applied psychological research for the US Air Force in Washington, DC. While in Washington he served as Senior Research Psychologist with the Human Resources Research Office, assistant head of the Department of Psychological Warfare Research, and, finally, as executive assistant to the Director's Office, developing research management tools.

In 1955 John accepted the position of Director of Personnel and Industrial Relations for the Ampex Corporation in Redwood City, California. In this capacity he directed all personnel and labor relations activities during a four-year period in which the company grew in size from 500 to 5,000 employees. While with Ampex he served as lecturer in industrial psychology with the University of California-Palo Alto, and he also lectured at Stanford University.

Management Psychologist
John V. Zuckerman (1918-1993)

John V. Zuckerman, an APS Fellow, died in a Houston hospital on August 19, 1993, following a lengthy illness with heart and diabetes complications. He was 74. A September 12 memorial service was attended by scores whose lives John had touched in his indubitably supportive and mentoring fashion. Although he had been ill for some time, John remained involved and professionally active up to the time of his death.

John’s professional contributions spanned six decades and are best characterized by the formidable diversity of interest and accomplishment they display. They are also a testament to the fact that while he was a world-class teacher, John Zuckerman was first, foremost, and always, a student.

John was born in Chicago on September 15, 1918. In a very real sense, his career as an educator began in that city, where as a 21-year-old he secured a position as a teacher of percussion instruments with the well-known Rudolph Wurlitzer Company. The beginnings of John’s eclectic academic interests also emerged in Chicago, where, after graduating from high school, he attended both the Goodman Theatre School of the Arts Institute—taking courses in theatrical production, drawing, painting, diction, and stagecraft—and the University of Chicago—taking senior and graduate courses in physics and mathematics. He received both his MA and PhD in psychology from Stanford University. Once again, however, his wide breadth of interests was demonstrated in his chosen minor area sequence during his doctoral program: Asiatic and Slavic Studies, including Russian language.

Following completion of his studies at Stanford, John conducted applied psychological research for the US Air Force in Washington, DC. While in Washington he served as Senior Research Psychologist with the Human Resources Research Office, assistant head of the Department of Psychological Warfare Research, and, finally, as executive assistant to the Director’s Office, developing research management tools.

In 1955 John accepted the position of Director of Personnel and Industrial Relations for the Ampex Corporation in Redwood City, California. In this capacity he directed all personnel and labor relations activities during a four-year period in which the company grew in size from 500 to 5,000 employees. While with Ampex he served as lecturer in industrial psychology with the University of California-Palo Alto, and he also lectured at Stanford University.
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Institute’s scientific advisory team at Fort Ord, California, the psychology department at Emory University in Atlanta, Georgia, and the Human Factors Research Laboratory at the Lockheed Georgia Company in Marietta, Georgia. In August of 1963, he moved to the University of Louisville and began a period he considered to be among his most enjoyable and productive years and where he became vice president for planning and institutional research.

At the University of Louisville, Earl was instrumental in helping the psychology department establish a successful PhD program, which he supported by founding the Performance Research Laboratory. With a scientific staff that included John Binford, Glynn Coates, Mike Loeb, Ben Morgan, Dick Smith, John Thurmond, and Joel Warm, among others, this laboratory was highly productive.

Well before dual-task performance research became popular, Earl pioneered in the development and application of the Multiple Task Performance Battery (MTPB), which was designed to measure individual and group performances of several (up to five) concurrent tasks. Using the MTPB, he conducted studies on performance effects of infectious diseases and temporal factors such as wake-rest schedules, sleep-wakefulness cycles, and sleep loss and recovery. His supporting laboratory research concentrated on the areas of human information processing, vigilance, and form perception.

In January of 1974, Earl left Louisville to accept a partially endowed chair in psychology at Old Dominion University in Norfolk, Virginia. He helped the department establish a successful doctoral program and supported the founding of both the Performance Assessment Laboratory and the Tidewater Chapter of the Human Factors Society. Thus, he transferred his research interests to Norfolk, along with his multiple task performance assessment methodology and two former students, Glynn Coates and Ben Morgan. After five years at Old Dominion, he went on assignment from the university to the Air Force Human Resources Laboratory at Brooks Air Force Base, Texas.

Earl enjoyed life in Texas so much that he accepted an appointment in the US government Senior Executive Service in December of 1982, and stayed on as Chief Scientist of the Human Resources Laboratory. He continued this appointment until the fall of 1986, when he was transferred to the Pentagon as Assistant for Training and Personnel Systems Technology in the Office of the Secretary of Defense. After a three-year tour at the Pentagon, Earl accepted a position on the research staff of the Science and Technology Division of the Institute for Defense Analyses, where he worked until his untimely death.

Throughout his career, Earl made substantial contributions to the field of psychology and to his chosen areas of concentration, human factors and human performance assessment. He authored or co-authored over 350 publications, presentations, and research articles.
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College of San Mateo and the University of California-Berkeley. It was this experience as a lecturer that probably cemented his subsequent decision to become an academician. He first, however, returned to Washington, DC, for a two-year period where he served as Deputy, then Acting Director, Bureau of International Business Operations at the US Department of Commerce. Once again demonstrating his broad scope, he directed an organization engaged in trade promotion, trade intelligence, and the management of personnel in commercial sections of embassies and consulates in Foreign Trade Zones.

In 1963 John Zuckerman accepted the position of Associate Professor in the Graduate School of Business Administration at the University of Southern California (USC) in Los Angeles. During his association with USC he served as the Director of Research and Development Systems Management masters degree program for career Air Force Officers, and for two years was chair of the USC Department of Management.

John was invited to the University of Houston in 1969 to chair the College of Business Administration’s newly created Behavioral Management Science Department (later to be renamed the Department of Management). He served the department, college, university ably, with skill and passion, until his death. The many contributions he made in scholarship, teaching, and service are far too numerous to chronicle. Particularly noteworthy was his administrative service. In addition to serving as department chair from 1969 to 1971, he also adely served as the masters program director, director of government sponsored research for the College of Business Administration, deputy director of the University of Houston Energy Institute, and coordinator of the Graduate Business International Programs. Further attesting to his eclecticism, he was a director of the Houston Center for the Humanities, a docent for the Grand Opera Guild, and a long term member of the Mayor’s Future Studies Committee. He published in journals as disparate as the Natural Resources Journal, Journal of Applied Psychology, and Quarterly Journal of Film, Radio and Television.

Always a student, John began law studies in 1976, concurrent with his full-time teaching, research, and administrative duties. When asked why he would undertake such an additional commitment at that point in his career, he would simply point out that the legal environment was becoming an increasingly important variable in the practice of management, and as a teacher of management he had a responsibility to his students to be prepared. In 1982 he completed the last of the three academic years of law studies. He subsequently developed and taught a three-course graduate sequence on various aspects of the legal environment of management which he continued to teach until a few months before his death.

His lifelong devotion and commitment to learning and to his students was not better illustrated than during his final semester at the University of Houston. Because of his illness John was in the hospital over the course of several class meetings. Physically in a great deal of discomfort, he arranged for a speaker phone to
APS Wants You!

Become an APS Fellow

The American Psychological Society seeks nominations for new Fellows (see box at right). Members are enthusiastically urged to identify and nominate deserving APS colleagues from among the full spectrum of psychological science specialties, and especially from among women and ethnic minorities. All APS members are encouraged to take advantage of this unparalleled opportunity to participate in the process whereby APS’s cadre of most distinguished psychological scientists grows to reflect the accomplishments and diversity of its membership.

All candidates for Fellowship should have demonstrated sustained excellence in published works which have had an important influence on teaching and research. Members may submit nominations any time during the year. Nominators must supply supporting documentation to the APS Membership Subcommittee on Fellowship, including: a letter of nomination; cv of nominee; three letters of recommendation, at least one of which is from a current Fellow. (Refer to the APS Membership Directory for a listing of Fellows or contact the APS office.)

There are currently about 2,350 Fellows in the Society. Listed below are the 23 APS Fellows elected in 1993.

Renee Baillargeon, Univ. of Illinois-Urbana
Terry A. Beehr, Central Michigan Univ.
Michael H. Birnbaum, Calif. State Univ.-Fullerton
R.J. Bodnar, CUNY-Queens College
Martin D.S. Braine, New York Univ.
Steven E. Brauth, Univ. of Maryland-College Park
Jennifer Crocker, SUNY-Buffalo
Michael Dawson, Univ. of Southern Calif.
Fritz Drasgow, Univ. of Illinois-Urbana
Morton A. Gernsbacher, Univ. of Wisconsin-Madison
Paul S. Goodman, Carnegie Mellon Univ.
Carol L. Krumhansl, Cornell Univ.
Hazel J. Markus, Univ. of Michigan-Ann Arbor
Leonard L. Martin, Univ. of Georgia
Carolyn B. Marvis, Emory Univ.
Robert D. Nebes, Univ. of Pittsburgh
Lawrence H. Peters, Texas Christian Univ.
Diane Scott-Jones, Temple Univ.
Marilyn Shatz, Univ. of Michigan
Sara J. Shettleworth, Univ. of Toronto
Michael Siegel, Univ. of Queensland
Susan C. Somerville, Univ. of Arizona-Tempe
Elizabeth S. Spelke, Cornell Univ.

Fellow Status Criteria

The basic criterion considered for Fellow status in the American Psychological Society is that of sustained outstanding contributions to the science of psychology. Candidates will generally be considered after ten years of outstanding postdoctoral contribution, though exceptional cases of candidates with fewer years will be considered.

Nominations

Individual APS members may make nominations any time during the year. Nominators must supply the following documents to the APS Membership Committee.

1. A letter of nomination specifying why the candidate is judged to have made sustained outstanding contributions. Self-nomination is appropriate.
2. The candidate’s current curriculum vita.
3. Letters of support from three outstanding contributors to the field of scientific psychology familiar with the nominee’s work, one of whom must be an APS Fellow.

Review and Approval of Nominations

The APS Membership Committee has appointed a Fellows Subcommittee consisting of a Chair and four other APS Fellows (representing diverse specialty areas) to consider the nominees for whom letters and vitae have been received. The Subcommittee’s voting on Fellow status may be made during a meeting at an annual convention, on a conference call, or by mail ballot. The Chair of the Membership Committee will coordinate all evaluations, recommendations, and voting. The APS Board of Directors will be notified of nominees approved for Fellow status.

Fellowship Application

I would like to nominate ________________________________(please print or type) for APS Fellow status. In support of this nomination I have enclosed the following documents:
- Letter of nomination
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Alluisi from page 19

reports. He was an APS Charter Fellow and served as president of the Human Factors Society, the Society of Applied Experimental and Engineering Psychologists, the American Psychological Association’s Division of Military Psychology, the Southern Society for Philosophy and Psychology, and the Kentucky Psychological Association. He received numerous honors including the Jerome Ely Award of the Human Factors Society, the Franklin V. Taylor Award of the Society of Applied Experimental and Engineering Psychologists, and the Air Force Meritorious Civilian Service Medal.

On one occasion, Earl noted that the rewards of his life included “a loving and loyal wife [Mary Jane], four wonderful kids, grandkids, many wonderful mentors, students, friends, and professional colleagues, lots of good luck, reasonably good health, and a zest for life.” As we adjust to the loss, many of us take some comfort in the knowledge that Earl enjoyed the rewards of life to the fullest, and that he maintained his zest for life until the end. But, we will miss his enthusiasm, encouragement, commitment to excellence, and professional leadership.

Ben B. Morgan, Jr.
Department of Psychology
University of Central Florida

Zuckerman from page 19

be installed in the classroom and continued with his lectures without his students being aware of the extent of his illness. It never would have occurred to John to do otherwise.

At various times during his tenure at the University of Houston John also held the title of Visiting Professor in the Physiology Department of Baylor College of Medicine, and Visiting Professor at the University of Texas School of Nursing. He was a fellow in the American Psychological Association, the Society of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, and the American Association for the Advancement of Science. He held a Diplomate in Industrial and Organizational Psychology and was a Licensed Psychologist, State of Texas.

Sara Freedman
Jim Phillips
College of Business Administration
University of Houston

Hayes from page 16

Divisions. At the time it felt right because it emphasized our unity and because we were all phobic about political turmoil after the APA reorganization battle, but there was a downside: weak protection of “intellectual minorities.” The protection of intellectual minorities within APS depends on who is on the Board or appointed to the convention committee, but election (or appointment) from an intellectual minority is obviously less likely overall than election from the mainstream.

Let me use an example from my own intellectual group. Many basic and applied behavior analysts joined APS. They were there early—Division 25 was the first APA Division to affiliate with ASAP/APS. But the behavior analysts are very much an intellectual minority within psychology. And while they were initially highly visible within APS and at the first convention, that is no longer true—not because of ill will but because APS has no reliable way to ensure the participation of intellectual minorities more generally.

Over time there has developed a belief that any divisions or distinctions within APS will harm APS. Some seem to feel that the terrible divisions within APA came from the very presence of Divisions, caucuses, and the like. But it was not Divisions that divided APA: it was the presence of radically distinct values and goals, and a “majority rules” mentality that allowed Divisions to be used to promote one set of values over another. The real and legitimate monetary interests of professional practice could only coexist with disciplinary values if each had their own sphere of influence. That was what APA reorganization was all about. Failure to make that compromise is what gave birth to APS.

I think we could develop a hybrid arrangement within APS that would avoid the Byzantine politics that befell APA but which would allow for a more structured recognition of intellectual diversity. I would like to outline one such alternative. Perhaps we could allow the formation of Assemblies or Special Interest Groups, and collect dues for these entities through the regular dues mailings. They could meet concurrently with the APS convention, organizing sessions of their own if they wish. Some kind of advisory group could be formed by representatives of these subgroups, which could in turn consult with the APS Board. They could periodically be given some space in the Observer, and journals they own could be offered to APS members at a discount. This “Divisions without the politics” proposal may not solve all the problems I’ve outlined, but it would give us a place to begin.

APS can be a better umbrella under which all of scientific psychology can reside. But to do so, it must allow for organized diversity in the context of unity and shared values. We need an activist agenda that thoroughly connects with the concerns of scientist-practitioners as well as basic scientists, we need to bridge the applied-basic interface, and we need to find a way to better include the intellectual minorities and their legitimate aspirations. When that day arrives, a much larger APS will be the booming and comprehensive voice of scientific values in psychology that its organizers envisioned and that the discipline and public needs.
WEXLER FROM PAGE 1

cancer biologist Donald Metcalf) for having aided the "kind of breakthroughs that we’ve only been able to dream about in the past but now take for granted." (Blobel received the Lasker Basic Medical Research Award for work on protein sorting and targeting, and Metcalf received the Lasker Clinical Medical Research Award for work on hormone control of white blood cell development and immunity.)

Early Start
Nancy Wexler knew at an early age that some terrible illness had killed several of her uncles, but not until the year after she graduated from college did she learn that her mother (a geneticist) had Huntington’s Disease (HD), and that therefore Nancy and her sister were at a 50% risk for the same condition.

Huntington’s Disease is a neurodegenerative genetic disorder, usually of late onset, that affects mood, cognition and motor control, and kills its victims within 10 to 20 years. During most of that time victims are acutely aware of their own decline. Autopsy reveals massive atrophy of the basal ganglia.

Symptoms begin with tics and progress to depression, dementia, and constant uncontrollable body motions—like some bizarre dance, for which reason it is often called Huntington’s Chorea. The inheritance pattern of HD is autosomal (males and females are equally at risk) and dominant (half of all offspring of a heterozygous parent, and all of the offspring of a homozygous parent, will inherit the disorder). Symptom onset in women usually occurs after the childbearing years.

Wexler, 48, shares the $25,000-Lasker award with Paul G. Rogers, a former Florida Democratic congressman (1955-79) who had chaired the House subcommittee on health and environment and now works in Washington, DC.

Positive Approach, Taking Action
After learning that she and her sister might be destined to get HD, Wexler went on to earn her PhD in clinical psychology from the University of Michigan. Describing herself as "counter-phobic," she studied HD-affected families and wrote her dissertation on the cognitive and emotional consequences of being at risk for HD.

Since that time, most of Wexler’s work has had something to do with HD or similar conditions. She counsels patients, relatives of patients, and prospective parents with affected relatives, and she studies the psychic and neurological effects of HD and the fear of HD.

Wexler, a key member of the Huntington’s Disease Collaborative Research Group—the organization which published the Cell article—attempts to balance her interest in the science of HD with her public service commitment to fostering a greater public understanding of basic science generally and the effects of HD specifically.

She serves on congressional committees, NIH advisory panels, and the boards of numerous foundations having to do with neurological diseases. She is Chair of the Ethical, Legal, and Social Issues Working Group of the Human Genome Project—one of a handful of the genome project’s working groups—part of whose mission it is to discuss with the public the massive gene mapping effort.

Wexler is Professor of Clinical Neuropsychology in the departments of neurology and psychiatry at the College of Physicians and Surgeons of Columbia University. She is also President of the Santa Monica, California-based Hereditary Disease Foundation—founded by her father in 1968.

Family Tree
In 1979, she began the search for the HD gene in a large Venezuelan family with almost 200 HD victims. She has gone there every year since then, has collected 3,000 blood samples for genetic analysis, and has constructed the pedigree of over 12,000 family members, back to the early 1800s. She has traced the origin of HD in that family to one woman.

Wexler has developed a neuropsychiatric battery suitable for use in this non-literate community, and her study gathers prospective data on people at risk as well as the current victims of HD. By 1983, her colleagues in the lab of molecular biologist James F. Gusella had used these blood samples to narrow the location of the gene down from somewhere in the total human genome (3 billion base pairs of DNA), to a 4-million base-pair region near the tip of chromosome 4p.

Meanwhile, Wexler’s father, Milton, a psychiatrist, had established the Hereditary Disease Foundation, which encourages HD research with $750,000 per year in grants. Nancy Wexler became president of the Foundation in 1983, and soon thereafter she convinced five other research groups to cooperate in the search for the gene. This was still a difficult task, as there was nothing to go on but linkage analyses, no clue as to the nature of the gene itself, and no established genetic markers in the region.

Ten years later, the gene was found. Along the way, the collaborative group developed 14 new gene-hunting technologies.

Genetic Details
Within the 9,432 nucleotides of the protein-coding sequence of the gene, there lies a variable number of adjacent repeats of the trinucleotide sequence C-A-G, coding for a string of glutamines. Individuals who carry versions of this gene with less than 34 repeats are normal; individuals who carry a copy of the gene with about 40 to 50 repeats develop HD, usually between age 17 and 70. Fathers often pass along to their children a copy of the gene with a further expanded number of repeats, indicating that this mutation often worsens during spermatogenesis. Those children who have a copy of the gene with over 60 repeats tend to get HD in childhood.

With the genetics now understood, there is a test for the disease, a test that can be done to verify a diagnosis or to predict the disease before symptoms appear, even prenatally. Work is underway to discover the gene’s function, but the answer isn’t simple. The gene is expressed in many parts of the brain and in some other tissues. There are hints that it may affect mitochondrial energy production, but the specificity of the cell death is unexplained, and as yet there is no cure or treatment.

Wexler refers to the dilemma that this situation produces as the Tiresias complex, after the blind seer who told Oedipus, “It is

SEE WEXLER ON PAGE 31
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Here's one perspective on what an academic job interview is all about and how to improve your odds of performing well. Zanna and Darley draw from being involved in the academic interviewing process for longer than they can remember, and Oleson draws on her recent interviewing experiences. Job interviewing was also the subject of Kathleen Morgan's APS Observer article—the third in a three-part series on job seeking—that appeared in March of this year in the Student Notebook section. Following up on the popularity of that article, below are more in-depth suggestions for succeeding in this most important task.

John M. Darley  
Princeton University

Kathryn C. Oleson  
Ohio State University

Mark P. Zanna  
University of Waterloo

You are midway through the last year of your graduate training or postdoc. In the fall you mailed so many job applications you probably can’t remember where they all went. But now you get an invitation to visit some distant campus for a job interview. It’s the moment you have waited for, and suddenly you realize you have little idea of what will happen on the interview and more basically, what the job interview “is about.”

First, understand that the job interview is not an “interview.” It is a visit during which you will be interviewed by several people, have a chance to interview several others, probably give a talk on your research, and most likely, give a demonstration of your teaching style. And there will be other events as well.

The visit has two general purposes. The faculty want to find out how you will suit their needs. Second, although jobs are scarce, you want to know how the job and institution would fit your needs.

There is one more important fact. Your visit schedule is not being set up by a skilled “visit specialist.” Rather, a faculty member—already overloaded with teaching, research, and administrative activities—is organizing it. This means the visit may not be organized to provide you with all of the information about the institution that you need, and, oddly enough, the faculty may not find out all of the information about you that they need either. At various points, and on various agendas, you are going to have to take charge.

Getting Ready

Before your visit, there are a number of things to do. From the beginning, it is important to be organized. Take the initiative to find out as many details as you can. First, set up your travel plans in advance. Cheaper air fares are obtainable if you book two weeks in advance and stay over a Saturday night. The institution will pay your way, that is, after the trip is over and you send them documentation of your expenses. Think ahead about how you will manage this.

Then, carefully research the institution and department before you visit. We recall an incident at a department that particularly valued collegiality and general psychological knowledge. The custom was for a visiting job candidate to have a brief interview with almost all of the faculty. One particularly inept candidate, when talking with a highly distinguished and well-known faculty member, asked “What do you research?”! The visit dragged on, but the candidacy was terminated as of that minute.

You should read catalogues or brochures about the university and the department. Talk to faculty and graduate students in your department to see what they know about the department. Network. Somebody knows somebody who has been in that department or on its visiting committee, or is acquainted with a faculty member there. Look up the recent research of your possible new colleagues. Especially, read the work of individuals whose research is similar to yours.

It is almost certainly via a phone call that you will be invited to visit. Ask questions! You should try to learn about the search process (e.g., how many candidates are interviewing, how is the decision made?). Also, try to find out as much as possible about the talk (e.g., the length, who will be in the audience, do they want you to present research or give a teaching lecture?).

And, you must deal with other seemingly unimportant issues: What clothing will make you feel confident and professional yet comfortable? Are there self-presentational things you need to keep in mind (e.g., do you tend to ramble when...
Preparing the Talk

This article will touch only briefly on how to prepare for and deliver the academic job talk. For a more in-depth analysis, read Zanna and Darley (1987, chapter 1) or Perlman and Perlman (1981). The talk is probably the single most important determinant of a job offer. It may be the only time many of the faculty have contact with you. It is your chance to demonstrate how well you communicate ideas, which reflects your ability to conduct research and teach. It also demonstrates ability to think on your feet.

What to Say

When deciding what to talk about, there are several issues to consider. You could either present completed research or work in progress. A talk definitely goes better if there is data. One approach is to present a completed set of studies that make a coherent and exciting story. If your dissertation is at that stage, you have the perfect material. If not, you could either talk about another line of research or your dissertation in progress. In deciding, keep in mind your multiple goals: to demonstrate both enthusiasm and thoroughness for an important research topic, to give the audience a “take home” message, and to show that you are capable of conducting research independent of your advisor. Talk with your advisor for input on what data to present.

The Audience

Tailor your job talk to the audience. This can be quite a task because you again have several goals. On the one hand, you want to seem sufficiently scholarly and well-versed in your area, but you also need to ensure that it is at a level easily understandable to the audience members (who may be faculty members in other specialized areas or other departments). Convey why you did the research and why you think it is important. Individuals not in your field of research may be confused about the impetus for or value of the work.

Practice

Practice the talk a number of times. If possible, at least a week in advance, give a practice talk for graduate students and faculty. This may be your toughest audience. Your own faculty may want to grill you in order to prepare you for the real thing; they may question many of your theoretical assumptions or force you to defend your use of certain methodologies. When you are giving the actual talk, you do not want to be surprised with unexpected questions. Members of your own department may anticipate many of them.

Visual Aids

Slides? Handouts? Overheads? Our impression is that at least overheads are now de rigueur in academic talks. Overheads are quickly made in photocopiers, creating the possibility of spontaneity that you may live to regret. Read the article that appeared in this newsletter about various ways to present your visual material (Estes, 1993). The major mistake is to have an overhead that cannot be read from the back of the room and that contains more undigested information than the persons in the front of the room would want to know. Include your overheads at an early point in your practice talks.

Travel Tips

So, now you are ready to go for your interview. You have all the necessary background information, you have practiced your talk several times, and have packed two copies of the talk and overheads. To the airport. Pack light enough that you can carry on all your bags if at all possible. If you can’t, it is your talk and overheads that go with you to your seat. Better to give the talk in day old clothes than give it without script and overheads. Better neither. Pack light.

Your Game Plan

You want to learn as much as possible during the visit, so ask questions (Zanna & Darley 1987, chapters 1 and 3). Ask about the department. Find out about teaching load and support. How many classes do professors teach each semester? Are there teaching assistants or secretarial help? Also, find out about the expectations for faculty research and about the amount of research space, support, equipment, and experimental subjects. Do professors typically conduct a great deal of research, or is teaching emphasized? How is research space allotted? Is there a subject pool; how many subjects? You need to decide if the teaching and research expectations match your own.

Try to get a sense of the quality of the undergraduates and graduate students. Are they bright and motivated? Could you imagine yourself learning from them? Finally, try to learn about the “politics” of the department (Zanna & Darley, 1987, chapter 3). What is the probability of receiving tenure? Is there a collegial feeling among the faculty? Are junior professors treated with respect? You want to know if you will feel comfortable and happy. Will “politics” get in the way of being a productive researcher and teacher? Will you feel appreciated?

There are also many things you will want to know about the university (Zanna & Darley, 1987, p. 13). What is the salary schedule? How long are the contract periods? Does the university cover moving expenses? What are the sabbatical and leave-of-absence policies? Are there good policies covering retirement and health care? What are the reward contingencies of the university?

A final key bit of information you will want to gather concerns the community. This information tends not to be emphasized typically. The assumption seems to be that if the department or university is good, then your quality of life will also be good. But this assumption is often quite erroneous. You are planning to live in this community for a number of years; during that time your personal life may change greatly (e.g., you may get married, or have children). So, look into housing. Is it affordable, attractive? Also, consider the opportunities for your partner. Are there job opportunities? Would your partner feel comfortable in the community? What about the quality and availability of day care and schools? Also, although you may feel that

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE
work will consume all your time, you should carefully consider the physical, cultural, and recreational offerings and “climate” of the community. Could you continue many of the activities that you currently enjoy, or would you be forced to stop a cherished activity? This is not to say that you should not try out new things in the new place, but consider these issues seriously.

To learn all these things, you may need to take charge of your time schedule. We remember one candidate who arranged staying over an extra day, partly to get a cheaper air fare but mainly to explore the town. Fearing that we might have to organize a relay team to entertain her that day, we soon were impressed when she explained firmly that she did not require our organizing that day. She had made plans to explore the town and housing on her own, would visit the lab of the person who was closest to her in research interests and spend more time there than she had been able to during the organized part of the visit.

Their Game Plan

Faculty members are trying to get a sense of “who you are,” what departmental slot you would fill. Therefore, you need to provide a classification for yourself. Be prepared to explain yourself in a phrase or two, “I am a cognitive social psychologist with strong statistical skills. But also be prepared for the “five-minute drill” in which you may be asked to explain your research ideas, hypotheses, methods, and results in five minutes. This is quite a difficult task but an extremely important one. The key is practice, practice, practice. Give your roommate a five-minute summary of your research. Or, rehearse the statement while driving. The five-minute synopsis will be an invaluable skill in your academic career.

The faculty want a sense of what teaching needs you are capable of and interested in filling. To prepare for this, it is important to research the teaching needs of the department, but do not present yourself as capable of teaching something that you cannot.

They may have some concerns about your candidacy. As early as possible, try to find out what these concerns are. Find out whether there are any hidden agendas. It is good to have someone in the department who can give you the inside scoop. Perhaps a junior professor can talk a bit more frankly. Or, there may be someone that you know from another source (e.g., a former graduate student of your advisor). Frame your question delicately by asking about possible concerns about your candidacy given the department’s multiple needs.

The Visit

You arrive for the interview. Although this can be a stressful event, try to enjoy yourself as well. You are in a new place, meeting new people, and you are trying to decide if you will be happy and productive here. The typical interview lasts a day or two. It tends to work like this: your host will have arranged your local transportation and lodging. He/she will have a schedule for you. The schedule typically consists of individual meetings with four or five faculty members. The skilled host is willing to play a dual and complex role, for instance giving you a sense of the styles of the different faculty members and alerting you to interviewing idiosyncrasies.

As well as meeting with faculty, you will also probably be meeting with the Chair and perhaps the Dean. With them, talk about the formal aspects of the job. How about the students? Has a meeting with them been arranged? Will you see graduate students? Undergraduates? If not scheduled, try to arrange it. Take charge.

As early as possible, see the room where you will give the talk. Check your overheads. Are they readable from the back given where the projector is currently located? If not, move it. During the day, imagine yourself talking in that room, and consider what degree of formality you will be comfortable with. You will also want at least 30 minutes to prepare before the talk. Find out about the local customs of giving talks—do people interrupt? Will you be introduced? Do you call for questions? Is there a tradition of politeness or “grilling”?

Perhaps at the end of the day there will be “social events,” an opportunity for informal talk with potential colleagues. But there is an agenda. (There is always an agenda.) The locals will want to find out if they like you and would want to spend time with you. You too will be assessing them and the environment. Do people seem to get along? Would you feel comfortable working and socializing with them? Are there barriers between graduate students, junior, and senior faculty?

After the Visit, The Anti-climax

Upon your return home, send to the department receipts and a list of your expenses. Did you promise anyone any of your writings or a strategic reference? Send them along quickly.

And then you wait. During the visit, somebody will have said the equivalent of “you will be hearing from us in about ten days to two weeks.” Usually wrong. What they really meant was: They respect your anxieties and also want to come to a quick decision for their own sakes. They hope to do it quickly, although they have committed themselves to see one more candidate, one with a difficult schedule. Just after that visit, the entire subset of faculty most relevant to the decision leave to attend their annual national convention. More time passes than they anticipated.

This is not easy for you to cope with. It is appropriate for you to call at intervals but not appropriate for you to turn into a nag. Guilt is working on the other end, but social scientists turn guilt into responsible behavior no more often than other persons. Seek council with your advisor. Informal third party contacts are possible.

A last word. This is a process that, obviously, contains anxious moments for you. That is realistic. You are being evaluated. We have attempted to show how you can take control of that process. Do your best; jobs are not easy to come by as we write, but some projections signal an expanding job market in the near future. Good luck, but don’t leave it to luck.
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important public health problems. The message from Congress has been and continues to be clear: It wants the NIH to make a genuine commitment to behavioral research.

7. Congress Should Not Be Asking NIH to Fund Behavioral Science.

This is code for “Congress has no business ‘micro-managing’ NIH research”—an argument that NIH typically trotts out to defend against change. It is especially off base here. First, the institutes spend more than $11 billion of federal tax money, so of course Congress should be shaping overall priorities on how that gets spent; it’s part of their job. Second, in the case of behavioral research, all Congress is asking NIH to do is give important public health issues higher priority. How NIH does that is pretty much up to the institutes. No “micro-managing” here. Just appropriate congressional oversight.

6. We Already Do Enough Behavioral Research.

When congressional directives on behavioral research started appearing in the early 1980s, NIH declared that it was doing enough behavioral science already. Congress knew better, having already heard similar arguments when it pressed the agency to support more research into preventing disease. Then, NIH exaggerated the scope of its prevention research by including activities that were only remotely related. To avoid a repeat, Congress has directed that the first task of the new NIH Office of Behavioral and Social Science Research should be to develop, in consultation with representatives of behavioral science disciplines, one standard definition of behavioral science. That definition then will be used to assess NIH’s current behavioral research activities and develop a plan for expanding them.

5. NIMH Will Take Care of It.

Yes, behavioral research at NIH will improve, thanks to the still-new presence of the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). Behavioral science is a significant part of NIMH’s mission. But some officials have tried to use NIMH’s recent transfer to NIH to deflect congressional pressure for more behavioral science throughout the institutes. While NIMH has been comparatively responsive, behavioral research historically has encountered the same kind of resistance even there, with NIMH most often portraying itself as searching for the biological basis of mental illness.

Further, Congress clearly sees behavioral science as part of NIH’s overall mission. In fact, when Congress decided to transfer the NIMH and its sister Institutes on drug and alcohol abuse to the NIH, the Senate-House conference report specifically said:

Indeed, the conferees expect that transfer of these three Institutes will bring to all of the NIH Institutes an increased appreciation for an 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.

4. Behavior is Not Science, Just Common Sense.

I hear this one even from people who believe in the importance of behavior. Behavior, they say, is not really a scientific issue, it’s just common sense. Overeating leads to health problems. Drinking causes liver and brain damage. Stress leads to heart attacks. We know these things, they say.

True, but then what? Knowing these connections doesn’t tell us anything about how they develop or how to solve them. For this, there is a sophisticated basic science of behavior that has developed that includes everything from where thoughts and memories reside in the brain, to the interactions of hormones and emotions, to the development of social behavior in children, to group learning, to cultural beliefs. Such science has to be rigorous. After all, a physical particle remains basically the same day in and day out. But a human being.... Ah, there’s something hard to study.

Here’s another way to look at this. Consider genetics. Isn’t it just common sense? Your parents have blue eyes, you have blue eyes. Yet NIH is spending hundreds of millions of dollars to map the human genome in the hope that a basic understanding of human genes will reduce human disease. The same holds true with behavior. To address behavioral aspects of health, we need to know much more about basic behavioral processes including learning, memory, the development of attitudes, the impact of social support systems, and the interaction of biology and behavior.

3. All Behavior Is Biologically Based.

Let’s look at genetics and behavior again, this time in the context of schizophrenia. Because schizophrenia appears to have a genetic component, it is natural to assume that NIH research in basic molecular genetics will inform us about its course. But schizophrenia involves distorted thought, language, and emotions. Before we can adequately understand those aspects, we will need to put more NIH resources into basic behavioral research in cognition, language development, and the regulation of emotions.

The “behavior is biology” view also dismisses huge public health concerns. Teenage pregnancy is an example. Does anyone really think that teen pregnancy is just biology gone wild? And from the perspective of behavioral science, it’s too simple to think that just giving information to teenagers is going to make a difference. To address teen pregnancy effectively, we need a better grounding in basic adolescent development. What processes are at work that allow teenagers to think they are immune to the risks of sexual behavior? What are the basic social principles behind peer pressure? How does individual maturity interact with a more general level of emotional development? The NIH should be supporting more basic science aimed at answering such questions.

2. The Behavioral Sciences Couldn’t Handle a Sudden Infusion of Money.

The short answer is, “Try us!” The long answer is that the behavioral sciences have never been more ready. The substantive science has always been there. Behavioral scientists have been
Scientists now have an organization that effectively represents their interests. That’s good for the science of psychology, and I think it’s good for the whole discipline.

APS has been magnificently effective. The Human Capital Initiative is the achievement I’m most excited about; the fact that its language was incorporated in legislation this year and will play a role in setting national research priorities is impressive.

Before APS was even one year old, it had achieved its own identity a strong personality of its own. It had become a major voice for psychological science.

I remember the first annual convention in Washington as the time when APS moved from being what I thought of as a miracle to being a formidable force of its own.

**Virginia O’Leary**

Chair of Psychology

Indiana State University

---

**FIVE FROM PAGE 14**

Attempts to constructively restructure the American Psychological Association [APA] to meet our needs.” Strickland said the 1988 APA reorganization plan would have given scientific psychologists a much-needed voice within APA. She noted that the plan was approved by APA Council and was favored initially by all five candidates for the 1988 APA presidential election. However, the clinical practitioner constituents of APA, the largest block of APA membership, were opposed, Strickland recalled, and they organized the ultimate defeat of the compromise.

**Laying Tracks**

The scientists had not waited idly for defeat. Instead they founded an Assembly for Scientific and Applied Psychology—known appropriately as “ASAP”—that served as a refuge for those disenfranchised by APA and that ultimately would become APS. “When it became clear that we couldn’t win and knew that the APA reorganization would be voted down,” Strickland said, “we [ASAP] began plans for a new organization.” Strickland said. Proposed bylaws for APS were fleshed out by Logan Wright, Steven Hayes, Ginny O’Leary, Milt Hakel, Kathy Grady and Strickland over a long weekend meeting at Strickland’s home near the University of Massachusetts-Amherst. Those bylaws were distributed to members of the APS-precursor organization, ASAP. It was understood that if the APA reorganization did not pass, ASAP would transform itself into APS with new and greatly expanded bylaws, Strickland said.

As to how APS is doing today, “I’m absolutely delighted with the way the Society has developed,” Strickland said, adding cheerfully, “But some of those past events were very problematic for me personally because I was President of APA at the time.”

Charter Fellow Chuck Kiesler, now Chancellor of the University of Missouri-Columbia, said that “APS has become more widely accepted today than we ever could have imagined. It’s an influential and respected force in Washington. The level of excitement at its meetings is really extraordinary.”

How does Kiesler account for APS’s success? “There was a need for APS,” Kiesler said. “Science had long been submerged in APA…. I was founding president of ASAP, and we decided that if we lost the vote to reorganize APA, ASAP would become a new organization, keeping our officers and changing the name to the ‘American Psychological Society.’ So I became the founding past president of APS,” Kiesler explained.

For psychology as a whole, APS has had “a very positive effect, rallying the scientists around the general area of science and the discipline,” Kiesler said.

Kiesler said he was on the three-person committee that recruited Alan Kraut for executive director and negotiated his contract. “So, I think APS just got off to a flying start and now it’s a real success story.”

**All Aboard**

Looking back to APS’s early days, McGaugh remarked, “At the start there were those who said, ‘Now you’ve made your statement. Okay, you’ve had your little joke, but now you have to use your energy to put this thing back together with APA.’ They missed the point,” McGaugh stressed. “It was not a statement, it was the development of a new organization to serve a number of very important functions for psychological science in all of its dimensions. And one of the most important functions is identification … APS has done lots of things, but from my point of view the most profound thing is that it has provided an institution that scientists can call ‘home.’ The scientists were increasingly becoming homeless. They had no place they could turn to, and they were losing their support for psychological funding and policy issues in the federal government, before APS came into being.”

**Building Steam**

Logan Wright, credited by many as chief architect of APS’s bylaws and who offered the nascent organization its first
roof in Norman, Oklahoma, said, “I think APS has worked marvelously well for an organization that was initiated virtually overnight and with virtually no material resources.” Wright said, “It was obvious in a matter of weeks after the start-up that APS was going to be a viable organization, which it has become with its 15,000-plus members. For APS to have started with little resources and have attracted that membership, and to be operating as it does now out of its Washington office .... I think is nothing short of miraculous. It has developed not just a national but also an international visibility.”

Wright, who along with Spence and Strickland was one of a score of former APA presidents who rallied to APS, describes himself as a “worker bee and helper-outer” who persuaded the University of Oklahoma to provide space for APS on campus and lend a computer while he also provided APS with space in his home. A bathtub there was APS’s earliest filing cabinet, he said. Wright was certainly instrumental in getting APS’s membership, and to be operating as it does now out of its Washington office. ... I think is nothing short of miraculous. It has developed not just a national but also an international visibility.”

Momentum toward the Future

As to APS’s future, Wright said, “I think it’s bright. APS is well established. It has direction, it has momentum—by that I mean the journals and Human Capital Initiative and the like. It’s cohesive, it’s sound economically, and the only question now is over how focused or inclusive it wishes to be. At first APS didn’t want to have anything to do with things like accreditation. It has now broadened its scope in matters of that type. And I’m convinced that whether in a focused mission or more inclusive mission it will be successful.”

In Training

Dianna Newbern of Texas Christian University, President of the APS Student Caucus (APSSC), became active in APS when she entered graduate school in 1990 and found that “students are recognized as an important and viable part of the organization, which really encourages us to become involved as much as we can. APS is exceptionally open to student activities and participation.”

What APS student affiliate members ask for most, Newbern notes, is “practical information about such matters as choosing and applying to graduate school and similar matters. APSSC is very helpful to these students, with its mentorship program and its email bulletin board where students can ask for advice and share experiences with other students. The mentorship program can link students with professors and scientists anywhere in the country who work in the fields those students are interested in.”

Concerns for students and younger faculty are also uppermost in the mind of APS Charter Member Harris Cooper of the University of Missouri-Columbia who, as noted above, attended the start-up APS meeting in Atlanta with Brad Bushman “mostly out of interest and support for the beginning of a new science-oriented psychology group .... I wanted to show my support.”

Cooper and his students presented posters at Chicago and other APS conventions. He notes, “The critical point I want to make is that the organization should remain ... very open and receptive and encouraging to younger scholars .... My hope is that APS will want to institutionalize the sorts of access procedures that lead a professor to attend the meetings with a student.”

A National Science Initiative

Cora Marrett, who heads the National Science Foundation’s (NSF) new Social, Behavioral and Economic Science Directorate (SBE), said, “When I took this position last year one of the first groups I met with were the people from APS.

NIDA is a research agency and APS represents research; so many of its members are our grantees. This makes for an exciting and natural partnership ....

Another way of looking at the partnership is through the growth of both APS and NIDA over the last five years—APS to 15,000 and NIDA’s research budget from $147 million to $350 million. That reflects awareness of the importance of behavioral and psychosocial research in addressing many of the nation’s public health needs. It’s a natural partnership ....

For instance ... we recently had a NIDA planning meeting for the behavioral therapies development program, one of two major new NIDA initiatives, and I look forward to further APS collaboration in this program.

... APS has been a tremendous force for good in dealing with issues of drug abuse science and public health.

RICHARD A. MILLSTEIN
ACTING DIRECTOR
NATIONAL INSTITUTE ON DRUG ABUSE

Continued on Next Page
It’s amazing that an organization started in the minds of a few individuals could grow into a full-fledged organization almost overnight. With a great many hopes, we launched it in Atlanta in 1988, but without the slightest idea how many would join. But it quickly became obvious we had tapped into a wellspring of enthusiasm ....

It wasn’t just the purely scientific people who were disillusioned with APA. And they really did care about belonging to an organization; APS was to their liking. Our initial uncertainty was swept away very early on. In six months we had 3,000 members ....

I had hopes and fears—my fear was that APS could devolve into a narrow specialty organization. That hasn’t happened. But my most optimistic hope was that more of the research-oriented clinicians would show more enthusiasm for APS. I think we attract them, but I had hoped we would attract more.

**Janet T. Spence**
**University of Texas-Austin**
**APS Past-President**

---

**From Previous Page**

Their question was whether NSF would provide some funds for work associated with the Human Capital Initiative (HCI). Impressed with the rigor and thoroughness of the HCI, Marrett said that NSF has decided to support the initiative.

"In fact, the idea spread beyond its original APS impulse," said Marrett, a University of Wisconsin sociologist. "We are discussing now about whether NSF should use the HCI for our division as a whole .... Most of the HCI topics now are being approached by some of the other disciplinary areas NSF supports. So it is possible that we could talk about research on aging, for example, from the perspectives of anthropology or some other field. That’s the question, whether we want to talk about an interdisciplinary HCI agenda."

Marrett pointed out that the language of NSF’s 1994 appropriation specifically mentions the HCI in connection with the new SBE Directorate, and specifically applauds NSF for its decision to supply support to it.

"We know why this has occurred more than once in the language of the Appropriations Committee. It’s happened because APS has been very effective in working with the committee," said Marrett. She emphasized, though, that the appropriations committee needs guidance on how much is needed to accomplish goals established in the HCI and what are the short- and long-term payoffs.

**Engineered for Success**

APS board member Elizabeth Loftus of the University of Washington says, "There are two things important to psychologists. Both relate to communication: publications and scholarly meetings. In five years we have achieved an enviable successful scientific meeting every year. Add to this the success of the two journals, as well as interest in developing new journals, and you can see APS is right on track in terms of its original goals and what it should be doing."

Another important element of APS, Loftus maintains, is the disciplinary breadth of APS’s meeting and membership. "One of the great things about the annual meeting is the involvement of the full spectrum of psychologists from all areas of psychology. In many other organizations interests are more narrowly focused. APS is broadly based; it has great thinkers from all fields that are essential to psychology."

Charter Member Stephanie Shields of the University of California-Davis, who chaired a symposium on gender and emotion at the convention in Chicago this year, attended the start-up meeting in Atlanta in 1988 after being recruited on the spot by Ginny O’Leary. While an avid reader of the Observer and journals, Shields has not attended conventions other than the Chicago meeting. What pleased Shields particularly was to see APS widening the spectrum of mainstream psychological research and applications with presentations like the one she chaired. Her symposium moved beyond the conventional search for sex differences in emotionality and threw doubt on some earlier research "by examining contextual variables in which gender effects are observed," she explained.

**Pulling It All Together**

Eugene Delay, a biopsychologist and physiological psychologist at Regis University, believes APS has made the whole discipline of psychology stand up and take note of the importance of its scientific base. "Practitioners can’t just practice—they are going to be put to task more and more to justify their portion of the discipline," Delay said. "They are going to need experimental psychologists do that. At the same time we need clinical psychologists to provide us with information to improve the accuracy of our..."
models of both normal and maladaptive behavior.”

Charter Member Tony Golden of Austin Peay State University has attended all five APS conventions because he “wanted to learn first-hand what APS was about and realized he wanted to be part of it.” He finds APS and himself “very much in agreement about our emphases” particularly appreciating APS’s focus on “academic psychology and the issues of operating in an academic environment.”

At convention sessions Golden was “impressed immensely to see speakers presenting their research and acknowledging the contributions of their students with whom they had worked. I was quite unaccustomed to that; it was wonderfully refreshing.”

As a physiological psychologist, Golden says, “It’s critical to keep our identity as psychologists intact. That is our contribution, as psychologists first. That’s how I was trained, as a generic discipline s they inadvertently create gaps. That’s how I was trained, as a generic discipline s they inadvertently create gaps. And I think that people will lose their identity with research development s make subdisciplinary extremely technical. The danger is s ively to the professional-scientific split. (3) the student’s general understanding of the research topic; and (4) the student’s general understanding of the research topic.

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;

Pages 2 and beyond:
(2) purpose and rationale of the study; (3) 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.

WEXLER FROM PAGE 23

but sorrow to be wise when wisdom profits not.” Our new genetic knowledge is changing all of medicine, says Wexler, and “most people are not equipped to know how and when and where they’re going to die.” She finds the test a mixed blessing at best, and counsels many people not to be tested because a positive finding can be so devastating. Of course, that would all change as soon as a cure or treatment is found. “That’s what drives me,” she says. “Every time I see another child at risk, I think, ‘I should be out there looking for a cure.’” So she divides her life between doing the parts she can do herself and catalyzing the complementary work of others. And when the cure is found? “Even if you can treat, you don’t ignore the psychological reaction to a diagnosis. Psychology has a role in how the information is presented.”

Has Wexler herself had the test? “It’s a private decision. People ought to know they can work on a problem, and be private, too. For me personally, what is most therapeutic is to be working on it. Starting out, it was like climbing Mt. Everest with nothing.... Now, the top of 4p is like an Arizona shopping mall!”

Because of the dedication of Nancy S. Wexler, the Huntington’s Disease Collaborative Research Group was formed, and succeeded, benefiting not only the HD and HD research communities, but the whole of human molecular genetics and the future of medicine. Her work is most certainly a public service. - Paul M. Rowe

To Enter the Competition
Send four copies of the entry and letter of recommendation to: Kenn White, 11235 Oakleaf Drive #2013, Silver Spring, MD 20901. Winners will be contacted in early April. Inquiries should be directed to Kenn White (tel.: 301-681-5520, email: KWHITE@WAM.UMD.EDU).
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Meet Your APSSC Committee Chairs...

Here's your opportunity to get to know the APSSC committee chairs. Brief comments from each and information about how they individually got involved with APS follow. Feel free to contact any one of them to talk about an issue or to just become acquainted. (See the September 1993 Student Notebook for an introduction to the APSSC executive council.)

Chapter Recruitment
Sunni ReHman: Sunni just finished her master's research at the University of Colorado-COLORADO Springs. Her research interests are mainly in geriatric neuro-psychology. Sunni is a brand new member and showed her enthusiasm at this year's convention by volunteering her time and energy to chapter recruitment. Sunni wanted to get involved in the APS because she is a very empirically minded and enjoys research and academics.

Psi Chi Liaison
Jacquie Pickrell: Jacquie is a senior at the University of Washington. Her research involves examining the current resurgence of repressed memories. She is also interested in social psychology, particularly gender issues. She attended this year's convention and became interested in the student caucus. She became involved at the committee level because she felt it was the best way to...
American Psychological Society
Student Caucus Bylaws

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

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

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

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

See Bylaws on Page 34
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All the officers welcome students and others who wish to contact them about concerns particular to their own offices.

Executive Council

President
Dianna Newborn
Department of Psychology
Texas Christian University
Fort Worth, TX 76129
Tel.: 817-921-7415
Bitnet: RP90(IP)@TCUAMUS

Graduate Advocate
Kena White
1725 Oakleaf Drive, #2013
Silver Spring, MD 20901
Tel.: 301-881-5520
Email: KWHITE@WAM.UMD.EDU

Undergraduate Advocate
Rachel Jo Allen
461 Adams Street
Plover, WI 54467
Email: PA204511@SPSTMAIL.UWSP.EDU

Co-Undergraduate Advocate
Rosendo Tanasim
/o Psychology Department
Wabash College
Crawfordsville, IN 47933

Student Notebook Editor
Stephan Fiore
Department of Psychology
601 Learning Research & Development Center
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15260
Email: SFIORE@VMS.CIS.PITI.EDU

Secretary
Kim Delemos
Department of Psychology
CB #3270, Dave Hall
University of North Carolina-Chapel Hill
Chapel Hill, NC 27599
Tel.: 919-942-0794
Email: UKIM@UNC.MVS.OIT.UNC.EDU

Treasurer
Jennifer Bugg
4831 Bluestem Drive
Colorado Springs, CO 80917
Email: JLBUGG@UCCS.EDU

Past President
Bonne Eberhardt
PO Box 10819
Calder Square
State College, PA 16805
Tel.: 814-234-8879
Bitnet: BKE1010@PSU.VM

Special Officers and Committee Chairs

Chapter Recruitment
Sanni Reilman
PO Box 18134
Colorado Springs, CO 80935
Tel.: 719-577-1098

Mentorship Committee
Kay Wanc
Department of Psychology
Southern Illinois University-Carbondale
Carbondale, IL 62901

Phi Chi Liaison
Jacqueline Pickrell
14007-172 Avenue NE
Redmond, WA 98052
Email: JPICK@U.WASHINGTON.EDU
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of the local school chapter, and thus not be members of that chapter.

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

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

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

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

---

**AUNT KENN FROM PAGE 32**

Do you have a question for Aunt Kenn? Maybe she can help you. To reach Aunt Kenn, write:

Aunt Kenn  
c/o Kenn White  
Benjamin Bldg. - EDHD  
University of Maryland  
College Park, MD 20742

---

**Letters to the Editor**

**Alleged Memory**

Dear Editor:

A group of eminent researchers recently objected (March 1993 Observer) to the use of the term “false memory syndrome” in an APS Observer article concerning cases where allegedly repressed memories of childhood sexual abuse are recovered in adulthood. Their position has considerable merit, as they correctly point out that in most cases we will never know whether the abuse occurred. As a consequence, no behavioral scientist can argue with their observation that those “who claim that memories of abuse are always true or always false are taking a political or legal stand.”

What is intriguing to note, however, is that despite this position against language that questions the veracity of memory of abuse, there is apparently no concern about language that implies the veracity of such memories. Specifically, the term “repressed memories” (in common use and used by these researchers) appears equally problematic as a neutral, scientific term in these contexts. Although “allegedly repressed memories” is far from perfect, it has the merit of not prejudging implicitly the truth of the memory or whether the material has anything at all to do with a prior event, but leaves these as open questions.

If the proposed standard for objecting to false memory syndrome is “unequivocal knowledge that the event did not occur,” then surely the standard for the converse case of repressed memory is “unequivocal knowledge that the event did occur.” The issue of veracity thus appears equally problematic in both cases. If we are to strive for objectivity and even-handedness, then surely we must guard against partisan language that favors implicitly or explicitly either the alleged perpetrator or the alleged victim.

Frank Fincham, PhD  
University of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign  
Department of Psychology  
603 East Daniel Street  
Champaign, IL 61820  
Tel.: 217-333-8624, Fax: 217-244-5876  
Email: FFincham@s.psych.uiuc.edu
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Organizational Profile

Origins and Purpose
The International Society for Research on Aggression (ISRA) was founded in 1972 for the purpose of encouraging the discovery and exchange of scientific information on the causes and consequences of aggression and for developing knowledge and techniques which might reduce harmful aggression. The Society is non-partisan, but its activities are intended to promote human welfare through enhanced knowledge of the causes and control of aggressive behavior.

Membership
The Society has more than 450 active researchers from various disciplines. The international membership represents over 34 countries. There are two classes of members: (1) Fellows and scholars have made substantial contributions on problems of aggression, and (2) Associates are scientists or professionals who support the goals of the Society but are not themselves actively engaged in aggression research. Annual dues are $15 (US). Members receive a discount on our affiliated journal Aggressive Behavior published bimonthly by Wiley.

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

OFFICERS
Robert Blanchard, President, USA
Dan Olweus, President-Elect, Norway
Ron Slaby, Acting Treasurer, USA

Adam Fraczek, Past-President, Poland
Rowell Huesmann, Executive Secretary, USA
Ron Baenninger, Archivist, USA

Council Members
John Archer, UK
Caroline Blanchard, USA
Richard Bandler, Australia
Gian Caprara, Italy
Kai Bjorkqvist, Finland
Ireanus Eibl-Eibesfeldt, Germany
Arnold Goldstein, USA
Veronika Grimm, Israel

Robert Hinde, UK
Miloslav Krsiak, Czechoslovakia
John Knutson, USA
Menno Kruk, Netherlands
Ella Nikulina, Russia
Stefano Parmagiani, Italy
Richard Tremblay, Canada

BACKGROUND
ISRA was founded to be a broadly interdisciplinary society that would study and address the vast and complex problems of destructive violence, aggression, and warfare. Due to intercultural differences in the expression and control of violence, and the international nature of warfare, the society's founding members determined that a society formed to focus on the study of aggression would best serve the scientific community and world through maintaining international membership. The first meeting of ISRA was held in conjunction with the International Congress of Psychology in Tokyo in the summer of 1972. Since then a world meeting has been held every two years. The Society has recently named two of its founding members as life fellows in honor of their contributions: John Paul Scott and Neal Miller.

Members include anthropologists, biologists, physiologists, sociologists, and psychologists. The society is composed of equally of members who study human aggression and members who study animal aggression. The primary activity of the society is its biennial world scientific meeting which alternates between the Eastern and Western hemispheres. Meetings focus on promoting a scholarly exchange of recent ideas between researchers from different countries using different methodologies. Regional meetings are often held in off years.

World Meeting
The 1994 World Meeting of ISRA will be at the Holiday Inn-Camino Real in Delray Beach, Florida, July 6-10, 1994. Professor Deborah Richardson (Department of Psychology, Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, FL 33431) is the local organizing chairperson. The 1992 World Meeting was in Siena, Italy. Keynote speakers were: Adam Fraczek (Poland), John Hutchison (United Kingdom), Stefano Puglisi-Allegra (Italy), Frans de Waal (United States), Michael McGuire (United States), Dan Olweus (Norway), and Gian Vittorio Caprara (Italy).

Publications
The Society's journal, Aggressive Behavior, is devoted to the experimental and observational analysis of conflict in humans and animals. In addition, a newsletter is distributed to members two or three times a year.

Contact and Membership
L. Rowell Huesmann
Executive Secretary - ISRA
Institute for Social Research
University of Michigan
426 Thompson Street
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248
USA
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Committee is concerned that NIH has not complied with past congressional directives to increase funding of basic and applied behavioral research and expects the Office to ensure that NIH increases significantly the amount of its overall budget devoted to basic and applied behavioral research. The Committee encourages the NIH Director to move quickly to establish the Office.

The Committee is particularly interested in NIH increasing its commitment to research in health and behavior, personality research, social and developmental psychology across the lifespan, thinking and cognitive science, treatment effectiveness, psychopathology, and the biological bases of behavior. What distinguishes these areas of research is that they focus primarily on the whole person, many times in the context of the family or social structure. The Committee directs that in fiscal year 1994 sufficient funds be set aside by the NIH Director as start-up funds and to fund the development of the required report. This amount is intended to allow extensive consultation with outside experts both in the development of the definition of behavioral and social science research and in the assessment of the current levels of support for those sciences.

Senate Awaits Report Of NIMBH Behavioral Task Force

In the same appropriations report, the Senate also expressed support for a behavioral science task force that is operating under the auspices of the Advisory Council of the National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH) (see March 1993 Observer). The group is co-chaired by psychologists John Kihlstrom, University of Arizona, and former APS President Gordon Bower, with participation by NIMH Advisory Council members James Jackson, former APS President James McLaugh, and Joe Matarazzo. Overseeing several groups of experts looking at a broad range of behavioral science in the context of NIMH’s mission on mental health, the objective is to develop a national plan like NIMH’s plans in neuroscience, child mental health, and schizophrenia.

With the FY 94 report language, the Senate Committee is reinforcing the need for a behavioral science national plan and is involving itself in the process by asking to receive the report. In addition, the Committee is asking NIMH to develop a plan to implement the task force’s recommendations within 60 days. The relevant excerpt, initiated by APS, is as follows:

**Behavioral science task force**—The Committee understands that the NIMH National Advisory Council is in the midst of a major effort to develop a behavioral science research agenda. It has convened a distinguished behavioral science task force of outside experts and they are now conducting a comprehensive assessment of basic behavioral and psychosocial research. The result should be a national plan for behavioral science research similar to other NIMH reports that have shaped the Institute’s programs in schizophrenia, child and adolescent mental disorders, and neuroscience. The Committee applauds this effort and is looking forward to receiving the task force report when it is presented to the NIMH National Advisory Council. Further, the Committee requests NIMH to report back to Congress within 60 days of the final task force report with plans for implementing the recommendations of the task force. S.B.

**Chronicle from Page 27**

elected to the National Academy of Sciences and have won the President’s Medal of Science and the Nobel Prize. There has been an enormous increase in recognition recently by federal and congressional bodies that behavioral science research has an important role in addressing national priorities. Much of this recognition is focused on a national research agenda, called The Human Capital Initiative (HCI), that was developed under the auspices of the American Psychological Society by some 70 separate psychological and behavioral science organizations. It is designed to be used as a guide for Congress and federal science agencies to plan federal research programs. It reflects a general consensus on ways in which research in psychology can contribute to meeting our nation’s health and social objectives.

Congress and federal research agencies sometimes have criticized scientists for not setting priorities. With the Human Capital Initiative agenda, we have responded to that challenge. Congress, in return, has given us a vote of confidence, asking federal agencies to look to the agenda in planning their own behavioral research priorities. What we now need is a more accepting NIH.

And the Number One Reason Why NIH Doesn’t Fund More Behavioral Science Research...

1. **NIH is a Medical Agency.**

   If you don’t have an “MD” after your name, don’t bother applying for a top post in the agency. Virtually every NIH Institute, Center, or Division always has been headed by an MD. All NIH Directors have been MDs, and one of their greatest concerns is research training for physicians. Of course, the kicker here is that MDs don’t do much NIH research. For at least the last dozen years, MDs accounted for less than a quarter of NIH investigators. See, it’s the National Institutes of Health, not the National Institutes of Medicine. And that’s as it should be. Health research in the United States has always been the natural province of the PhD.

SEE CHRONICLE ON PAGE 40

**NSF from Page 3**

The report language as passed by the Senate Committee:

**Behavioral and social science research**—The Committee commends the Foundation for its response on incorporating aspects of the human capital initiative into the fiscal year 1994 budget. This initiative was developed with the help of more than 70 scientific organizations and coordinated by the American Psychological Society. It couples research in behavioral and social science in a number of key areas of great importance to the Nation, including violence, worker productivity, schooling and literacy, drug and alcohol abuse, aging, and health. The Committee expects a report by September 1, 1994, on the actions the NSF has taken to implement this initiative. In addition, the report should outline a long-range plan for how the initiative will be used to develop strategic research projects specifically in the behavioral and social science activities funded by the NSF. S.B.
Announcements

CALLS FOR PAPERS

The Journal of Mental Health Administration publishes peer-reviewed articles on the organization, financing, and delivery of behavioral health services (including mental health and substance abuse services). The editor seeks manuscripts for special issues in the following areas: law and mental health policy; women's mental health and substance abuse services; and case management services. To request a copy of the "Information for Authors" or to submit a manuscript for publication consideration, contact: Bruce Lubotsky Levin, Editor, Journal of Mental Health Administration, The Florida Mental Health Institute, Univ. of South Florida, 13301 Bruce B. Downs Blvd., Tampa, FL 33612-3899, tel.: 813-974-6400, fax: 813-974-4406.


International Symposium on Integrating Knowledge and Neural Heuristics (ISIKHN'94) - Pensacola Beach, Florida - May 9-10 1994. Symposium is sponsored by the Univ. of Florida, and AAI, in cooperation with IEEE Neural Network Council, and the Florida AI Research Society. Symposium focus is on research integration of neural and symbolic methods. The integration of knowledge-based principles and neural heuristics holds promise for solving complicated real-world problems. The objective of this interdisciplinary symposium is to bring together researchers interested in applying neural network techniques to augmenting existing knowledge, and vice versa, and who have demonstrated that this combined approach outperforms either approach alone. Welcome are views from areas such as constraint- or knowledge-based learning and reasoning, connectionist symbol processing, hybrid intelligent systems, fuzzy neural networks, multi-strategic learning, and cognitive science. Examples of specific research: 1. How do we build a neural network based on a priori knowledge (i.e., a knowledge-based neural network)? 2. How do neural heuristics improve the current model for a particular problem (e.g., classification, planning, signal processing, and control)? 3. How does knowledge in conjunction with neural heuristics contribute to machine learning? 4. What is the emergent behavior of a hybrid system? 5. What are the fundamental issues behind the combined approach? Program activities include keynote speeches, papers, panel discussions, and tutorials. Paper summaries are due December 15, 1993; Notice of acceptance: Feb. 1, 1994; Camera-ready papers due: Mar. 1, 1994. Limit extended paper summaries to 4 pages (single- or double-spaced) and include title, authors' names, email and postal addresses, and telephone number of the corresponding author. Important research results should be attached. Send 4 copies to: LiMin Pu, Dept. of CIS, 301 CSE, Univ. of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611, tel.: 904-392-1485, email: fu@cis.ufl.edu. More information: Rob Francis, ISIKHN'94, DOE/Conferences, 2209 NW 13th St., Ste. E, Univ. of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32609-3476, tel.: 904-392-1701; fax: 904-392-6950.


Information Technology in Community Health - Victoria, British Columbia, Canada - October 30 - November 2, 1994. Conference provides a forum for academics, health professionals, and computer system profes-