What's In This Issue

MEC GERRARD, Editor

If the process of successfully submitting a proposal for a paper or symposium to APA has baffled or eluded you in the past, you will be interested in reading the two articles devoted to this topic. Murray Levine, current divisional president and last year's program committee chairman, has supplied a retrospective account of the trials and tribulations of putting together the Division 27 program for the 1977 national convention in San Francisco last August. Robert Newbrough, 1978 Program Committee Chairman, has outlined the changes he is instituting in the program format for next year, and has provided us with the division's priorities for symposia and papers for the 1978 convention.

Also of very special interest is the article by Darwin Dorr, on the attrition study he conducted for the division. After over two years of very devoted service as membership chairman, Dorr is stepping down, and passing his responsibilities on to Annette Rickel of Wayne State. Be sure to note the new address for membership applications.

President's Column

MURRAY LEVINE, SUNY Buffalo

Not long ago, I was part of a group that responded to an RFP. For the uninitiated, an RFP or a Request for Proposal, is a set of specifications for a research project that a government agency wants done under contract with a research group. The government agency defines the parameters of the problem, and requests bids from research groups. The bids are to include details as to how the group proposes to carry out the research, and a budget offering to do the research for a given amount of money. Usually the research is to be carried out in close consultation with a project officer, a government employee who sees to it that the contract specifications are fulfilled, and who may guide the research in any number of ways, including editing the final report.

Contract research differs considerably from grant research in that the investigator's scientific freedom and independence not only are not guaranteed, but are not even desired by the government agency letting the contract. Contract research may or may not be published, it may or may not be distributed widely, and the final report certainly does not have anything like the independent review that takes place within scientific publication. Moreover, since contract research is not for the consumption of the scientific public, but rather is designed to serve the relationship between administrative agencies and the Congress, much of it is not subject to the kind of cross examination and critical review that goes on in relation to published research in normal science. It goes, however, by the name of research, whatever its uses, and thus reflects on all of us.

The results of contract research influence legislation in some degree. The research is used to influence testimony to Congressional committees by administration officials in the sense that it is used to buttress arguments or to answer questions Congressmen or their staff members might raise. Research influences legislation, if we can judge by the fact that excerpts from such research appear in the legislative histories accompanying the law that is passed. These legislative histories are sometimes used by the Courts to ascertain the intent of Congress should litigation arise in relation to the legislation, so the research report can have enduring consequences.

The highly politicized context of contract research in relation to social programs needs to be recognized, and ought to be reviewed carefully by our profession. Administrative officials control contract money very tightly. There may be some review of proposals by social scientists outside of government, but the problems to be studied, the methods to be used, the samples, and the final report are all subject to a variety of extra-scientific considerations. Regional officials of the Federal government might be involved in selecting institutions to be studied, for example. I do not mean to imply that other research is not subject to extra scientific considerations. It most certainly is. However, there are special problems here since it is explicit in contract research that he who pays the piper calls the tune. We need to understand the constraints and the contextual forces influencing research, if not in self protection, then because the intellectual problem presented is an intriguing one for the field.

It is also important for us to understand what is happening since social science is literally being used for governmental purposes. Now I have no suspicions about the personal integrity or scientific competence of our colleagues in government. I believe they are highly competent, knowledgeable, and probably a lot better informed than most of us about issues and problems on a national level. However, those individuals also function within a social and organizational context and I have to assume that their behavior is role shaped in some measure much as everyone else's is.

I have been interested in contextual influences on research, but I started thinking about this particular problem because an element in the RFP puzzled me. The specifications called for one to draw a "stratified random sample" of institutions from a population with a total N of 606. However, the sample size was restricted to 9 cases. Being naive about the ways of contract research the specification puzzled me. I wondered whether there were esoteric but powerful sampling procedures with which I was unfamiliar, but from which incisive statistical inferences could be drawn. I consulted with statisticians at my university but received no enlightenment. Finally, I expressed my puzzlement to a group of colleagues more experienced with these matters than I am, and obtained the answer.

It seems that at some earlier time protests about social science research, concerning invasions of privacy and excessive demands of government agencies for information, led to a desire to exercise tighter political control over the content of government sponsored research. Congress passed a law (44 USC,3509) that any questionnaire administered to ten or more people must be cleared for its acceptability by officials in the Office of Management and Budget. If the sample size is under ten, the grant research is specifically exempted (see circular A40 OMB Nov 1976).

The mystery was solved. Sample size 9 was not dictated by a sampling formula, or the demands of the problem, but it was the largest sample size that could be contracted for without sending the questionnaire or the interview schedule for clearance through the OMB. Apparently the specification of a sample size of 9 was one administrator's device to cope with political constraints on the research process imposed by Congress.
Clearing the questionnaires may be a formidable process fraught with delay. Imagine the instance in which contract research is funded, a staff is hired, and the whole enterprise grinds to a halt because the questionnaire hadn't yet cleared OMB. The waste of funds in that instance is totally insignificant compared to the waste of funds in developing a new weapons system, but we shouldn't be amused on that account at all. The bureaucratic process and interagency fragmentation has a variety of serious human consequences, as those of you who may have read the report of the US Comptroller General (Jan. 1977) on the Federal government's deinstitutionalization policy are well aware. None of this should be accepted lightly as another instance of government SNAFU, (as we used to say during the "cold war"). I think it is a manifestation of a serious social problem that affects our personal and professional lives.

There are other important issues as well. A recent editorial in Science (23 Sept. 1977, 197, p. 1237) quotes the report of the US Commission on Federal Paper Work pointing out that government growth has resulted in the development of compartmentalized interest groups committed to individual program objectives, separated from other programs, and responsive to constituencies within the Congress, or at state and local government levels. The US Comptroller General's report on the "deinstitutionalization policy," or our lack thereof, documented very similar phenomena for mental health. A conference on Community Living Arrangements for the Mentally Ill and Disabled, sponsored by NIMH (September 1976), described similar fragmentation, lack of communication, and lack of cooperation between programs within HEW, let alone between agencies or programs responsible to other cabinet officers.

The fragmentation has led to programs and bureaucracies each with its own separate information requirements. Thus we have a literature demonstrating a decline in the population of state and county mental hospitals, and attempting to attribute variation in that rate of decline to whether or not there were community mental health centers in the areas served by the hospitals. That literature ignores policy toward the aged which has resulted in a shift of the aged population from state and county hospitals to nursing homes. That literature further ignores the impact of Medicare and Medicaid and the Supplemental Security Income legislation on patterns of hospitalization, and of patterns of discharge. A US Senate Sub-Committee on Long Term Care (March 1976) pointed out that it is the aged population of mental hospitals which has declined drastically. Many former patients are now in inadequate nursing homes, and many others were discharged outright and now exist in what they term psychiatric ghettos in unregulated board and care homes. There are far more mental patients in nursing homes now than there were in state and county mental hospitals when we started thinking about community mental health. Contract research, focused on the narrow information requirements of a single agency, ignored those critical factors as far as I know from reading summaries of the available literature. If I am wrong on the point, and such information was produced through contract research, the information has not yet entered any of the professional journals with which I am familiar.

The US Senate Sub-Committee report, and the report by New York State Assemblyman Andrew Stein, released February 1976, document the poor, frequently scandalous conditions of care for mental patients housed in domiciliary care facilities, nursing homes, and the like. The basic facts emerged from investigative reporting which brought the issues to public attention, and then in hearings using investigative techniques available through the law.

To my knowledge, the basic findings did not emerge from the efforts of the social science research community. Why not? Researchers don't go into sensitive areas of work very easily. Private board and care homes don't have to allow us in, and if they say no, we can't splash that fact on the front pages of a newspaper as journalists can. Beyond those issues, which are important, quantitative research approaches which keep us at some distance from the phenomena can conceal as much as they reveal.

Moreover, if our research approaches are narrow, it is not only because government is fragmented. University departments are equally isolated one from the other, graduate training usually does little to help students overcome university compartmentalization, and avoid compartmentalization of their minds. The fact that university social organization cuts knowledge up into small pieces, is no reason for students and later for professionals to believe the world's problems can be adequately analyzed within any of those small pieces. I am sure I don't have any answer to that problem, except to alert us to its consequences, and to encourage development of structures which will help develop broadened vision among the students in our field.

I don't have any good answers for the potential politicization of research through the contract system. I recognize that academically based research has not always been responsive to public need. I recognize also that on occasion, some stupid, insensitive and even harmful things have been done in the name of research. I can appreciate the desire for information which will be directly relevant to issues and questions confronting governmental officials. However, when that research develops into a profit making industry and the norms and controls of the professional dialogue are lacking as in the control of publication, and the opportunity for critical review and replication, we have to ask questions about what is happening and why. Normally, scientific controls, and the social organization of the research enterprise guard against overstatement. We may need to develop devices to guard against understatement as well.

Don Campbell has put forth a number of suggestions to cope with some of the politicized aspects of evaluative research. Elsewhere I have suggested that research studies ought to incorporate adversaries to the major thesis. I am sure that those solutions are inadequate because I am sure we are not really fully cognizant of all that is involved. It may turn out, as Seymour Sarason has suggested, that many of the problems that face us are intractable and should be faced as such. While that may be true for the big problems, and the big picture, I am willing to argue there are some corrections possible even within the largely intractable. I think we need to be looking at what is happening very carefully, and to be ready to talk and write very freely about what we see happening. We may not be able to predict what will happen when an idea is implemented in some elaborate social context, but we can certainly ascertain the consequences, sometimes rapidly, and we should be willing to undo and to redo in a healthy spirit of experimentation.

Robert Newbrough

Division 27 is proud to announce the election of Robert Newbrough as President Elect for 1977-78. Dr. Newbrough received a B.A. from the College of Idaho, and an M.A. and a Ph.D. in psychology from the University of Utah at Salt Lake City. Since 1966 he has been with Peabody College for Teachers in Nashville, Tennessee, where he is currently a Professor of Psychology and Education, and the Coordinator of the Center for Community Studies. Prior to moving to Nashville he was with the Mental Health Study Center, NIMH. In 1959-60 Dr. Newbrough completed a postdoctoral fellowship in community mental health research at Massachusetts General Hospital.

Dr. Newbrough's research and publications have covered a wide spectrum of topics related to community psychology, behavior disorders, stress, and family functioning. He was elected as a Fellow of Division 27 in 1969, and in 1970 was chosen as a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.
Bernard L. Bloom RECEIVES DISTINGUISHED CONTRIBUTION AWARD

The 1977 Division of Community Psychology Distinguished Contribution Award was presented to Bernard Bloom at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association in San Francisco. The award, presented by the Division for the fourth year, recognizes significant contributions to conceptualization and theory building, research, and program development in the fields of community psychology and community mental health.

Bloom is currently a Professor in the Psychology Department at the University of Colorado at Boulder. After a decade as a practicing clinician, he entered the field of community mental health by spending a year at the Harvard School of Public Health and then serving for three years as a mental health consultant with the National Institute of Mental Health.

A Diplomat of the American Board of Examiners in Professional Psychology in clinical, Bloom is a past president of Division 27. Since joining the faculty of the University of Colorado in 1965, Bloom has published an impressive list of articles and books which reflect a broad range of interests including campus community mental health, preventive strategies, program evaluation, prediction of post-hospitalization adjustment, crisis intervention, and the theoretical conceptions of community psychology.

The paper Bloom presented at the award ceremony and Ira Iscoe's introductory comments will be published in a forthcoming issue of the American Journal of Community Psychology.

VOTE FOR COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY

In early November APA will be mailing its members the Council Apportionment Ballot. Your Ballot will help to determine the number of Council seats held by Division 27, and thus the strength of the representation of community psychology ideology on the Council in 1978. Please allocate all of your votes to Division 27 to insure that our division is represented in APA policy decisions.

Report from the Division Fellowship Committee

This year we sent out notices to all 125 current Fellows in the Division, asking for nominations. This resulted in just over a 10% return rate (14 responses), yielding 27 names. After eliminating repeats and non-members of the Division (who were contacted and asked to join), there were 18 different names remaining. After a careful review of application materials and letters of recommendation both this committee and the A.P.A. Central Office Committee nominated four new fellows who were elected by a vote of Council at the recent convention. Criteria used for selection, in addition to A.P.A. minimum standards were: 1) some concern with institutional and/or organizational level understanding and/or interventions; and 2) demonstration of influence on the profession outside of one's own setting for employment or direct consultation. While division membership is open, on the basis of interest, Fellow status should be reserved for those who have a documentable influence on the field, in some clear way, and this influence should have some direct bearing on community psychology per se.

The new Fellows are:

George G. Katz, Coordinator of Psychology Training
Wadsworth V.A. Hospital Center
Los Angeles, California
Howard E. Mitchell, Professor and Director of Human Resources
Department of City and Regional Planning
Graduate School of Fine Arts
University of Pennsylvania
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Richard H. Price, Professor of Psychology and Chairman of the Community Psychology Program
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan
Edward Seidman, Associate Professor of Psychology
Community Psychology Action Center
Department of Psychology
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Champaign, Illinois

Two community psychologists who were already Fellows in other divisions of the A.P.A., and members of our division, were also elevated to the status of Fellow in Division 27:

Robert Perltof, Director of Research Programs and Professor of Business Administration and of Psychology
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
Theodore R. Sarbin, Professor of Psychology
Adlai E. Stevenson College
University of California
Santa Cruz, California

We are most proud to have these six outstanding psychologists as Fellows in the Division of Community Psychology.

Jack M. Chinsky
N. Dickson Rappaport
Julian Rappaport, Chairman
Call For Nominations

Distinguished Contribution Award

Nominations, along with supporting documentation, are now in order for recipients of the 1978 Division 27 Award for distinguished contributions to community psychology and community mental health. Awards are made in the areas of conceptualization and theory development, empirical research, and program development. Please send your nominations to:

J. Wilbert Edgerton, Ph.D.
Chairman, Award Committee, Division 27
South Central District Office
Division of Mental Health Services
Suite 504 225 Green Street
Fayetteville, N.C. 28301

Final determination of the award will be made by the Award Committee, which is made up of all past-presidents of Division 27.

Division 27 Executive Committee 1977-78

President
Murray Levine
SUNY Buffalo
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University of Texas
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APA Program

HOW DIVISION 27’S 1977 PROGRAM AT APA GOT PUT TOGETHER

MURRAY LEVINE, SUNY at Buffalo

Primary responsibility for the program at the annual APA falls to the Division’s President-Elect. That is a wise decision since it is clear the Program Chairperson will never again be elected to anything. Since far more proposals are submitted than can be accepted, all those individuals whose papers are rejected are potential enemies. All those whose papers are accepted are also potential enemies because they inevitably receive less time on the program than they feel their presentations warrant, or the time, the day, or the room is unsatisfactory. Ithas been a policy decision of the Division to try to accept as many presentations as possible, and thus the time allotted to each is constrained.

This past year the task of putting together a program was complicated by the fact that we received approximately 25 percent fewer hours than in the year previous. Hours are allotted to the division by APA using a complex formula involving the number
of division members who registered at the convention in previous years. This year we had 76 proposals for individual papers and 100 proposals for symposia to squeeze into the 30 hours allotted to the Division. One lesson is that our membership ought to be advised to come to the annual meetings and to register.

The Executive Committee also expressed a preference for organized symposia over individual papers; a limited number of hours was allotted to individual papers. We accepted 25 papers and 18 symposia proposals. We also tried to select papers for paper sessions that had some degree of common content. Thus papers were selected not only because program committee members thought the content was promising, but because the papers fitted together, at least in terms of their superficial resemblance to each other.

All the individual papers were selected by a program committee that was developed from among Division members in the Buffalo area. The local six member program committee also screened all the symposia proposals and then sent them out for blind reading to 16 additional division members. The program Chairperson then selected the final program from among those proposals which received the highest rankings and strongest reviews from the people who read the proposal. There were still many good proposals which were not accepted for the program because of overlapping program content. The program Chairperson offers no apologies for the process, except to seek your sympathy by visualizing him in place of Pavlov's dog, forced to make discriminations where little basis for making the discrimination existed.

Paper proposals are easier to judge than symposia proposals. They are written by a single person, and there is enough detail concerning method and conclusions to decide something about the merit of the paper or its appropriateness for the Division. Symposia proposals are much more difficult to evaluate. The brief abstracts give little basis for understanding the full presentation, and the integrative summary may or may not help in understanding the part each presentation is to play. As a program committee we set ourselves the task of trying to decide whether the content was sufficiently generalizable to warrant presentation at a national meeting, whether the program was integrated enough to look like a symposium, and whether the topic would have interest to a broad range of the membership.

We rejected proposals which centered around an agency program, featured several members of the agency staff, and were not presented in such fashion that the generalizable aspects of the program came through clearly. Thus a presentation on How Our Day Care Center Operates in Frisbee City was not received favorably. On the other hand, an emphasis on problems to be resolved, or a report of an experience which tested certain propositions was more favorably considered. Another common rejection was the symposium which depended heavily on data to be collected. Such symposia proposals were promissory and thus could not be judged. A third type of rejection was the proposal which seemed to the reviewers a rehashing of topics already well covered in the literature. If you are working in a well trodden path, be sure to show how the presenter will provide new data, or a new interpretation of the issues. A fourth type of failure was a proposal which seemed to be a vehicle to put friends on a program so they could get together in San Francisco. Such a proposal would have no consistent theme in the papers but would represent sets of papers whose common conceptual rationale escaped the reviewers.

Proposals are judged more or less blindly. I say more or less because symposia proposal writers use names and references freely, and we cannot block out everything identifying feature when a proposal is sent out for review. Also, if there is a choice to be made among competing acceptable symposia, the names of the presenters might well influence choice. In that regard our senior citizens may have somewhat better chances of appearing than unknowns. While unfair perhaps from one viewpoint, from another it is true that meetings with name figures are usually better attended than meetings with unknown persons presenting. It is my feeling that students and younger professionals are interested in seeing and hearing, and perhaps meeting, those whose works they have read, and who, in some instances are role models and heroes for them. However senior figures are also turned down with some regularity and, I am sure, not without embarrassment and regret.

The needs for scientific and professional communication are complicated by institutional rules providing for travel reimbursement for those listed on the program, and by individual ambitions to advance careers through obtaining exposure at national meetings. They are also complicated by the fact that program committee members work on a volunteer basis and have to concentrate their efforts within a few weeks. These extra-scientific considerations shape the program to some extent, and are inevitable. While continuity may be desirable for efficiency, it is probably a good thing that the program committee have a constantly varying membership. In that way biases distribute over time. In any event, scientific and professional communication is the heart of the meeting, and we should make every effort to have the meeting meet those purposes first. We do find out about new things going on through our national meetings, and they do provide for personal exchange as well. That they could accomplish their purposes better is an article of faith. How they might accomplish their purposes better may be a matter for legendarium.

DIVISION 27 CONVENTION PROGRAM, TORONTO, 1978

ROBERT NEWBROUGH, Peabody College

This is to announce the themes and formats of the Division 27 time at the 1978 Annual Convention scheduled for Toronto. There will be some changes from last year.

Major Theme: The Practice of Community Psychology

Meeting formats: Symposia

Priority for consideration:

1. The practice of Community Psychology, with emphasis on special skills and the knowledge bases.

2. Reflective of constituencies in the division (minority groups, women, community mental health centers, etc.).

3. Coordination with the regional coordinator.

4. The use of the symposium to build networks in the division.

Special Program Interests:

1. Symposia or Workshops that emphasize Toronto as a locality. Canada as a specific focus would have second priority. Consider including tours and meetings with Toronto residents as part of the entire presentation.

2. There will be special program time for topics which would (or could) be co-sponsored with another division (which would not usually co-sponsor). Interest has been found in SPSS (Division 9) and History (Division 26) for possible co-sponsored programs. Be innovative! It might get you on the program.

Papers will be increased in number this year, but they will require a special presentation format. The presentation will be on a poster—to be displayed with a number of others in a large room. Interested persons come by, read the poster, stop and talk, and may be given a written form of the paper. Details on this will be in the APA Call for Papers coming out in November.

Anyone interested in further information, contact J. R. Newbrough, Box 319, Peabody College, Nashville, TN 37203.
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Membership Committee Report

DARWIN DORR, Highland Hospital, Duke Medical School

Last year the recruitment efforts of many people led to an optimistic membership report. This year our primary goal was to continue our program to attract interested and qualified persons to the Division. Recruitment efforts took place on many fronts. Particularly large projects included a mailing to all U.S. Community Mental Health Centers by Ed Hock and myself and a mailed invitation to all the members of Division 35 by Annette Rickel. Our combined efforts continue to pay as the figures below will show:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1975</th>
<th>1976</th>
<th>1977</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># New Members</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># New Associates</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># New Students</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># New Affiliates</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This year the number of new (Full APA) Members admitted was 251, reflecting a nearly 52% increase over the previous year. We also attracted more (APA Associate) Members and the 50 persons who were admitted in this category this year represents a 72% increase over the previous year. (Division 27 does not distinguish between Full and Associate Members, but because APA continues to make this distinction Associates are listed separately here for convenience.) The number of Students admitted this year was healthy (111), although our increase over this past year was not as marked as it was in the previous year. Finally, we have been extremely fortunate in recruiting Affiliate Members (102) to the Division as the 252% increase over 1976 will show.

The effect of these new recruits will have on our overall census is shown below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pre APA (77)</th>
<th>New</th>
<th>Projected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td># Fellows</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Members</td>
<td>1011</td>
<td>251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Associates</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total APA Members 1272 307 1573

| # Students   | 209 |
| # Affiliates | 123 |
| Total Students and Affiliates | 332 |

Grand Total 1905

Prior to the APA Convention we had a total of 1272 Fellows, Members, and Associates. This census added to the numbers of persons who have been recruited in 1977 gives us our projected census. Two persons who were Fellows in other divisions were elected to Fellow status in the Division and four Division members were made Fellows which brings the projected number of Fellows to 132. The addition of 251 Members will bring the total number of Full Members to 1256 (6 Members changed to Fellow). The addition of 50 Associates will bring our projected Associate census to 185 which brings the total number of APA Members holding some form of membership in the Division to 1573. It must be pointed out, however, that this is the projected census which does not take into account the number of people who may drop out of the Division by the end of calendar year 1977. The actual census will not be known until APA does its final tally in January.

The number of Student Members is now 209, the number of Affiliates is 123, which brings the total of Students and Affiliates to 332. This added to our projected APA census brings the projected grand total to 1905 persons who at the time of this report hold some form of membership in Division 27.

I am pleased to have had the opportunity to chair the Membership Committee for the past two years, but other demands force me to relinquish this position. While I will remain on the Committee we are very fortunate that Annette Rickel, who has served diligently on the Membership Committee, has agreed to chair the Committee. Henceforth, all inquiries regarding membership should be sent to the new Membership Chairperson.

Annette Rickel, Ph.D.
Membership Committee Chairperson
Department of Psychology
Wayne State University
Detroit, Michigan 48202

The names of our new Members are listed below:

Members
Abulsad, Kamal G.
Albers, Robert J.
Albino, Judith E.
Alcorn, John Douglas
Allinson, Beverly Balch
Allison, Sarah G.
Anthony, Verlin L.
Armstrong, Robert E., Jr.
Atkinson, David R.
Bailey, Bruce Ernest
Baker, Jean M.
Barrilleaux, Stephen Philip
Beck, Norma
Bednar, Mary Ann
Behar, Lenore B.
Benenson, Thea Fuchs
Bennett, Bobbie Hamilton
Benswanger, Ellen G.
Berg, Greg K.
Berger, Susan Robbins
Biskin, Donald S.
Bolotin, Else Kessler
Bolton, Ruth E.
Booraem, Curtis Deil
Boyd, Foster
Bram, Susan
Brown, Patricia MacDonald
Brown, Luride
Brunette, Elizabeth C.
Burkhardt, Jane M.
Burns, Barbara J.
Campbell, Susan M.
Carlson, Gary E.
Cerra, Victor
Chu, May K.
Cinnamon, Kenneth Mark
Clairol, William L.
Clifffield, Steven Paul
Clos, Marjorie C.
Coley, Sandra B.
Craver, Ann April
Crowe, Patricia B.
Crum, Joseph E.
Curan, Michael Joseph
Daly, Frederica Y.
Davidsson, William S., II
DeVore, Susan Dunn
Dickey, Marguerite A.
Dunn, Charleta J.
Dworkin, Anita Lazier
Edelman, Ann Lynn
Emerson, Patricia G.
Erwin, William M.
Faubert, Marc
Fawcett, Stephen B.
Feitel, Barbara

Feldman, Robert H. L.
Feshbach, Norman Deitch
Fingerer, Marsha E.
Fitzgerald, Warren Daniel
Fleming, Eldridge Eustess
Foely, Linda A.
Folkins, Carlyle H.
Fox, Muriel
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Student/Affiliate Membership Renewal

If you would like to request or renew Student or Affiliate Membership in Division 27 for 1977, please fill in the information below and send this article with your check for $3.00 to:

Annette Rickell, Ph.D.
Department of Psychology
Wayne Stad University
Detroit, Michigan 48202

Name _____________________________
Address __________________________
City _____________________________ State ______ Zip Code ______
University Affiliation ____________
Expected Date of Graduation ______
Check those that apply:
________ New Member
________ Renewal
________ Student
________ Affiliate

Videotape on Community Psychology

The response to a notice in the spring issue of the Newsletter about the color videotape on Community Psychology has been very encouraging. This half-hour cassette features an interview with Ira Iscoe by Beulah Hodge, skilled interviewer of the PEOPLE AND IDEAS program, Station KLBN, University of Texas, Austin, Texas. Rental fee: $10, including postage (one way). All profits will go to Division 27. Write to: Community Psychology Program, Benedict Hall, University of Texas at Austin, Texas 78712.

American Journal of Community Psychology

The American Journal of Community Psychology continues to grow. Six issues will be published in 1978 and pages increased from 480 to 600. Two special issues will be published, one on Community Mental Health Centers and one on responses to transition events and crises. A year’s subscription is only $15; complete the following form and mail it to the Plenum—or send for a free examination copy.

Plenum Publishing Corp.
227 West 17th Street
New York, NY 10011

Please enter my subscription to the American Journal of Community Psychology. I am a member of Division 27, APA.

Enclosed is $15 for one year.

Please bill me $15 for one year.

Name _____________________________
Address __________________________
City, State, Zip. __________________
SUMMARY OF DIVISION 27
GROWTH AND ATTRITION PATTERNS
DARWIN DORR, Highland Hospital, Duke Medical School

Amid an otherwise optimistic membership report in the Fall 1976 Newsletter, I pointed out that there was reason for concern about our attrition rate. Terry Miller, who previously chaired the Membership Committee, had also voiced concern about attrition. In order to shed further light on the matter, I undertook a Division 27 growth and attrition survey. Many people helped on this project, including stalwarts being my secretary Mrs. Bertie Phillips, and student assistants Jeff Farr, Susan Crawford, and Andrew Potts. A full account of this study will appear in the American Journal of Community Psychology this fall. The present report summarizes the results of this study for the Newsletter. Additionally, I have chosen to do some editorializing in this version of the report.

The first thing we did was to examine the Division’s dropout rate as compared to that of APA nationally. Figures relevant to this question for the years 1970-1976 are summarized in the first table. Unfortunately, Divisional data were not available for the second table will show. We calculated the growth rate in APA and in Division 27 back through 1967 when the Division was established. An eyeball examination will show that while the Division is more variable in terms of proportional growth, the median seems to be roughly equivalent to APA. Hence, we can speculate that while we seem to have a higher proportional dropout rate we must also take in a proportionately larger number of members which makes our total growth rate approximately equivalent to that of APA nationally.

We also compared the growth rate of Division 27 to that of other divisions, specifically the 9 that were established after us (through Division 36) and the 9 that were established before us (through Division 18). These results will be published in detail in AJCP. Basically, the figures showed that compared to these other divisions our growth rate is moderate though steady. Some divisions, such as Humanistic (32), continue to show spectacular growth. On the other hand some divisions are showing a pattern of steady decline, notably Division 31, State Psychological Affairs. An optimistic interpretation is that we are a “blue chip” division that is showing a steady, moderate growth.

The data taken as a whole would suggest to me that Division 27 is doing reasonably well in terms of attracting members and in terms of overall growth rate. We still, however, should be concerned about persons who drop out of the Division and to this end we undertook a survey of those persons who dropped out of Division 27 between 1970 and 1976. The survey items were patterned after a continuing survey undertaken by Mrs. Jane Hildreth, who coordinates membership for APA. There were 3 reasons provided which were “cost,” “dropped out of APA,” “interest and/or focus change,” “to foreign association,” “back to graduate school,” “in too many division to profit from all,” “lack of communication with Division 27,” “poor leadership in the Division,” and “forgot to pay dues.” In addition to these 9, 2 other categories were tolerated, “known deceased” and “no reason checked.” (DD note: the results of this survey are also detailed in AJCP.) To summarize, the formal aspects of the survey suggested that the primary reason people dropped out of the Division was “interest and/or focus change.” The reason checked second most frequently was “in too many divisions to profit from all.” Running a close third was “cost.” “Lack of communication with Division 27” was the fourth most frequently checked item.

These results taken alone would suggest that reasons for dropping out of the Division are fairly benign. However, in addition to the formal aspects of the survey, we solicited comments from all of the individuals surveyed. In all, there were 48 comments that I could read and these constituted the pool. After the fact, I realized that these constituted one of the most important aspects of the study. Of course, reading comments solicited from disenchanted former members can be very painful, but as we all know with pain can come growth. I will not report every comment that was written in this article but instead will attempt to summarize what we found. Several times Andrew Potts and I read the comments and attempted to sort them into general categories. While we hardly agreed totally, we did achieve some consensus.

In my judgment, 13 of the comments suggested that Division 27 was not socially activist enough and/or too clinical. Some examples are: “Division 27 has become too clinical for me—I am more interested in the social psychological aspect of community psychology.” “The absence of a substantive reason for dropping out of 27, of course, reflects the malaise of our culture, society and profession. To wit: community psychology is a seduction and travesty. Having been the director of a large community mental health program . . . I know that when we really help communities to be autonomous and inevitably ‘radical’ then funding is withdrawn or threatened. Also, the program is a (not readable) for the community—with ‘advisory’ boards set up only after the program is conceptualized by us, the professionals.” “Came to the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>APA Census</th>
<th>% Growth</th>
<th>Div. Census</th>
<th>% Growth</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>'67</td>
<td>25417</td>
<td></td>
<td>636</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'68</td>
<td>27250</td>
<td>7.21</td>
<td>612</td>
<td>-3.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'69</td>
<td>28488</td>
<td>4.54</td>
<td>676</td>
<td>10.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'70</td>
<td>30839</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>753</td>
<td>11.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'71</td>
<td>31985</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>806</td>
<td>7.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'72</td>
<td>33029</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>19.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'73</td>
<td>35254</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>1025</td>
<td>6.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'74</td>
<td>37000</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>1082</td>
<td>5.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'75</td>
<td>39381</td>
<td>6.43</td>
<td>1128</td>
<td>4.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'76</td>
<td>42028</td>
<td>6.72</td>
<td>1186</td>
<td>5.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>'77</td>
<td>44650</td>
<td>6.23</td>
<td>1272</td>
<td>7.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1Over base year.
conclusion that community psychology as formulated and in the manner in which it functioned in our society was dishonest and just another middle class manipulation of the poor. I await the formation of the division of Marxist Humanists which I will join. Until then I will work on the problem of the meaning of personal development for me as an economic matter. (As a form of wealth)."

From my experiences at the Austin Conference and elsewhere, I am sure that a lot of people reading these comments will respond with vigorous "Amen!" and "Right On!" since the Holy Grail of community psychology is political and/or social action toward the end of primary prevention. On the other hand, several comments suggested that there is another faction in our ranks which in my experience is usually not recognized and/or dealt with. Several comments (my count was 10) indicated that we were getting too social and political in our orientation. Examples are: "My orientation to professional psychology suggests that its primary function is the delivery of services which address and deal with the psychological functioning of individuals. As community psychology has become more and more concerned with social ills, I have lost interest, and I feel we are overstepping our area of professional competence." "Quickly lost interest in community psychology. Finally accepted that I don't enjoy selling the community something it basically doesn't want--I have 'deflected' to private practice!" "I think MA/MS psychologists with experience are worthy of full membership. I believe Division 27 to be community/clinical oriented; I found it was more social action and this orientation does not suit my needs." (DD note: masters level psychologists do hold full membership in Division 27.) "I run a growth center, and also am doing marriage counseling, private practice, etc. The directions of community psychology are in more political areas. At first I thought it would be relevant to my work, but has not developed that way."

I classified 10 comments as "non-specific negative." For example: "Community psychology is a light that failed." "Your focus is all wet!" "Too many debates about what community psych (sic) is and not enough doing or even talking about projects that worked or didn't work. Also, I have gotten to be more existentially late and more concerned with getting my own trip together before I go out and tell someone else how to do it." Four persons cited communication as a difficulty; "Did not feel there was the opportunity for greater involvement in the activities of the Division." "I do not understand the importance of being a member of the Division. What do you do for us, and we for you? Communication has been non-existent." I classified 5 comments as miscellaneous; e.g., "Also, something akin to finding it too 'fashionable.'" Four persons said that they merely got interested in other areas. Two persons confessed some personal difficulties; e.g., "Lethargy, sloth, and degradation are the key variables. I do appreciate the letter from you. I have since been reinstated in APA and Division 27. I won't work as a piano player."

While every division will have some disenchanted members who feel its "focus is all wet!" I feel that it is instructive to consider the validity of all criticisms. Personally, I am especially interested in the first two groups that were cited; i.e., the Division is not social and political enough, "and" the Division is not clinical enough and/or too social. "The charge that the Division is not political enough could easily be met with the cry of "Hey, you're not being fair!" Clearly the whole tone of the Austin Conference very much advocated political activism and "clinical" activities were generally shunned as was reflected by the very low attendance in the clinical-community training model. There is little question that the highest value of the Division is primary prevention through social action. On the other hand, while we often talk about social action in our meetings I see few accounts of action in this arena. Either we are truly not active or we do not share our social action experiences. While I believe many folks in the Division indeed do talk a better "social game" than they play, I personally know of many who are legitimately active but who do not publish accounts of their activities. Perhaps Charlie Spielberger was right in his 1975 presidential address, "Community psychologists would rather fight than write." Even if all social action pursuits were published, however, I know of few efforts that have been focused at an entire overthrow and reworking of the existing system. While we advocate system and social change in our Division, it might be interesting to examine how radical the Division is and should be.

The charge that community psychology is not clinical (professional?) enough and/or may be overstepping its bounds through social action will, I hope, be considered by all factions within our Division. Some may dismiss these individuals as reactionary, ultraconservatives who are shortsighted and unconcerned with the social ills faced by our country. On the other hand it is my impression that a sizeable proportion of our membership is indeed "clinical-professional" in orientation. One sign of this was the survey done by Barbara Dohrenwend published in the summer of 1977 Newsletter which showed that of the respondents 42.2% were members of AAP and 62.1% felt that AAP should direct its efforts to assuring that psychologists are included among health practitioners eligible for direct reimbursement under a national health insurance program. While Barbara points out that only about 7% of the membership of the Division responded to her survey which questions the representativeness of the sample, I think it would be safe to say that there are a significant number of individuals in the Division who are interested in such professional affairs as AAP and reimbursement to health practitioners, very "clinical" sentiments. These results ought to be considered in the light of criticism from the "community mental health wing." (e.g., Edward Heck's letter to the Newsletter in 1975). Traditionally, community psychology is clearly distinguished from community mental health in the minds of many of the leaders of the Division and yet many members, as well as non-members, do not make this distinction. It could be argued that community mental health has too limited a scope and the Division ought to consistently set its sights in the direction of system change and "leave community mental health behind." On the other hand the present data suggest that our membership is indeed pluralistic in terms of interest and focus, and in my opinion these various sentiments and points of view ought to be dealt with in an affirmative manner. Perhaps as Bob Newborough, President-elect, suggests the concept of organization of the Division by region might be replaced by organization by constituency. Indeed, Panetta has strongly argued that community cannot be defined by geographical boundary but rather must be understood in psychological terms. Perhaps this would be a fruitful direction to take in the future, not as a means of working toward consensus but at least of fostering understanding and communication.

Community Action

Readers are invited to submit brief (250 word maximum) reports of research, programs, or projects about which they would like to correspond with other community psychologists. These reports will be published as space permits, with a request that interested community psychologists contact the author.
Program Evaluation in Community Psychology

IS PROGRAM EVALUATION PROTECTING THE STATUS QUO?

BRENNA H. BRK, Graduate School of Professional Psychology, Rutgers University

In his response to my last Program Evaluation column, Ed Seidman raised some vital issues. First, he is concerned that my portraying program evaluation as a service function could lead to community psychologists practicing program evaluation in such a way as to protect the status quo instead of bringing about social change. That danger does exist. In fact any potentially powerful evaluation (and I see program evaluation as a potentially powerful intervention) can become “dangerous” in the wrong hands.

The safeguards against program evaluation’s being used to support the status quo are the values and ethics of the program evaluator. This is analogous to the situation that a psychotherapist is in. The results of the application of a potentially powerful psychotherapeutic technique are dependent upon the ethics and the values of the psychotherapist.

For instance, when parents tell a therapist that their goal is for their child to attend school, the therapist could provide service in one of two ways. The therapist could accept their goal unquestioningly and teach them to apply behavior modification techniques and use the number of hours per day that the child stays in school (regardless of the method used to get him/her there and regardless of the state of the child while he/she is there) as the sole criterion for assessing effectiveness; or the therapist can examine the school and home situations and the child’s feelings and abilities and take on the responsibility of broadening the parents’ goals.

Similarly, a program evaluator can protect the status quo by accepting a board of directors’ goal to reduce jailbreaks; or the evaluator can serve by examining the prison and the parole system, involving the prisoners in choosing criterion measures, and interpreting program evaluation results within a human rights framework. One reason I’m interested in seeing more community psychologists doing program evaluation is that I assume that they will practice in the latter way.

Ed’s second point was raised also by Gary Cox in a letter responding to my first column. They are both concerned that my emphasis on the distinction between program evaluation (research “to use”) and traditional research (research “to know”) will support an unhealthy split between the two functions. As Ed put it, “. . . both . . . go hand-in-hand as in a gestalt; both are important, and neither “ideal” action nor “ideal” knowledge is achieved by either the disregard or minimization of one type of research or the other.” Gary states, “. . . there does seem to be an unfortunate degree of polarization . . . , accompanied on both sides by a striking lack of understanding of and respect for the purposes and functions of those on the other.” He would have to see a “bridging” between the functions.

So would I. In fact, that goal was behind my emphasizing the distinction in the first place. Before the distinction was clear, I saw discussions about program evaluation vs. traditional research result in program evaluation being classified under traditional research. No “bridging” could occur under those circumstances. Now such discussions can occur about two equally distinct functions. The likelihood of fruitful dialogue has increased.

EVALUATION AND THE PROCESS OF PLANNED CHANGE

CLIFFORD ATTIKISSON, Ph.D.
Department of Psychiatry and The Langley Porter Institute University of California, San Francisco

Several important themes have been reflected in recent issues of this newsletter regarding the application of evaluation methods to human service programs. These themes have centered on (a) various definitions of evaluation, (b) the relationship between program evaluation and evaluation research, (c) the use of evaluation in planned change versus the potential for “status quo agency,” (d) the professional opportunities (or lack thereof) for psychologists in the evaluation field, and (e) the potential (or lack thereof) for evaluation activities to contribute to the knowledge base of behavioral science.

In my view, these themes cluster around a more central integrative issue: Can the application of evaluation methods, within the context of human services, contribute to a process of planned change as we work toward the alleviation and prevention of personal and social problems?

Most current human service programs have a recent origin (though some of us have endured the majority of them quite long enough) and, in essence, are social experiments of varying magnitudes and quality. The proliferation of “new” programs and interventions reflects, paradoxically, equal portions of the American brand of optimism, our failure to monitor and enhance existing programs, and our seemingly inability to de-rail programs once they are instituted on a broad-scale. Coping with this paradox places many evaluators in a dilemma: Does one join the service system and work for change from within, while assisting with the maintenance of program aspects that have social value? Or, does one proceed to a more external position and work at the development of viable options to the existing way of doing business? For many, this choice is a perplexing one that alternately fosters fence-straddling or chauvinism for one or the other alternative. Although any one career can combine both options, being in both spaces at one time is too much for many of us. Each option is very appealing, though frequently I find one of the strategies to be appalling—depending on “where I’m at” in any given year. Typically, greatest conflict emerges when career and status goals and pressures become incompatible with one’s perspective on the best approach to planned change. For example, many evaluators with appointments in university settings find it stressful, and often impossible, to meet academic standards by participating in evaluation activities with community-based human service organizations. Although some have found this path less difficult, few within academia have found it easy without the clear commitment and sanction of department heads.

Fortunately, there is an emerging gestalt that can assist our efforts to make optimal career choices and that can provide a perspective within which our work choices can have systemic clarity. It should be clear to all of us that evaluation is not an end in itself. Evaluators work at macro-levels (federal, regional, state, and large metropolitan counties) and at micro-levels (at the community base close to the locus of service delivery). At macro-levels evaluation serves policy analysis and strategic planning. At micro-levels, evaluation serves ongoing program administration, provides information about accountability to consumers, citizen advisors, and funders, and facilitates tactical planning. Evaluators at either the macro- or the micro-level can relate to the human service context from an “external” or an “internal” position—though the decided trend is toward a more micro-level for internal participation and a more macro-level for external participation. Quality and utility of evaluation products depends on an adequate evaluation technology and well-educated evaluators; whereas utilization of those products depends upon (a)
Dialogue

RE: SEIDMAN'S EVALUATION COLUMN

I am always encouraged when a journal or newsletter focuses in on the area of program evaluation. For those of us who have been in the area for a number of years, the possibility of learning from the experiences, both positive and negative, of others in the area has always been worthwhile. However, I must confess to some confusion after reading Dr. Seidman's paper in the last NEWSLETTER (Summer, 1977).

Dr. Seidman cautions use of the service role emphasis because "it places the community psychologist (when in the role of evaluator?) in the role of handmaiden to a set of preordained standards of efficacy." But to my understanding, that's what evaluation is all about. Goals or standards are set before the program activity takes place and it is the role of the evaluator to help determine if the program achieves these predefined objectives (Suchman, 1969). These standards or goals are not absolutes as the inability of a program to achieve its goals may be due to a variety of factors ranging from inadequate resources and planning to, in fact, poorly defined goals. Therefore, modifications are required. Evaluation should be viewed as a continual process (the program viewed as an open system if you wish), not as a final outcome. As a consequence, the evaluator is not a handmaiden to standards at all, but rather a member of a team of which administrators, clinicians and non-professionals alike are also a part and which is seeking to improve quality of care.

This leads to Dr. Seidman's second concern: selection and formulation of the "wrong" problem or a focus on concerns other than those of the recipients of our services. This point is a bit more difficult to deal with. But when one considers the cost ($36.7 billion in 1974) of mental health services, it becomes clear that mental health providers are also mental health receivers. Of that $36.7 billion, only $14.5 billion go to direct care, $80.7 million went to research, $285 million to training. $385 million to facility development, $1.1 billion to management expenses. (Mental Health Statistical Note No. 125, 1976).

As a consequence, personnel survival becomes a factor. This is true whether the evaluator comes from either inside or outside the agency as both are being paid. There are many other factors involved in evaluation—PSRO, JCAH, DPH, SRA, etc., all having requirements. The clients therefore are only a part of the system.

Dr. Seidman's third point, the role of the innovator for the evaluator, is interesting. We can, if we wish, view the evaluator as one who is going to enter a public booth, undergo a transformation and emerge with a big, orange E on his/her chest, pontificating wisdom (pears) to the community; wisdom that they have been anxiously waiting for, and all the politicians, educators, police, and other professionals and non-professionals will simply listen in awe to "E"'s advice and alter their life styles.

Or, we might view the evaluator as an active member of a team who helps specify objectives in measurable goals and who is able to give suggestions on the basis of his data that might be used to improve care.

Ronald H. Nelson, Ph.D.
Director of Evaluation and Research
Emma Pendleton Bradley Hospital
Riverside, Rhode Island

REFERENCES
**Student Affairs**

**Student Election**

Brian Wilcox is the new student member of the Executive Committee. Brian is a 4th year student in the University of Texas at Austin Community Psychology Program and is also Southwest student representative. He replaces Bonnie Burstein of UCLA. Thank you, Bonnie, for the time, energy and enthusiasm you have contributed to our student community.

**APA Happenings**

A number of events and discussions of particular interest to students occurred at APA. The Division 27 student meeting held during the convention was well attended. Most students who participated were affiliated with community psychology programs. The session provided an introduction to the Division and a fruitful discussion of student concerns. There was interest in expanding our professional and social network with particular focus on developing non-clinical models of community psychology and on sharing research information and resources. The issue of women as a special interest group in the community and in the Division was discussed. The possibility of opening Divisional membership to undergraduates was presented and there was consensus that this would be a constructive change. Finally, the potential effects of training and future roles were explored.

Items discussed in the Executive Committee of particular interest to students included:

1) Jack Glidewell, AJCP editor, reported that students are now represented on the AJCP editorial board. Students submit independent reviews while working in collaboration with a regular member. Student reviews are presented to paper authors without reference to student status. Students interested in being considered for the editorial board should contact someone on the board and ask to work with him/her.

2) The Minorities Task Force is developing a survey to assess minority students' experiences in community psychology training programs. This survey will also, of course, document student experiences in general and provide data that could be of interest and benefit to all students.

3) “Student affiliate”, the title currently used for Division 27 students, will probably be changed to parallel the official APA terminology used for student members.

Division 27 Executive Committee student representatives participated in an interdivisional meeting of student representatives of all Divisions of APA which involved students. Of the Divisions represented, Division 27 appeared to have the largest, most well-functioning student organization, and was able to offer direction to other Divisions seeking to develop their student organizations.

**Northeast Student Conference**

Yale is still planning to sponsor a student community psychology conference as mentioned in the last Newsletter, but the date has not yet been set.

---

**Graduate Programs Survey**

Meg Meyer and Meg Gerrard of the University of Texas at Austin have written a paper analyzing the results of a 1975 survey of graduate training programs in community psychology and community mental health. For 62 programs offering master’s or doctoral training, formal curriculum components in each of five content areas (community systems and behavior, prevention or promotion of effectiveness, practice of community mental health, research and evaluation, and administration) are reported. Availability of training in six sites (community mental health centers, state hospitals, legal, public health, and social service systems) is also indicated for each program. The number of faculty primarily involved in community psychology or community mental health training and principal sources of financial support for graduate students are described. This paper also includes a list of the 62 programs with mailing addresses.

For pre-prints of the article, write:

Meg Gerrard
School of Social Work
University of Texas at Austin
Austin, Texas 78712

---

**Community Action**

**TRAINING MINISTERS TO ESTABLISH LAY CARING PROGRAMS**

Pastoral Care Team Ministries, which is based in St. Louis, Missouri, but works nationally, is presently involved in the final stages of development of a program which trains and consults with clergy on how to establish lay caring ministries within their own congregations. PCTM is a not-for-profit religious and educational organization. The need for lay people to be skilled in helping and for clergy to have an organizational plan for teaching such skills and coordinating the work of volunteers presents the occasion for the development of lay training which seriously takes both of these needs into account.

Through the STEPHEN SERIES, the name of the project, clergy are to be taught such things as how to select, recruit, and train volunteers, how to prepare the congregation as a whole for what may be a new approach to their community life style, and how to supervise/consult with the lay volunteers. Pilot programs have been set up at about 10 congregations so far.

Vehicles by which ministers are to be equipped include a two-week training course offered for the first time in the summer of 1978 and an extensive leader's manual consisting of organizational as well as training materials. Among the 25 training topics included in the training part of the leader's manual are: What to Do in the First Helping Contact; Stress of Hospitalization: The Art of Listening; Childbirth as a Family Crisis; Utilizing Community Resources; Telecare; Confidentiality: Being 'Professional'; the 'Small Step' Approach; and so on.

As PCTM finalizes the development of the Stephen Series, we request the comments of community psychologists involved in or interested in such programs of "equipping the equippers."

Please send your comments to:

Dr. Kenneth Haugk, Executive Director
Pastoral Care Team Ministries
7120 Lindell Blvd.
St. Louis, MO 63130
Phone: (314) 725-0991

---

**FIELD TRAINING AND INTERNSHIP MANUAL AVAILABLE**

The Internship and Field Training Task Force of the Division 27 Education and Training Committee has completed a fall, 1976 revision of the manual which first appeared early in 1976. This manual deals with the variety of community psychology field experiences available, how to find or create innovative placements, and how to assess prospective placements. Copies of the manual are available for $2.50 from Dave Stenmark, secretary-treasurer, Department of Psychology, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida 33620. Make checks payable to Division 27.
REQUEST FOR INFORMATION ON RURAL PROGRAMS

A paragraph from a letter recently received . . .

I find comparatively little literature devoted to program development in primarily rural areas, and would appreciate inputs from others who have had experiences in such areas. Published and unpublished manuscripts, outlines, comments, etc., would be helpful to me as I begin to examine community needs and resources, and develop ideas.

Steven Heyman
Assistant Professor
Division of Teacher Education
and Psychology
Southwestern Oklahoma
State University
Weatherford, OK 73096

Across The Editor’s Desk . . .

SCIENTIFIC AWARDS PROGRAM FOR 1978

The APA Committee on Scientific Awards is accepting nominations for its award program. The Committee will select up to three persons as recipients of the Distinguished Scientific Contribution Award who, in its opinion, have made the most distinguished theoretical or empirical contributions to scientific psychology in recent years.

The Distinguished Contribution for Applications in Psychology Award will be given for the sixth time this year. This award will be presented to an individual who, in the Committee’s opinion, has engaged in a program of research that is systematic and applied in character.

A new award, the Early Career Award, has been established to recognize the large number of excellent young psychologists. For purposes of this award, psychology has been divided into nine areas (human learning/cognition, psychopathology, physiological, animal, personality, developmental, methodological, social, and sensation/perception), and three awards are given in 3-year cycles. The titles of the areas were chosen not to stereotype the field but only for convenient identification. The titles should not be restrictive, and the Committee will be very inclusive in considering nominees. Nominations of persons who received their Ph.D. after 1970 are being sought this year from the areas of human learning/cognitive, psychopathology, and physiology. The Committee would appreciate receiving a statement on the worthiness of the nominee, along with a vita, list of publications, and reprints of his or her outstanding, youthful contributions to science.

The awards are subject to the following limitations: (a) members of the Committee, former recipients of the awards, and the President and President-elect of the APA shall be ineligible.

(b) The Committee shall seek diversity in selecting recipients, avoiding as far as possible the selection of more than one person representing a specialized topic, a specific method, or a particular application.

Names and appropriate information that will guide the Committee on Scientific Awards in conducting an intensive career review and evaluation should be forwarded to the Office of Scientific Affairs, American Psychological Association, 1200 Seventeenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

The deadline for nominations is January 13, 1978.

CALL FOR PAPERS ON CONSULTATION

Call for papers (published or original) for consideration in The Field of Mental Health Consultation, Saul Cooper and William F. Hodges, Editors, a book to be part of the Community Psychology Series under the general editorship of Bernard Bloom and sponsorship of Division 27.

Introduction

I. Models
(A) Educative Mental Health Models
(B) Process Mental Health Models
(C) System Models

II. Programs
(A) Schools
(B) Clergy
(C) Social Agencies
(D) Police and Courts
(E) Nursing Homes

III. Issues
(A) Entry, Transfer, Termination
(B) Accountability
(C) Economics
(D) Ethics and Values
(E) Political Pressures and Constraints

IV. Future Directions
(A) Self-Help Networks
(B) Human Service Networks

V. Postscript

The authors are interested in material geared to practitioners and students in Mental Health Consultation. Special consideration will be given to integrative articles related to the chapter headings.

Contact: Saul Cooper
2992 Plymouth Road
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48105

Or: William F. Hodges
Department of Psychology
University of Colorado
Boulder, Colorado 80309

CALL FOR PAPERS

The Second International Conference on Psychological Stress and Adjustment in Time of War and Peace will take place in Jerusalem on June 19-23, 1978. The format will be similar to that of the highly successful First Conference on this topic which took place in Tel Aviv on January 6-10, 1975, and which included participants from 17 countries. The program will consist of invited key addresses by speakers of international reputation and of paper reading sessions, panels and symposia, conducted by scientists and practitioners from Israel and other countries.

The central theme of the Conference is the investigation of war-related stress and of the psychological adjustment made by individuals, groups and societies to the threat of war or the consequences of war. This issue is of special interest to the State of Israel, the site of the Conference, and papers on the Israeli experience will be presented. Many nations and societies, however, have a serious interest in this topic and papers will be presented by participants from many countries.

For any other information, please write Prof. N. Milgram,
P.O.B. 16271, Tel Aviv, Israel.

POSITION OPEN

The Department of Psychology, University of Guelph is seeking an Associate Professor with teaching and research experience in applied social psychology. Preference will be given to candidates with specialization in program evaluation and field research methods. The successful candidate will be expected to contribute to an M.A. program in applied social psychology as well as to undergraduate teaching.

Applicants should send vita, the names of three references and copies of recent publications to: Dr. Michael L. Matthews, Appointments Officer, Department of Psychology, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario, N1G, 2W1.
COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY
IN TRANSITION

EDITED BY
IRA ISCOE
THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN
BERNARD L. BLOOM
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO, BOULDER
CHARLES D. SPIELBERGER
UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH FLORIDA, TAMPA

This comprehensive book is based on the proceedings of the National Conference on Training in Community Psychology held in Austin, Texas, in April 1975 to confront the need to modify graduate-level psychology programs to parallel the rapid and continuing changes in demands being made on psychologists working in community settings.

Analyses of current training models and approaches, discussions of central training issues, commentaries on critical training problems, and efforts to clarify future directions and trends are reported. Salient issues with regard to the current status of training in community psychology and the relationship between community psychology and other sub-specialties are considered in depth in this volume along with training needs and future prospects.

While community psychology is still quite young as an area of specialization, there is conclusive evidence in this book that it has earned its place as a substantive field within the discipline of psychology.

PARTIAL CONTENTS: Planning the National Conference • Keynotes: On the Ideology of Community Psychology • Training Models and Approaches in Community Psychology • Central Issues in Community Psychology • Current Trends in Training and the Practice of Community Psychology • Problems of Concern to Community Psychologists • Epilogue • Appendixes • Author Index • Subject Index

ISBN 0-89116-044-2 $22.50 about 350 pages
Division 27 members, order now and pay only $19.95!

TO:
HEMISPHERE PUBLISHING CORPORATION
1025 Vermont Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005

Please rush my copy of Iscoe, Bloom, & Spielberger,
COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY IN TRANSITION

at the special Division 27 member rate of $19.95

at the nonmember rate of $22.50

NAME __________________________________________
ADDRESS ________________________________________
ZIP ________________

Check, payable to Hemisphere Publishing Corporation, must accompany all Division 27 special rate orders.
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