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Toward the Integration

Leonard DePaul I

As a behaviorally oriented community psychologist, it might seem somehow odd to begin my presidential column with a discussion of affect, and its prominent role in community activities. On closer examination, this might not be too peculiar as the field of behavior therapy is currently initiating rapprochements with several relatively nonbehavioral areas, including the study of affect. My comments, however, are limited to the role of affect in conducting and implementing community-based interventions and projects. I maintain that while the study of process has been one of the central characteristics of community psychology, some process variables (e.g., affect) have been to some extent neglected. In the remainder of this essay I will try to identify several salient "affect" themes that might profit from more of our attention.

When I use the word affect, I am using this term in its broadest possible sense. It concerns our enthusiasm and commitment to a particular problem or issue, it involves the faith we have in an intervention's efficacy, it includes the rallying capacity of citizens to embrace and believe in a new perspective or strategy, it incorporates the energizing components that generate long-term involvement with social dilemmas, it touches upon personal meaning that centers our actions and allows us to persevere despite numerous obstacles, and it reaches for transcendent values that lay a visionary foundation for a more protected and connected future. I posit that when affect is compromised, in one or more of the above dimensions, both the immediate and long-term benefits of the community analysis and/or intervention are lessened substantially.

Let me be a tad more specific. The concept of affect might help us to understand why a community psychologist was initially moved to participate in the research and/or action project. Is it not possible that more external motivations (e.g., grant money availability) as opposed to internal attributes (e.g., personal experience with the problem, sense of outrage that a need is not being addressed) might differentially influence an investigator's outlook, sensitivity, involvement, and acceptance by community groups? (Of course, one does not need to be a heroin addict to be helpful to those who suffer from this addiction.) If I am correct with the analysis, then is it possible that some unintentional consequences might begin a number of investigators: a) quickly shift areas of their work, b) maintain few long-term commitments to community groups; and c) are not recognized, appreciated, or valued by those mandated to help neighborhoods solve their problems.

I believe that affect cannot be separated from our work, which is a life thread of pulsating energy; more mysterious than documentable but tangible nonetheless. We need to learn to sense what we can barely hear, to feel what is as omnipresent as the air we breathe, and to smell a texture of colors that pervade our senses. As we begin to notice the affective processes that are before us, our analyses will become sharper, our collaborations richer, our missions clearer, and our work more meaningful and ultimately more socially important.
Editor's Corner
Joe Galano & John Morgan

What's a Biennial Super Sleuth Anyway?

It's time to confess. Not all the folks in East Lansing were the carefree conference participants they appeared to be. Unbeknownst to the throngs of people moving to and from the rich array of difficult-to-choose among sessions were a few biennial super sleuths. Their task was to prowl around in search of clues to solve of mystery of what this conference means to you, me, and the field of Community Psychology. For those of us who were there, their "clueless" (sic) reporting gives us a chance to reflect on our own reactions. For those of you who couldn't be in East Lansing, we hope to convey some of the content and context of the Second Biennial Conference, whose goal was to facilitate discussion and debate of substantive, timely issues in our field. We hope the meanderings of our band of roving detectives and their "Holmes-like" deductions will give you some kind of clue as to what went on. Hey, at least we tried!

Special Issue

The 1989 Biennial Conference on Community Research and Action: Insights and Outcomes

Fear and Loathing in East Lansing: A Roving Reporter Wanders the Biennial Hoping to Hear that the Revolution is Still Alive

Tom Wolff
Area Health Education Center, Amherst, MA

I approached the Michigan Biennial with a range of concerns: Could the Division pull off another event as successful as the first Biennial, an event that displayed openness, exchange, informality, and excitement? On this count I was once again delighted. The Planning Committee and especially the Michigan State crew are to be commended and thanked.

My other concern dealt with the field as a whole. In an era where there is a greater discrepancy between rich and poor, growing intolerance for differences among races, religions, and ethnic groups; vast disregard for human needs and underfunding of human services at all levels - of what relevance is community psychology? I entered the field joining its commitment to social change and social action and yet at times I feel that there are not many of us whose work as community psychologists reflect this commitment to social change. Is community psychology genuinely concerned with communities, with political change, with advocacy? Or is their field a grand academic charade that is all talk and no action? Did the Michigan conference offer us any hope? The answer is yes and no.

The highlight for many of us was the inspirational vision of Lois Gibbs, an especially articulate and impressive role model as a grassroots organizer on environmental issues. The auditorium hummed with energy and enthusiasm as she laid out her path from housewife/mother in Love Canal to organizer of the national Citizen's Clearinghouse for Hazardous Waste, Inc. But what do we do with our admiration for Lois Gibbs? I later heard students musing over whether they could do work like Lois Gibbs. Where are the role models for students of community psychologists as organizers? Are community psychologists just voyeurs living vicariously through the actions of others? Or do we take this seriously?

Many at the conference seemed convinced that a new wave of community development/community organizing approaches will soon be sweeping our communities. Already there are cries for substance abuse prevention and health promotion interventions to be incorporated into broader community development approaches. As the federal and state governmental pull back from their commitments to the needy, the local communities are left with the problems. These local communities are learning to appreciate the strength of local community development approaches. Will community psychology have anything to contribute to this effort? Will our new graduates be prepared with the skills to partake in and study these ventures? Again it was the idealism, questioning, and interest of the many graduate students present at Michigan that gave me some hope that these issues may be addressed.

It was also heartening to see the role of community psychology in social policy begin to be given the importance it deserves. Ed Zigler's view of the "School of the Twenty First Century" as the center for day long child care gave us food for thought. The timing of his remarks with the Congressional vote on the ABC Child Care Bill and the morning-after an interview with Ed in the New York Times was dramatic evidence of the role that community psychology can play in social policy. That afternoon the social policy committee, led by Deborah Phillips and Brian Wilcox, decided to actually get Division 27 into the real policy arena by developing social policy position
papers on key issues.

Other snippets overheard at the conference that reflect the struggles of our field: Where were our grandparents in the field? So many of them didn’t show. The fact that they no longer dominate the conference seemed appreciated, but their absence was distressing.

Some colleagues expressed concern, and even distress, that the Michigan program was research dominated and indeed dominated by the traditional APA non-participatory format. There were few creative experien-
tial offerings. Additionally, there was concern that there continued to be papers presented that reflect an attitude of researching communities in ways that are not respectful of the communities themselves and do not represent a partnership with those communities.

Is it okay to be community psychologist and do clinical work? This is a real issue, with applied community psychologists feeling intimidated by some if they revealed their clinical practice. This is interesting in view of the fact that almost half of Division 27’s members pay the APA Special Assessment for clinicians. Let me happily come out of the closet and acknowledge that “I am a Clinician,” and have found that my clinical practice and my social activism can live quite happily side-by-side.

The sheer joy of being surrounded by over three hundred people identified with community psychology. The pleasure of dozens of stimulating exchanges that occurred in the halls between papers. The growing ex-
changes between academic and applied community psychologists. These Biennials give me some hope that this field is still very much alive and willing to tackle the tough issues. Hopefully they will generate enough energy that the field will actually march ahead and face the dilemmas of the 1990’s.

A Student’s Perspective

Gabriel Kuperminc
University of Virginia

One year into my graduate training in Community Psychology, I wondered a few nagging questions as I traveled to East Lansing for Division 27’s biennial conference. Most persistent among them was “What is Community Psychology?”

At the conference, I found, as I expected, an array of faculty and students presenting a tremendous range of research. The gathering was larger than I had expected, and the range of research topics more broad. Given the conference’s theme of “Community Research and Action,” I wanted to find out just what distinguishes community from other types of research. Can community research be done only in the field (as opposed to the laboratory)? Must the research carry practical implications for social change in order to be called Community? How do investigators move away from an individually focused, medical model of mental health and toward an approach that emphasizes competence and “routes to psychological wellness?”

Far from answering my big question, the conference left me with some impression of directions the field seems to be taking. First, Lois Gibbs’ keynote discussion of her experiences at Love Canal could only have happened at a community meeting. It seemed to signify a willingness to reach out to the community to identify the social problems that psychologists need to research. Perhaps a feature that distinguishes Community from other fields of psychology involves giving voice to the “subjects” of our inquiry and valuing their expertise in defining and exploring the issues that influence mental health.

A symposium led by Bruce Rapkin (NYU) and Ed Mulvey (Western Psychiatric Institute and Clinic) on integrating quantitative and qualitative methods pointed to ways in which Community Psychology might improve its research methods. Developing ways of processing qualitative data doesn’t have to mean sacrificing rigor and becoming “softer” scientists. Instead, better analysis of qualitative data might lead to more relevant - more ecologically valid - research than we can do now. A participant’s reasoning becomes as important as her/his answer to a question. Making our interviews more conversational and less interrogative might serve to ease tensions between interviewer and interviewee, yielding richer and perhaps more accurate data. Having better techniques for dealing with the answers to open-ended questions in our surveys may improve our study of how perceptions shape the ways people act in given settings. Moving in the direction of including more qualitative data in our analyses could result in our learning to treat those who participate in our studies as something more than “subjects.”

Community psychologists work toward combining research and action in meaningful ways when they become familiar with and get involved in the policy making process. Many psychologists argue that because we are not and cannot be expected to be expert in public policy, we should leave certain types of action to the policy makers. Putting aside our hesitation and getting into the fray, however, is perhaps the best way of learning about the process.

One answer to the ethical problems psychologists might encounter was discussed at the conference in an interest group on social policy moderated by Deborah Phillips (University of Virginia). There, a group of about 25 faculty and students agreed on topics - such as homelessness and AIDS - on which task forces made up of psychologists could corroborate existing research and issue a statement that would simultaneously inform policy and set agendas for needed research on each topic.

I did not leave the conference with any new definition of Community Psychology that I had previously lacked, but I did leave East Lansing enthusiastic that the goals of “Community Research and Action” are attain-
able ones. Building coalitions with other disciplines, and working with policy makers and community groups become more possible when we recognize the complexity of social problems. Building and working with others becomes more important as we learn to recognize the value of different points of view in resolving problems, rather than muddling them, and in improving social conditions.
Community Psychology: Heading into the Nineties

Melvin N. Wilson
University of Virginia

The recent meeting of the Community Research and Action conference on the campus of Michigan State University of East Lansing brought together community psychologists from all parts of the nation and the world. As before, this meeting provided an opportunity to convene a group of like-minded professionals and discuss and learn about the latest developments in our field. Although it was clear that several different community perspectives exist, the conference reaffirmed the general consensus that the quality of life could be enhanced through the application of psychological science to community, social, and ecological problems. My task is to comment on the implications of the East Lansing conference for the future of community psychology. Consistent with my interest, the sessions that I attended focused on various aspects of cultural diversity, empowerment, and/or community action. Although I did not expect that I could attend all the sessions that I desired, I was thoroughly satisfied as there were plenty of interesting sessions from which to choose.

The underlying themes of ecology, human diversity, and cultural relativity (Rappaport, 1977) dominated the conference. As important hallmarks of our discipline, these themes were seen not only in the titles of the various presentation, but also, heard in the formal and informal discussion during the conference. The diverse topics and issues covered a variety of populations including Black, Hispanic, Asian, and Hawaiian American communities, and women and feminist groups, and a variety of social issues and national concern including adolescent pregnancy, homelessness and poverty, hazardous waste, reducing substance abuse, and AIDS prevention programming. In accordance with the original conference on the education of psychologists for community mental health in Swampscott, Massachusetts, during which the term community psychology was created (Bennett, 1965), this conference focused on research and intervention that applied psychological methods to community-based problems that are soluble only through a community-wide approach.

Considerable intellectual discourse occurred over measurement, operations definition, and usage of prevention and empowerment, each of which possessed different issues for researchers. In the case of prevention, the issues involved prioritization of etiology, multiple-risk factors, and prevention priorities (Heller & Monahan, 1977; Heller, Price, Reinhart, Riger & Wandersman, 1984). In the case of empowerment (Rappaport, 1987), the presenters spoke of applying an empowering strategy and empowering target populations rather than devising a strategy that would facilitate empowerment (Rappaport, 1987). Although further refinements are still necessary, the prominence of prevention and empowerment in the conference’s discussions demonstrated their emergence as central constructs in our theoretical, research, and intervention activities.

In contrast to the discussion on empowerment and prevention, social support, as the most frequently used construct, has considerable consistency and validity in research and intervention applications. This construct generally conforms to our notion of a functional collective providing and/or making available to the individual opportunities for security, recognition, affirmation, task-oriented assistance, emotional comfort, personal growth (Berkowitz, 1982). From my observations and eaves-dropping, social support has become a well established construct that serves an important unifying and bridging function for understanding and grappling with other community psychology constructs. Overall, these three terms, social support, empowerment, and prevention, form a solid foundation for building our discipline in the 1990’s.

Based on the number of presentations, we were still more comfortable with the conceptualizing, researching, and assessing community-based problems than we are with developing, implementing and evaluating community-wide solutions. A greater number of presentations reported on the outcomes of community research findings than reported on the outcomes of community action. The concern for this disparity was reflected in a roundtable discussed as a public hearing on “applied community psychologists: What is their place in Division 27?” (Wolff, 1989, June). We must remember that “at its essence community psychology requires application as well as analysis” (Rappaport, 1977, p.4). We have developed the importance of community research analysis and assessment; but now we must develop the importance of reporting on community action projects. If our discipline is to deal with community research and action then we must strive hard to keep it research and action, and not research and/or action.

After 24 years, we are no longer faced with the questions of “what is community psychology?” Staying the course will mean that we continue to reflect the values and activities that have distinguished our brand of psychology from the others.

References
Great for this displaced Hoosier to be back in the Mid-west.
Muggy...hot...hot...muggy.

Now that I have these reactions out of the way, I can move on to reflections about the “Second Community Research and Action Conference as they relate to the future of our field.

At the Biennial, in contrast to the 1975 Austin conference (the first national community psychology conference that I attended as a graduate student) there seemed to be much less concern with defining community psychology and appropriate community models, and much more focus on application and intervention related to specific substantive issues. I saw less self-consciousness about identity, origins and “turf,” coupled with more respect for and inclusion of varied and compatible theoretical models and areas of expertise. There seemed to be less attention to marketability and more concern with ongoing work in areas critical to community survival and enhanced quality (e.g., homelessness, daycare, drug prevention programs, sexual harassment, self-help efforts).

The title of the conference itself, “Community Research and Action,” continues a recently created description for the field that more adequately, clearly and inclusively represents what and who we have always claimed to be. It eliminates the narrowing and professionalism that the label “psychology” suggests and brings together research and action, theory and practice. It welcomes those of similar interests from other professional specialties within and outside psychology, and perhaps more importantly, allows in (at least theoretically) the community constituencies who have not only the knowledge but also the right to full participation in the processes of change in their own communities. Unfortunately, while the conference title suggests this broader, more inclusive definition and the program content reflected it as well, the participants themselves appeared to be mostly psychologists working primarily in academic settings and doctoral level psychology students. This is one way in which the conference gave mixed messages.

Hence, a key question that arises for me regarding the future of the field: Do we want to be primarily a professional organization or do we wish to broaden ourselves by actively including these other constituencies, working collaboratively and fully with them toward common goals? If the answer is the latter, this will not doubt necessitate a more political orientation and an alternative way of working. As Lois Gibbs so convincingly argued in her keynote address, research, science and professional expertise are useful tools in the service of those with political power toward real goals. All too often, these tools have not been used in the interests of those groups we purport to serve. Ms. Gibbs pointed out how very different she was from “us professionals,” and emphasized the need for grassroots political action. She was convincing and exhilarating; she was also clear about what our contribution should be: Knowledge and professional skills used in the service of clear human values and particular political goals, not in place of them.

The highlight of the conference for me personally was the expanded interest and spontaneous enthusiasm that focused on feminist community psychology and that supported the work of the Committee on Women generally. Often in the past, I have left community conferences feeling that I was one of a few “resident feminists,” that my politics and assumptions were too radical or too narrow somehow for these gatherings. How refreshing and energizing it was to be questioned as to why we were not calling ourselves feminists, or using feminist methodologies and processes.

At the same time, there is no question that there has been increased inclusiveness of women as a constituency both within the professional organization and in theory and practice. That feels good...and was evident in the program content. For example, there were three independent sessions on sexual harassment. Still, some of the newcomers to the Committee on Women special interest meetings were surprised and disappointed by the absence of feminist language and methodology in the program and in our own group meetings. New participants brought new vantage points and challenges and reminded me that there is much more to be done. It was exciting to hear about the “feminist stream” of the community psychology program at OISE (Ontario Institute for Secondary Education) and to hear about this institution which provides benefits for same sex couples as well as traditionally married heterosexual ones. Encouragingly, there were at least two conference presentations that dealt with lesbian and gay issues, and several others on AIDS-related issues. This is in contrast to my sense that the field has done little professionally or in community work to support lesbian and gay men, or to expose or prevent homophobia. There are also plans underway for a feminist “track” or pre-conference sessions at the next Biennial, Wonderful!

Witnessing the birth of the “International Network on Community Research and Action,” was also exciting and a sign of future directions. I also heard several people report enthusiastically on the pre-conference self help group working meeting, and on the sessions related to graduate training. These observations and interaction lead me to believe that the future of the field promises more specialized networking and closer collaboration among people working in similar settings and substantive areas, and greater diversification overall.

There continues to be some tension between those working primarily in applied versus academic settings. Few people from community settings, as compared with academic, attended the conference. I also perceived some frustration or feeling of isolation from people in applied settings and private practice, On a more positive note, there also seemed to be more program content that was directly community-based. John Terry and Jim Grout’s session on a community-wide leadership project in rural Vermont and Marge Schneider’s poster on an innovative Canadian advocacy program for lesbian and gay youth are good examples.

I have many more observations, but space does not allow me to elaborate on them. Let me highlight a few:

— Excellent choice of keynote speakers (Lois Gibbs and James Jackson) both in terms of representativeness and content; wish they had stayed for more of the conference.

— More attention to minority groups and issues needed, and should be addressed in the future.

— Visibility and participation of students a real plus; “A proactive approach to training: Graduate students creating their own resources,” was a great session and the findings and strategies presented there were great resources.

— No opportunity to see the East Lansing community or to get much sense of the community context, either local or university; would have appreciated seeing more and getting a sense of these local communities.

— Finally, there was an openness and exchange among “old-timers” and “newcomers.” Perhaps this was a reflection of the Midwestern, relaxed setting and its stereotypic hospitality, or the very real context created by the conference organizers and hosts. I think the latter since, to me at least, this comfortable and collegial spirit seemed to grow over the days in an organized way despite the heat, hard choices given competitive programming, and overstimulation.

So, what does all this suggest about the future of the field? I hope it means that we’re here to stay: Less conscious about our identity and more focused on issues critical to the survival of communities and the growth of “community.” I hope it means that we’re here to stay: Using community principles that are broaden and deepened by synthesis with other compatible theoretical, political and practical approaches. I hope it means we’re here to stay: Supporting each other’s separate efforts and collaborating more fully and closely on our common agenda. I hope that we’re here to stay: Community research and action in the broadest, most inclusive sense of the word and work.
The 2nd Biennial Conference:
Reflections on Community Psychology’s Future

Tina Mitchell
New York University

This assignment—to write about in what direction I think the field of community psychology ought to be heading—is naturally colored by my particular life circumstances. Right now, I am basically immersed in the research end of community psychology, rather than in other important areas of community psychology such as teaching, administration, or providing services. As a result, my personal "lens" currently carries with it a strong research hue. However, I also have a contract with McGraw-Hill to write an undergraduate text on community psychology, so this request offered me a chance to look at the conference through that lens, as well.

The "Undergrad Text" Lens

Each of us trying to arrive in East Lansing that Thursday—at least those of us coming from the East Coast—seemed to have a story to tell about trying to get there. At times, it felt almost like "ayuh, ya cahn get theyuh from heyuh." The good news is that eventually the fog let us descend on the town; the bad news is that I missed the one session I had really hoped to get to which was most relevant to my writing the text—that on "Teaching concepts and raising consciousness." So, I guess "ya cahn get theyuh from heyuh": you'll just be a bit late.

As a result, the major thinking that I did about the textbook occurred during Lois Gibb's entertaining, enlightening, and rousing talk. Ironically, I was just beginning work on the chapter concerning social change. Much of that chapter deals with Saul Alinsky's community organization approach to social action. Lo and behold—a modern-day example of his approach appeared in Gibb's talk about Love Canal: the Citizen's Clearinghouse for Hazardous Wastes, and in general people's rights to choose the risks to which they expose themselves. Because it was not illegal to pollute, the Love Canal owners had to fight hazardous waste politically. For example, they targeted specific figures at rallies—at one time, they burned scientific peer review groups in effigy. They held EPA members in Love Canal houses, stating that the bureaucrats could leave when the Love Canal families were removed. When New York's Governor Carey proclaimed that the only people in possible danger in that area were pregnant mothers and children under two (referred to by Gibbs as "our canaries in the mine"), the protesters encircled the podium with 3- to 5-year-old children.

Someone asked about the roles that the Levines had played during the Love Canal activities; it was clear that Addie has been useful for Lois for brainstorming, defusing, and general support. (Dick Reppucci pointed out to me that that role sounded like Sarason's "external critic.") However, Gibbs articulated little awareness of the wide variety of ways community psychologists could work with such efforts. Instead, she reflected tasks from a totally legitimate, but more traditional clinical model of stress reduction and empathy. It seems clear that community psychology as a field needs to market its applied aspects better. Overall, I left the talk feeling energized, empowered, and uplifted. As a contrast to my other world, which is too often filled with basic research and academic rhetoric, it was a wonderful feeling.
An Evaluation of the 1989 Biennial Conference on
Community Research and Action

Bill Berkowitz
Solomon Mental Health Center, Lowell, MA
Anne Mulvey
University of Lowell

The feedback is in from the 1989 Community Research and Action conference at Michigan State, and it looks good. This is a brief summary report based on the conference evaluation. A more detailed report for the Conference and Executive Committees should be available by the time this issue reaches you; contact either one of us for a copy.

Two positive indicators stood out: The overall rating of the conference, and the expected likelihood of attending the next one. On a 1-10 scale (1 = lowest; 10 = highest), the mean conference rating was 7.49, and the mean estimated likelihood of attending the next conference was 8.36. What is more, mean student and faculty ratings were identical on the first question (8.59), and nearly identical on the second (8.50 and 8.42; ratings by those outside academia were slightly lower). So this conference appealed across disciplinary generations.

Below are other results, some with brief commentary attached.

Who Came

- Three hundred and twenty-four people preregistered, about 50 more than for the inaugural 1987 conference. (Data for 1987 throughout are from Galano & Nezlek, 1989.)
  - There were more female preregistrants than male (53% to 47%), compared to an even gender distribution in 1987.
  - In all, 29 states plus Puerto Rico, Canada, and West Germany were represented, though 82% of preregistrants came from east of the Mississippi. The highest percentage came from Illinois (19%), with Michigan a close second (18%), and New York third (14%).
  - Forty-four percent of the respondents were students; 40% worked at colleges or universities; 5% were employed in mental health settings; and 9% worked in government or other nonprofit organizations. Faculty attendance declined by 8% from 1987, and the percentage of students rose about comparable; but the dominant audience at this conference was clearly those in academic life. (Note: We received 233 conference evaluations and the figures in this paragraph and those following are based upon that 72% return; figures may not add exactly to 100% because of rounding and occasional dual responses or nonresponses.)
  - Mean age was about 33.5, down from 36 in 1987. The high student population affected this figure. But with 79% of respondents under 40, and 96% under 50, this was unmistakably a youthful gathering.
  - Minority representation: 7% of respondents identified as black or African American, 5% as Hispanic, and 3% as Asian. Respective 1987 percentages were 5%, 10%, and 1%. Combined minority attendance was constant, and mean ratings by minorities of the overall conference were about equal to those by nonminorities (7.58 to 7.47).
  - Forty-five percent of respondents held Ph.D.'s; the highest degree for 30% was a master's degree, and for 24% a bachelor's. The percentage of Ph.D.'s was down 16% from 1987.
  - Sixty-nine percent were Division 27 members (1987 = 82%); 65% were presenting or moderating (1987 = 67%); and 43% had attended the 1987 Biennial in South Carolina.

Why They Came

Almost all respondents came for multiple reasons. The most important were "acquiring new ideas or theories" and "learning about new developments in the field" (respective mean ratings = 4.24 and 4.17 on a 1-5 scale, with 1 = not important and 5 = very important); others ranking highly were "acquiring new factual information" (X = 3.90) and "meeting new people" (X = 3.87). Some of the many other responses written in included "to recharge my batteries," "to locate models and resources for conducting research," "professor encouraged me," and "looking for a job."

Conference Content

The overall content quality rating was high (mean rating = 4.00 on a 1-5 disagree-agree scale). Respondents generally thought the content reflected the values of the field (X = 3.75) as well as its scope (X = 3.66). They felt too that the conference had sufficient research emphasis (X = 3.99), though they were less satisfied with the representation of applied settings (X = 3.00). Were there content areas or issues not included that should have been? About 100 suggestions were received, ranging from economic development to job-hunting to ethnic minority research, to name a few. Areas mentioned five or more times were women's issues, feminist theory, alternative methodology, and international concerns.

Program Formats

The conference formats rated most highly were workshops (X = 3.67) and roundtable discussions (X = 3.49). (On this 1 to 5-point scale, 1 = "would like fewer of," 3 = "about the same," and 5 = "would like more of." ) Paper panels (X = 2.99) and poster sessions (X = 2.95) received lower ratings. There was some support for including local community events and site visits, neither of which were scheduled in this conference program. The most frequently volunteered format comments were that too many sessions were scheduled concurrently, that many formats were not sufficiently distinguishable from each other, and that there was not enough time for discussion.

Conference Arrangements

Participants were generally pleased by the conference arrangements, with the Michigan State University on-site organizing team frequently being singled out for praise. Although ratings for the (non-air-conditioned) housing and meeting room facilities were negatively influenced by the unsanitary heat, the scheduled social events, informal social opportunities, and opportunities for special interest groups to meet were all rated positives on a 1-5 scale (X = 4.09, 4.00, and 3.75 respectively). The MSU site overall received a mean rating of 4.09.

Preferred Arrangements for 1991

- A solid majority of respondents (71%) preferred meeting at the same time of year (mid- to late-June) in 1991, or possibly a little earlier. The second choice, of 20%, was spring (April to early June).
- Forty-two percent of respondents preferred the 1989 conference length of 21/2 days; 36% opted for three full days. The remaining preferences were split between longer and shorter lengths.
- As for types of location, 66% preferred to continue holding the conference on a college campus. Thirty percent favored a conference center or lodge, and 5% a hotel. Easy accessibility of meeting rooms and proximity to the outside community were often mentioned as desirable criteria.
- Sixty-eight percent of respondents preferred a two-tier conference fee
structure, with a lower rate for students. Twenty-seven percent also preferred lower fees for attending a smaller number of days. Only 5% voted for a single fee structure. This conference was generally seen as a good value for the money, and affordability was cited by many, especially by students, as a factor in determining attendance.

Program Selection for 1991

- How selective should the next conference committee be in screening proposals? Sixty-five percent felt that “a moderate degree of screening and selection should take place”; 30% instead favored a more rigorous level of screening; while 5% believed that “virtually any proposal submitted by a Division 27 member should be accepted.”

- How much initiative should the conference committee take? Seventy-two percent thought that “the conference content should primarily reflect proposals submitted, but might also include some programs and events initiated by the conference committee”; 23% felt the committee should take a more proactive and stronger leadership role than the alternative quoted above; 6% thought that “the conference content should essentially be limited to proposals that are submitted.” For both these questions, the middle ground was the most supported.

Summary and Future Directions

These evaluation results show without much doubt that this was a successful conference by most conventional criteria, that the conference has broad appeal, and that, taking the ratings at face value, there is already a sizable audience primed for the next conference in 1991. We would further conclude that in only two outings, this conference has become a major event for Division 27. Having so concluded, how can the conference be improved?

Qualitative comments indicate it can be improved in many ways. We received an abundance of good suggestions which can’t all be listed here, but which will be elaborated in our longer report. These suggestions were far-reaching and resist easy categorization, but some recurring themes touch on more innovative formats (not just solicited, but executed in practice), more discussion time, more varied programming, and more outreach to and inclusion of nonacademics. Some preferences for more skill building and program tracking were also expressed. And while there were rave reviews, there was also a strain of commentary criticizing the conference for being too traditional, clustered, and nonprovocative, as in “the field has become increasingly empirical and conservative.” This was a minority opinion, at least as voiced in the evaluation forms, but it was a minority of more than one.

The task for the next conference committee will be to try to incorporate these many suggestions into the conference framework. That will be tricky at best, because the call on the one hand is for “more” (more diverse content, alternative formats, community representation, time to discuss), and on the other hand for “less” (fewer simultaneous programs), and on the third hand for the same conference length. How do you stuff more items into a packed suitcase? Some possibilities may include predistribution of papers, audio or videotaping, expanded evening programming, and written guidelines for presenters and panel leaders. But more creative thinking may be needed.

These points notwithstanding, the 1989 Conference Program Committee can take pride in a job well done. The data bear this out. We are optimistic that the next conference committee will build thoughtfully upon the strong foundation already established, and that the Community Research and Action Conference in 1991 will be a memorable event.
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The Changing Sociopolitical Environment

In the United States and its Impact on the Conceptual and Organizational Development of Community Psychology:
New Concepts, Research Models, & Interventions

Send a proposal, (symposium, poster, conversation hour) for the APA 1990 Convention which presents your work. Give us all a chance to see your reaction to this complex and exciting scene. This is the time to share, to promote change and exchange. Deadline: December 15. Send to: Meg Bond, 61 Dudley St. Cambridge, MA
We've been looking for new community action approaches for this column, and Julie Trebat's work at a container redemption center serving the poor and homeless is one of them. The emphasis here is on working together with, alongside of, one's clientele. This raises issues: Who is serving, and who is being served? What distinguishes the "professional" from the "worker"? What, precisely, constitutes the intervention, and where are the data that lead to empirical or conceptual advance? Julie's account is the more striking for its frank discussion of the personal issues involved in her work and how they are addressed. There are plenty of disciplinary implications here, much room for lasting discussion. (WE CAN: 630 9th Avenue, Room 1406, New York, NY 10036.)

In future issues, I'd like to use this space for your own innovative community action efforts. Send your accounts and story idea to me at 12 Pelham Terrace, Arlington, MA 02174.

WE CAN: Struggling with an Alternative Model of Intervention

Julie C. Trebat
New York University

One of the goals of community psychology is to empower people. However, if we define ourselves as "empowerment experts," paradoxically we risk putting ourselves in a role which prevents empowerment. It may be hypocritical to use our status as professionals to "give empowerment" to others. And while as community psychologists we may want to abandon the old model of providing services to dependent clients, we have not consistently used new models in our interventions.

How can this be done? I believe that the best way for us to discover new intervention models is by working together with disempowered people. I have attempted to work from this partnership approach. This article addresses some of the personal and professional challenges I have faced.

WE CAN is a container redemption center in New York City, which serves the numerous poor and homeless people who collect bottles and cans. Redeemers come to the redemption center to exchange their containers for the nickel deposit. In its first 22 months, WE CAN has paid out over $700,000 in nickels.

WE CAN also hires homeless and unemployed people to run the redemption center. In addition, it operates from an advocacy model, in that WE CAN was founded to help homeless people overcome a major barrier in the daily lives: that is, although stores were legally obligated to redeem 240 cans daily from each redeemer, they habitually took only 20 or 30. This advocacy perspective has continued past reaching the initial goal of opening the redemption center. For example, WE CAN has been working with the Leg Action Center for the Homeless in its lawsuit against grocery stores which refuse their legal obligation to take back 240 cans per redeemer. WE CAN has also challenged the state, and so has commanded almost constant media attention.

I first came to WE CAN in November, 1987, a month after the redemption center opened. I worked as a volunteer until May, 1989, when I was hired into the newly-created position of Outreach Coordinator. My official role is to develop relationships, resources, connections, and knowledge needed to assist redeemers and employees of WE CAN. Over the past months, I have focused more on the internal workings of the redemption center than on outreach. I have acted as a bridge between the redemption center and administration, set up meetings and recreational events, provided nurturance and warmth, and helped in the operations of the center.

Given the conditions of the redemption center when I began, it was impossible to set up what I thought would be a good outreach program. I felt it was important that WE CAN be a place that street people could trust; however, WE CAN employees needed to trust each other before others could trust us.

Initially, my assisting the redeemers was ridiculed by some of the workers, as redeemers were seen as not being worthy of help. It was felt that the redeemers should help themselves; this was ironic, given that the workers had pulled themselves out of the very same system. But the help of WE CAN. The workers felt that I was naive in thinking that redeemers are addicts (although several workers have had severe and chronic alcohol addictions themselves), who collect cans for money for alcohol and drugs.

Redeemers have also tried to rip us off in every imaginable way, a reality which deeply troubled me. I was naive to the ways of the street, and began to question my own beliefs and methods. I was also troubled because the WE CAN workers had unfairly grouped all redeemers as hopeless.

Bob, the last manager (names have been changed), was a very powerful, charismatic, and manipulative person. Although I always voiced my opinion, I was unsure as to how much I should push my agenda. At times, Bob was very abusive to the redeemers, and would justify it as necessary to keep order. Bob had everyone convinced that he knew the best way to control the situation.

At the time, I felt conflicted about pushing too hard, since Bob was street-wise and seemed to know the real scene. I felt uncomfortable, as my style is not based on aggression, but on kindness: I thought maybe I was wrong, that kindness did not work in this situation. I thought it was wrong to get into a power struggle with Bob, because I felt that the homeless workers should develop their own policies. When I did express discomfort about the way a situation was being handled, it only seemed to make things worse. Some others and I stated our feelings to the agency administration; they were concerned, and had numerous talks with Bob which ended up having little effect.

A crisis period occurred when Bob's personal problems and work problems collided, and he disappeared for several days. During this time, I became a leader at the lot. It was even discussed whether I should manage the redemption center. What I feel especially proud of is that instead of retaining control (which I was dying to do), I filled the gap in leadership temporarily, and at the same time encouraging others to participate, and eventually turned decisions over to an emerging leader. During this time, the consensus was reached that we did not want Bob back, because we no longer respected him.

The workers' perception of the redeemers softened somewhat with the hiring of a manager who felt it important to maintain respect for our
"customers." This change in attitude was interesting, because the new manager had worked at the redemption center all along. In the transition of leadership, he gained confidence in his own viewpoint. I think Larry learned something from Bob, and something from me. Larry sees that a strong authority figure is needed; he also sees that he can be strong while listening and responding to workers and redeemers.

Larry now runs the redemption center with an even hand, and workers and redeemers have relaxed. As a group, we have discovered that the center can be run more smoothly by treating our customers with respect. People speak their minds, yet are supportive of each other, and decision-making actively incorporated the opinions and needs of workers and redeemers. Having both homeless and non-homeless people as employees at the redemption center has also been positive. We work closely as a team, and having diversity of backgrounds, experiences, and resources has strengthened us.

One perspective which has been suggested to me is that the "consumers" should run this service without interference of "professionals." I'm not sure this perspective fits my experiences at WE CAN. A more important element of this intervention may be that we make no status distinctions based on how a person is housed. WE CAN employees are not thought to be different because they have been, or continue to be homeless. What I have to say is not more legitimate because I have a graduate degree and live in an apartment. This intervention does not define workers and redeemers as "clients," or even "consumers," although they are often people who have problems in living. The people served by WE CAN are instead defined as "workers," "redeemers," and "customers." This definitional shift is what makes WE CAN so different.

Some might suspect that we are able to minimize internal status differentiation because we are hiring the most functional and least problematic homeless people as workers. This is not the case. Some employees who function at a high level at work do not own a towel for a shower, or feel uncomfortable shopping for groceries. One employee, who has been at WE CAN over a year, lives a fantasy life as an ex-New York City cop. He maintains that he lives with his wife in a co-op and that she earns $70,000 a year; however, we know that he picks up cans on the weekend for extra cash, and sleeps on the streets. He is an excellent and steady worker, although he annoys everyone with his endless fictional life stories. Other workers are currently active alcoholics.

Some of the problems I have had at the redemption center may revolve around differences of class background. I have never before worked side by side as closely with working-class and urban poor people. Both groups have a definite distrust of educated people who prefer theorizing to getting their hands dirty. I think because I have been willing to involve myself in their daily lives, workers and redeemers have come to trust me. This has enabled me to assist them with individual problems, as well as to have input in crucial decisions. However, it has not always been easy for me to deal with these class differences, especially when it comes to the role of women. Workers at times prevent me from carrying things that they decide are too heavy for me, and tell people I am the secretary. Of course, this drives me bananas.

And in working at the redemption center, it has been personally painful to me to be told what to do by someone—in the sense that my immediate movements and whereabouts are directed. It was sort of a joke, that when I would come in, everyone would look at their watches, because I came in later than everyone else. Most workers are supervised from moment to moment: only professionals are able to avoid this. At times, I have felt that my work is so much more sophisticated, and based in theory and a dedication to broader social changes. Why should I abide by the same rules as the other workers?

In fact, I generally do not. If I want to take the morning off to talk to my thesis advisor, I do it. They cannot. Fortunately, I have been able to get away with this and still be considered as part of the group. Somehow, I have been able to balance my needs as a professional with my participation at the lot. Often, I have wanted to have a different set of rules, as the rules that the other workers live with feel demeaning to me. But those rules I want to avoid are the rules of work which average people all over the planet must follow.

When I talk to others in my role as outreach coordinator, I become more and more aware of how different my role and attitude is from traditional social service providers. I relate to homeless and poor people as fellow human beings with strengths and weaknesses. I am involved with the WE CAN workers on a personal basis; they are my co-workers, my close co-workers who needs my assistance may also support or help me. A turning point in
Computers
Denis Gray, Editor
North Carolina State University

Research Funding Announcements Available on E-Mail

The following National Science Foundation announcement about funding information available through E-mail should prove valuable to individuals whose BITNET.

Immediate electronic access to the most up-to-date information on funding for behavioral research is now available free through the Science Directorate’s new Research Psychology Funding Bulletin.

The Funding Bulletin consists of two components: First, there is an index of funding announcements electronically mailed via BITNET, the university-based electronic mail system. The index lists each funding announcement by name and title, and includes a one-line description of its contents. Second are electronically accessible files of the actual announcements. Each funding announcement contains a complete summary of the Request for Proposals (RFP) or Request for Applications (RFA), deadline date, sponsoring institution, amount of funding available, and contact person.

It works like this: The index is updated and mailed bi-monthly. If the one-line description makes you want to learn more, instructions are provided on how to electronically request the full announcement using ListServe, a network file distribution system. Within minutes of making your request, the funding announcement(s) will have been sent to your computer.

The Science Directorate has regularly publicized funding announcements in the past through mailings and the Science Agenda, and, APA provided a similar electronic bulletin board service two years ago when the Research Support Network listed funding announcements on the APA Central Office computer, a system that had the disadvantage of long-distance telephone charges during access to the database.

BITNET provides a new, faster, and much less expensive way of getting funding announcements. There are no telephone charges or subscriptions fees for the Science Directorate’s funding bulletin service. And, this service allows users flexibility in requesting only those announcements that interest them. All files and the mailing list reside on a computer at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (VPI), for which we are most grateful.

If you have access to BITNET, you can subscribe to the Research Psychology Funding Bulletin directly by issuing a SUBSCRIBE command to APASD-LIST AT VTVM. Consult with your university computer staff for details on the exact wording for such a command from your computer or network site. Since each computer site (i.e., node) is unique, it is not possible for us to provide you with the exact format for the SUBSCRIBE command. In general, though, most VMS or VAX computer systems should accept the following wording and pass it along to the VPI computer:

TELL LISTSERV AT VTVM2 SUBSCRIBE APASD-LIST <your name>

where “your-name” is replaced with your actual name (first and last separated by an “_”) so that your actual name will appear in the list.

You may contact Science Directorate staff via BITNET if additional assistance is needed: Suzanne Wandersman (APASDSSW@GWUVM) or Lee Herring (APASDKLH@GWUVM).

Directory of Community Psychologists on BITNET—An Update

In previous issues of the Community Psychologist, we have provided lists of BITNET addresses provided by individuals to facilitate communication among our members. The following individuals should be added to the Directories we have published previously (Fall 1987; Spring 1988).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>BITNET</th>
<th>ADDRESS/TELEPHONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ken Maton</td>
<td>MATON@UMBC2</td>
<td>University of Maryland, Baltimore</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Catonsville, MD 21228, 301-455-2567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Castellano Turner</td>
<td>CASSTURN@UCSFVM</td>
<td>937 Shorepoint Court, Almeda, CA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leonard Jason</td>
<td>PSYLV@DEPAUL</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John F. Smith</td>
<td>JFSMITH % WAIKATO.AC. <a href="mailto:NZ@RELAY.CS.NET">NZ@RELAY.CS.NET</a></td>
<td>Psychology Department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Waikato, PB Hamilton, New Zealand</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Computers Editor Needed

Denis Gray, Andrea Solarz, and Terry Gidley will begin a new column in the next issue of the Community Psychologist: Community Innovation and Technology. Individuals who would be interested in continuing the Computers column are asked to contact Joseph Galano or John Morgan.
Community Psychology

Education Connection

Maurice J. Elias, Rutgers University, and
James H. Dalton, Bloomsburg University

The Community Psychology Education Connection is your place to send ideas, materials, teaching techniques, book reviews, and essays regarding the teaching of community psychology to graduate students and undergraduates. You can send something for us to publish, something for our clearinghouse files, or something about which you have a question, opinion, or concern.

Please send materials in any form to: Maurice J. Elias, Ph.D., Department of Psychology, Tillet Hall, Livingston Campus, Rutgers University, New Brunswick, NJ 08903, (201) 932-2444, and/or James H. Dalton, Ph.D., Department of Psychology, Bloomsburg University, Bloomsburg, PA 17815, (717) 389-4475. In this column, we focus on experiential-oriented teaching methods, featuring an article by Gil Rogers of the University of Maine at Presque Isle. We also present a description of a new psychology program in Australia.

Experiential Techniques for Teaching Community Psychology.

At the second Community Research and Action Conference in June, 1989, Jim Dalton led an informal discussion on experiential techniques in teaching community psychology to undergraduates. Attendees discussed several approaches for helping community concepts become alive and useful in undergraduates' lives. Small-group exercises can be done in class to conceptualize community problems and concepts. Examples include Bill Berkowitz's problem vignettes (The Community Psychologist, 1988, 22(1), p. 15-17) and Maurice Elias' application of Kurt Lewin's force-field analysis to community issues chosen by students (copies available from Maurice). Some outdoor-experiential techniques developed by Outward Bound can be adapted to a community psychology course. Jim has used the low-ropes course (a standard component of Outward-Bound-influenced programs) to illustrate group problem-solving and the elements of a psychological sense of community. (Call Jim for ideas on this.) Observation of community environments, and description of these with ecological and community concepts, is a feature of many community courses. Teaching students to conduct and develop surveys on community problems, with a limited sample of convenience and an emphasis on an ecological interpretation of findings, is another approach. (Contact Maurice or Jim for course materials on some of these.) Finally, participants mentioned an interest in films or videotapes illustrating community issues or describing community-oriented programs. If you use or know of these, please contact Maurice or Jim; we'll mention them in future issues. As one example, you may obtain a videotape on the Rutgers University-UMDNJ-CMHC at Piscataway Improving Social Awareness-Social Problem Solving program from John Clabby, Social Problem Solving Unit, UMDNJ-CMHC at Piscataway, 240 Stelton Road, Piscataway, NJ 08854.

Community Psychology in Australia.

Adrian Fisher and his colleagues at the Western Institute in Australia are establishing a Graduate Diploma programme in community psychology which they hope to have up and running in February 1990 (noting the different academic year in Australia). It is planned as a one year coursework degree that is somewhere between and US bachelor's and masters level qualification. Adrian provides the following outline of the programme:

Full Year Courses: Community Psychology: introduction, history, theories, levels of analysis, empowerment, social skills training, prevention, social support networks.

Research Practicum: A one-year placement in an approved agency or organization in which the student will design, conduct, analyze, and report on a supervised research project. The report will represent the students' major thesis equivalent report.

Semester 1:

Research Methods (Programme Evaluation): basic approaches to programme evaluation, including selection of appropriate methods, entry issues, needs analysis, meta-evaluation, and data management.

Organizational Psychology I (Structure and Change): conceptualizations of the structure of organizations, including formal structure, communications, power, and change strategies.

Psychology of Group Processes: an understanding of the dynamics of groups, shared decision making, and group management.

Semester 2:

Social Policy Formation and Analysis: considers various ways of examining, influencing, and analyzing the formation and implementation of social policies.

Counselling Psychology: an introduction to methods used in counselling, negotiation, and dispute resolution. Special emphasis will be given to group processes and uses for prevention and alleviation (e.g., stress management, smoking cessation). This unit will also be used to examine the ethical issues of the practice of Psychology.

Electives: a range of electives will be available for students in each semester, e.g., Environmental Psychology, Community Development. Adrian notes, "This programme reflects a number of aspects of what I and others in Australia think are important elements in this type of education. It also reflects having taken community psychology classes from both Julian Rapaport and Bob Felner. There are also a few constraints that are placed upon us by the Australian Psychological Society about course content and time allocations." To correspond with Adrian, write to Western Institute, P.O. Box 315, St. Albans, Victoria 3021, Australia (Phone: 03-365-2111).
Our main article is Gil Rogers' adaptation of his presentation at APA in 1988, describing his use of simulating an agency as a vehicle for teaching community psychology. For further information, contact Gil directly at the University of Maine at Presque Isle (207-764-0311).

Teaching Community Psychology through Agency Simulation
Gil Rogers

This paper deals with an undergraduate course in which ambitious goals appeared to call for a relatively powerful classroom treatment. As the next-to-last offering in a structured sequence (group dynamics, abnormal psychology, personality and assessment, counseling, community psychology, field experience), this course serves as an introduction to field experience and is therefore literally the academic bridge between all previous undergraduate coursework in the discipline and the more demanding reality of life in a human-service agency. Among the objectives are such diverse items as experiencing a sense of community, seeing firsthand how a fledgling agency organizes its staff and services with start-up monies, and developing and using outcome criteria.

Simulation has been broadly employed in teaching where the requirements for realism, spontaneity, and transferability were great (Fulmer, 1983; Howard, 1983; Jordan, 1985; Rooney & Moore, 1984). In classroom simulations in which there are no intrusions by a teacher/coach or peer observers (Hunsaker, Whitney & Hunsaker, 1983; Shatz, 1985), the situation can take on atmosphere of actual settings. The increased power of this approach makes it an excellent choice for the course linking students' academic background and future field experiences.

Method

The approach taken here involved a double simulation. The opening day handout contained a description of two organizations—one to be simulated by the instructor; the other, by the students. The former was somewhat sketchy, alluding to a remotely located funding source with a need for detailed information on the effectiveness of actual human services agencies operating in the general area served by the University of Maine at Presque Isle. This entity supplied a hypothetical staffing grant of $15,000 for use by the student simulated agency for its first month of operation. The student organization was provided with a mission statement and explicit instructions on the kind of evaluative information desired by the funding source.

Meeting twice a week for an hour and a quarter each session, the student organization was to produce three reports. The first, due after a month's activity, was to include four components: 1) a master list of area agencies, along with indication of which six were to be targeted for evaluation, 2) an outline of its own staffing titles and salaries, together with respective responsibilities and methods of conducting business— including the welfare and morale of the staff, 3) a statement of philosophy and the agency's understanding of its mission, and 4) a budget request for the second month of operation.

The next report, due at the end of the second funding period, was to consist of substantive findings on three of the six community agencies. Instructions also called for a seemingly audacious recommendation on continued funding for the actual agencies under scrutiny. It was thought that by the end of the first few weeks of the course most students would be immersed enough in the simulation to be able to consider funding issues with some degree of objectivity and to have built into their recommendations the capability of agencies as sensitivities to the needs of a target population, use of outcome criteria, and capacity for adjusting program strategies to accommodate shifts in budget, public policy, or need.

Beyond Simulation

Instructor responses also were used to underscore "real role" occasions emerging naturally from the simulation. For example, one segment of the report covered a program called "Disabled Homemakers," a service which assists single female parents in reorienting themselves after death or divorce. Program funds offer partial support for education and training, i.e., tuition, baby-sitting, and transportation. Despite a tiny working budget, the agency's local director complained of the need for better community awareness of her program and its potential benefits. The simulated funding source (the instructor) availed itself (himself) of this fortuitous circumstance to remind students of the requirement for summary

Resources

The text was Levine and Perkins' Principles of Community Psychology. The physical layout of the simulation consisted of adjoining rooms, one-way glass, and piped sound. Microphones and speakers in both locations provided the equivalent of conference calls, a feature that student staffs were encouraged to use as they felt the need.

Students

The students were six undergraduate juniors and seniors majoring in behavioral science and who had successfully completed from eight to thirteen courses in psychology and sociology. Five of the six were planning to enter the human services field at the paraprofessional level immediately upon graduation. The sixth was already employed with the State Department of Human Services.

Results and Discussion

I have used the simulation approach for a number of years with classes of varying size; no two groups have created the same structures and processes. In the present case, the students decided first to simulate a board of directors, purportedly the same panel who wrote for and received the initial staffing grant. They worked out some of the internal matters, e.g., mission statement and philosophy, before adjourning and reconvening as a staff concerned with the more immediate details, such as roles and responsibilities. More specifically, the board of directors consisted of a chairperson, a pair of co-directors, a secretary, a treasurer, and an unlabeled standing committee of five.

A request by the co-directors that everyone offer language for their agency philosophy and mission statements led, as might be expected, to a healthy level of co-ownership, a circumstance which resulted in fairly balanced participation.

An organizational staffing chart came quickly into existence and called for shared leadership, i.e., a co-director for administrative and personnel matters, as well as a corresponding position for the management of agency products. Additionally, there was a composing editor, a secretary, a computer technician, a comptroller, and four research technicians (interviewers).

The first few sessions meandered back and forth through such issues as role and salary negotiation, generation of the required agency master list, preparation of an agency contact guide, and creation of an atmosphere open enough to promote free and easy comment by any "staffer." Interestingly, the first mock phone call to the instructor was not prompted by ambitious course goals or breadth of mission, but rather by concerns over how to budget telephone, copying, travel and FICA.

The first two formal reports were acknowledged in writing with equally formal comments calling for revision of various portions. The first report, for example, needed an expansion of the agency master list and clarification of budget information. The second and third afforded the instructor opportunities to comment on the handling of such agency issues as sensitivity to the needs of a target population, use of outcome criteria, and capacity for adjusting program strategies to accommodate shifts in budget, public policy, or need.
reports suitable for public consumption. *Staffs* were urged to recontact the actual Displaced Homemakers director to inquire whether such a report could be done in consultation with her, the product then to be shared with the public. The result was an actual press release for two local newspapers and an agreement to collaborate on a segment for local television.

The simulated agency's final report was to include an evaluation of itself as a simulated agency. A 74-item questionnaire was distributed which covered course objectives as they converted to mission activity. Ranging across definition of community, translation of human service objectives into agency activity, application of outcome criteria, and recognition of the agency's "position" in the human services network, the instrument offered ample opportunity for students to comment revealingly on the course format and the practicality of its challenge. A response summary was returned to them for use in preparing their final report.

Most of the students had taken laboratory, or "hands-on" work, but no other formal occasion is afforded which purports to facilitate the crucial transition from campus to field.

Despite the comparatively low instructor profile, student reaction was laudatory — even on the initially disconcerting fact of a completely novel approach. Several were grateful for the opportunity to try out new roles and skills. All were impressed with the discovery that a fictitious student entity could be fashioned from whole cloth which could perform a real, albeit modest, service. The generally favorable results support agency simulation as a means of preparing students for field work, a view which coincides with anecdotal evidence from them and their field work supervisor.
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**Jobline**

**Peggy Watkins-Ferrell,**
**Julie Perelman,** *University of Missouri-KC*
**Olga Reyes,** *DePaul University, Editors*

**Assistant Professor, Clinical/Community Psychology**

Began: July 1, 1990

Deadline: December 1, 1989

Responsibilities: All applicants are expected to provide high-quality teaching at the undergraduate level and in a graduate clinical/community program, and to have exhibited (or shown very clear promise of) excellent research.

Qualifications: Ph.D.; Applications representing any subspecialization in this area, broadly defined, are welcome.

Contact: Applicants should send a letter describing research and teaching interests and accomplishments, vita, copies of publications, official transcripts, teaching evaluations and three references to:

James R. Haines, Chairperson
Psychology Department
Indiana University at South Bend
P.O. Box 8777
South Bend, IN 46634

**Community Psychologists/Tenure-Track Assistant Professor**

Began: August, 1990

Deadline: Review of applications begins immediately and continues until the position is filled.

Responsibilities: The candidate will teach introductory Psychology and community-clinical courses. The area of subspecialization is open, though the candidate should have a clear program of scholarly research and be able to contribute to the undergraduate teaching program.

Qualifications: Ph.D. or Psy.D. and internship from APA-accredited programs required. Teaching experience desirable. ABDD's will be considered. Women and minorities are especially encouraged to apply.

Contact: Applicants should submit a letter describing research and teaching interests and accomplishments, vita, copies of publications, official transcripts, teaching evaluations and three references to:

Chair, Clinical/Community Psychology Search Committee
Department of Psychology
Yale University
New Haven, CT 06520-7447

**Research Psychologist for the AIDS Research & Education Project at California State University - Long Beach**

Responsibilities: Participate in an ongoing research program investigating AIDS-prevention strategies for intravenous drug users, their sexual partners, runaway/street youth, homosexual/bisexual men, and ethnic minorities. Incumbent will have direct responsibility for implementing and monitoring specific research projects addressing risk-reduction issues in these populations. Specific duties will include: Design of research interventions, implementation of study protocols, supervision of data collection and data management, conduct of statistical analysis, and participation in grant writing. Some program management duties will include: Strong emphasis on presentation and publication of research findings.

Qualifications: Ph.D. degree required, with strong background in experimental design and quantitative methods. Excellent writing skills and required as well as significant experience in AIDS research.

Salary: Range is $3,021 to $3,672 per month.

Contact: Fen Rhodes, Ph.D.
AIDS Research and Education Project
Psychology Department
California State University
Long Beach, CA 90840-0901
(213) 985-7508
Women’s Issues and Community Psychology

Elsie Shore, *Wichita State University*,
Melody Embree, *University of Kansas*, and
Sarah Erwin, *University of Virginia*, Editors

At the 1989 Biennial Community Research and Action Conference the Committee on Women met and decided that community psychologists interested in women’s issues often are isolated from each other. A decision was made to provide an ongoing communication among community psychologists who share these interests. This column, edited by members of the Committee on Women, is the result. The goal of the column is to facilitate communication and provide a vehicle for exchanging information of interest to community psychologists studying women’s issues. We welcome your comments, requests for specific topics, and contributions.

Elsie R. Shore, Department of Psychology, Wichita State University, Wichita, KS 67208; Melody G. Embree, Department of Human Development and Family Life, University of Kansas, Lawrence, KS 66045; Sarah J. Erwin, Department of Psychology, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22903.

Community Psychology and Feminism:
The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education

June Larkin, Marina Morrow, and Karen Williams
*The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education*

In June of this year we had the opportunity to attend the second biennial Community Research and Action Conference in East Lansing, Michigan. As Canadian students of community psychology, we were interested in meeting with other researchers and practitioners in the field. Over the three days that we attended presentations and poster sessions we realized that our program at the Ontario Institute for Studies in Education (OISE) differed in orientation from other graduate programs.

Through sharing ideas with other women involved in the committee on women’s issues, it became apparent that they considered our program unique, particularly in its legitimization of feminist theory and methodology. As a result, we were invited to describe our program for other community psychologists.

In 1982, several faculty members developed a community psychology program to address the limitations of mainstream psychology. Traditionally, psychologists have examined human behavior from an apolitical, intrapsychic perspective which excludes the consideration of the individual’s social context. Community psychologists, by incorporating a social analysis, seek to empower individuals by examining factors that foster oppression. The goal of this approach is social change.

The OISE program was designed to provide an integrative approach to issues of race, class, and gender. The founding faculty members focused on an analysis of social class, while additional faculty members examined social issues from a feminist perspective. As the program developed, both faculty and student interests diverged into two distinct areas: community development and feminist studies. Although students are required to take courses in both streams they can choose one as their area of concentration.

The integration of race, class, and gender issues is an ongoing process. In the most recent calendar, the community psychology program is described as:

"...being designed primarily for individuals interested in a community orientation to social problems. The focus uses a critical orientation for the analysis of feminist issues, social class, ethnicity, and racial concerns. Students are encouraged to use theory for the analysis of applied problems and to become involved in the process of developing recommendations for solving those problems."

The current faculty members and their interests are:

Paula Caplan: The psychology of women, sex roles, research methodology, and the psychology of motherhood.

Jack Quarter: Education programs for worker cooperatives, the workplace, and organizational democracy.

Margaret Schneider: Adolescent sexuality, research methodology and feminist issues.

Edmund Sullivan: Effects of mass media on cognitive development, critical research methods in community settings, critical pedagogy and cultural studies.

Jeni Wine: Feminist counseling and psychotherapy, and feminist perspectives on social interaction and human relationships.

Students in both streams are required to participate in a community psychology seminar in which issues are examined from a feminist perspective. These issues have included: Prostitution, violence against women, sexual harassment, women and mental health, sexism in children’s literature, a critical examination of psychological theories, and the development of a feminist pedagogy.


Within OISE, students have access to the Centre for Women’s Studies in Education (CWSE), which was established to bring together feminist faculty, professional research staff, and graduate students involved in the study of women and education. CWSE has an extensive library of feminist/women’s studies, print and audio visual materials. In addition, CWSE houses several projects including the Canadian Women’s History Groups and the Centre-based journal Resources for Feminist Research.

Feminist methodologies challenge the logical, positivistic paradigm which dominates mainstream psychology. We reject the existence of a detached researcher, refute the simplicity of cause and effect relationships, and criticize researchers who do not include the social context of people’s lives. All of these characteristics can lead researchers to adopt an individualistic approach to social problems which promote victim-blaming. As feminists, we generate research questions from women’s shared experience. For example, our own personal research has examined the following questions:

- How do women who work with survivors of male violence cope with the
stresses of their work?
- What is women's experience of sexual harassment and how does it affect their lives?
- Can the theory of co-dependency accurately explain how women cope when living with an alcoholic male?

We have explored these questions through qualitative methods which have included: interviews, observations, questionnaires, and critiques of the literature. An important component of our research as feminists is the blurring of the boundaries between researcher and participant. Through collaboration with women, we seek to understand our experiences and work together for social change.

Our current project exemplifies how feminist theory is translated into social action. As students we were concerned about the lack of a sexual harassment policy in the institute. Through our shared experiences while forming a women's student caucus to address this concern, we discovered that policy was not the most pressing issue. Women discussed the need for information about sexual harassment and strategies to deal with it when it was happening. The focus of the caucus was expanded to include an analysis of sexual harassment based on women's experience, a support network, and educational strategies within the institution. Through our work we have implemented policy, a greater awareness of sexual harassment within the institute, and the development of educational resources (i.e., buttons, video presentations, and "Sexual Harassment Emergency" posters).

As feminist researchers and community psychologists we are continually facing the challenge of incorporating women's experiences in an analysis of social issues. Feminists must work together to ensure the existence of a feminist theory and practice in community psychology. We believe that our program is a significant part of this process. We would enjoy hearing from other feminists engaged in community research and action.

Write the authors c/o:
The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education
Department of Applied Psychology, 9th Floor
252 Bloor St. West, Toronto, Ontario M5S 1V6

APA Symposium 1990

Dave Glenwick of Fordham University is interested in organizing a symposium for the 1990 APA Convention of the topic of "Innovations in the Teaching of Preventive Psychology." This could be at either the undergraduate or graduate level and involve either an explicit preventive psychology course or the inclusion of prevention in other courses. Anyone interested in contributing a paper to this symposium should contact Dave at 212-579-2178.

Call for Community Psychology Undergraduate Course Outlines

Out of an interest in improving my own undergraduate course materials in Community Psychology, and determining whether there is a common core of subject matter that is taught at different Universities and Colleges, I am requesting course outlines from faculty who teach undergraduate Community Psychology courses. Naturally, I'd be delighted to review any other teaching materials you may wish to send, as well as information about how the course is taught, and how both students' and faculty performance are evaluated. Please send this material to: Benjamin H. Gottlieb, Ph.D., Department of Psychology, University of Guelph, Guelph, Ontario, Canada, N1G 2W1.


**Book Reviews**

Stevan Hobfoll and Angela Bridges, Editors

In this issue we have a number of books reviewed on a diversity of topics. Because I (Stevan Hobfoll) am one of the book review editors, *The Ecology of Stress*. Lenny chose the reviewer and handled all correspondence with the reviewer to ensure the integrity of the process. We thank him for his help with our book review section.

The book reviews offer a good overview of a number of areas of interest to community psychologists. They include women's issues, racial concerns, primary prevention, and a new look at some older topics—crisis intervention and paraprofessionals.

Please do continue to let us know about books you publish or volumes you contribute to or would like to see reviewed. Thanks to each of the reviewers for their vital contributions.

---

**The Ecology of Stress, by Stevan Hobfoll**


**Review by Edison J. Trickett,**

*University of Maryland*

Steve Hobfoll’s *The Ecology of Stress* can become one of community psychology's most influential books of the time. It represents an incisive effort at articulating a “person-in-environment” perspective which contextualizes both stress and stress resistance theory and individual behavior. It pushes us to develop a new awareness of how gender, culture, and history are embedded in our theories and our research. It is thoroughly done, scholarly, and creates the framework for more context-sensitive research and intervention.

The spirit of the book is captured in a quote on the discrepancy between rhetoric and reality in research on social support as an environmental variable and personal qualities which serve as buffers to the deleterious effects of stress. In reviewing with care and precision these bodies of work, he comments on the need to move beyond “post hoc ecology” to a framework grounded in ecological thinking.

“In the research reviewed here and in the previous chapter,”

it is a rare study indeed that does not apply ecological concepts post hoc in interpreting the findings. The concepts of fit, interaction of different domains, needs, perceptions, values, and situational constraints are acknowledged in nearly every discussion of study findings; seldom, however, are they stated at the outset and incorporated into the study design or in the logic supporting the hypotheses.” (p. 199)

The organization of the book itself reflects the need to begin such work from an ecological perspective. The first chapter includes a historical overview of the stress concept, covering different definitions and their underlying paradigmatic assumptions. From this review comes Hobfoll's new environment in which there is either (a) the perceived threat of a net loss in resources, (b) the actual net loss of resources, or (c) the lack of resource gain following investment of resources. Resources are defined as those objects, conditions, personal characteristics, or energies that are valued by the individual or that serve as a means for attainment of valued resources (p. 54). The concepts of conservation of resources and ecological congruence are discussed as the general framework for defining stress and understanding stress resistance. Both concepts are elaborated in a clear and differentiated way which, as the author points out, can serve as a heuristic for generating testable hypotheses. Hobfoll's emphasis on loss as "the essence of stress" represents a useful and stimulating formulation.

The model serves as a backdrop for reviewing various areas of stress research in subsequent chapters. Social support served as the exemplar for an environmental resource, and a variety of personal qualities such as hardness are used to clarify the ecological position that individual health and stress resistance is an interactive, not individual, phenomenon. In both of these and succeeding chapters focusing primarily on his own work, Hobfoll provides excellent linkages between the model underlying the book and the research data. In particular, his sections on "Ecological Rationale" which discuss how ecological thinking was translated into the nature of the research problem and subsequent research design, serve as concrete examples of how to translate paradigmatic ideas in to specific research and intervention activities. He concludes the book with the "Development of an Ecological Loss Theory of Personality and Intervention." This chapter, while serving as a nice summary heuristic for the book, seems somewhat distant from the previous chapters. Further, it rests on the primacy of the ubiquitous nature of stress, an assumption which itself probably varies considerably in varying ecological contexts.

Hobfoll has written a fine book which adds momentum to the ecological movement within community psychology. It is deep in ideas, personal yet professional in style, and clearly reflects a culmination of first rate integrative thought. To be sure, it is "person-in context perspective on the ecology of stress, which does not focus directly on such ecological questions as what kinds of contexts provide for the development of stress-buffering social networks and how social policies and social structures differentially promote stress and stress resistance. These kinds of questions, focusing more on the person-in-context," however, are fully congruent with Hobfoll's approach. Further, the lack of mention of Kelly's contribution to the ecological notion of conservation of resources represents an omission of an important antecedent body of relevant conceptual work. The book, however is one which deserves wide and careful reading. Its implications for stress research and community psychology are vast.

---

**Divided Neighborhoods: Changing Patterns of Racial Segregation, edited by Gary Tobin.**


**Review by Paul Sites,**

*Department of Anthropology and Sociology,*

*Kent State University*

This is volume 32 of the Urban Affairs Annual Reviews and continues the generally high quality of this series. Overall, this is a good book in that it covers nearly all of the major issues related to housing segregation and the chapters are all of good quality. The major problem with the volume is that data dealing with major trends in housing discrimination are dated, since the authors use the 1980 census. This can be blamed on the availability of large-scale data; not the authors.

Even though studies since the 1940's show a steady decline in prejudice against minorities, segregation patterns in neighborhoods continue even though there was been some improvement, particularly in the decade of the seventies. Those authors (Darden Chapter 1, Yingler 2, Kahn 3, Farley 4, and Clark 5) dealing with major trends in urban and suburban segregation patterns show that even though many suburbs are now integrated, much of this is in token nature. Blacks moving to the suburbs tend to move to suburbs already integrated thereby tending to reproduce segregation. Most of these authors would probably agree with Tobin's assertion in the Introduction that of the three general theories dealing with segregation, class theory, preference theory, and discrimination theory, the last named

Review by Sharlene A. Wolchik, Arizona State University

This volume is the eleventh in the Vermont Primary Prevention of Psychopathology series. Bond and Wagner have assembled a stimulating group of papers which focus on a timely and important topic—helping families cope effectively with the normative and nonnormative transitions they face.

The book opens with an interesting historical perspective on the American family. By presenting graphic details of the strife which characterized families of earlier times, Bahr effectively questions the notion of the demise of the American family. Bahr's chapter serves to remind us that families of all eras face challenges, only some of which are unique to the historical context, and that families are arenas for pain and stress as well as support and growth.

The chapters in the second section are devoted to broad systems approaches to prevention. Roppel and Jacobs describe the development of the Promotion Branch of the California Department of Mental Health, a resource center which grew out of a state mandate to prevent mental illness. Details of several of their innovative programs and products, such as radio vignettes to promote social support, multimedia materials for starting self-help groups and a state wide contest for schools to develop wellness programs, are presented. Their discussion of the importance of obtaining community and legislative support for prevention efforts is a particularly valuable contribution. Schmidt and Tate focus on a powerful mechanism for facilitating the strengths of families—employer-supported child care. Using an ecological model of the family-workplace interaction, these authors argue that decisions about employer-supported child care have ramifications at individual, family, workplace, community and societal levels. After reviewing the history of employer-supported child care and describing several child care options, Schmidt and Tate present research on knowledge and attitudes toward employer-supported child care and on the cost benefit analysis of such programs.

The next section examines five programs for promoting competencies of families and of individuals within families. Two of these programs (Quenby's Family Relationship Program and Shure's Interpersonal Cognitive Problem Solving Skill Program) have lengthy histories and strong empirical support. The other three programs (Mitchell et al.'s program for families of newborns, Alvy's program for Black parents, and Silverman's program for widows) are in earlier stages of the iterative process of design, evaluation and redesign. This difference in developmental stage provides a useful perspective on the lengthy process of developing effective prevention programs. In addition to providing rich, detailed descriptions of the content and format of their programs, these authors raise issues that are critical to all preventive efforts. For example, Alvy thoughtfully articulates the need for culturally sensitive programs. Silverman emphasizes the potential for growth that occurs during transitions and helps the reader to consider how the remaining and adaptive demands of transitions may differ as a function of gender. A highlight of this section is the scholarly chapter by Mitchell and her colleagues. Their careful attention to the links between generative research, theory development, and program design, and to the assessment of program strength, integrity, and effectiveness is exemplary. Their research can serve as a model for developing and evaluating theory-based prevention programs.

The next section focuses on the nonnormative family transition of divorce, family violence, chronic childhood illness, and memory impairment in older adults. For the most part, the chapters in this section provide a broader perspective than do the earlier chapters. Thus, the rich details of the authors' programs are replaced by reviews of the literature on processes related to adjustment in these transitions and by examinations of the efficacy of available programs. In evaluating prevention programs for divorcing families, Stolberg gives particular attention to the link between generative research and program design, the demonstration of efficacy, and the
availability of a means of dissemination. Swift's chapter on family violence make a convincing argument for programs to include strategies to reduce the stressors that impinge on families as well as strategies to enhance family resources. Her thoughtful discussion of how gender differences in socialization affect family violence forces the reader to realize that major social changes which lessen the power differential between the sexes will be required for significant reductions in family violence to occur. Stein and her colleagues present a lengthy discussion of the emotional problems and adaptive behaviors which should be targeted in programs for children with chronic childhood illnesses. They also identify three fruitful approaches for preventive efforts: coordination and continuity of medical, social and educational services, enrichment of social support and enhancement of cognitive competencies, and give examples of programs that employ these approaches. In contrast to the other chapters in this section, George and Gwyther provide a detailed description of the development and maintenance of community support groups for family caregivers of memory-impaired older adults and present some encouraging data on the utility of these groups.

The book concludes with two thoughtful overviews. Price's synthesis, which goes beyond the manifest themes to articulate what the emergent themes tell us about the craft of prevention, merits close attention. In discussing the issues that need to be considered in developing effective prevention programs, Bond and Wagner not only highlight the strengths of the programs presented in the volume but also provide a useful check list of concerns relevant to the design of all preventive efforts. Developing theory-based prevention programs and evaluating their efficacy are difficult endeavors. This volume presents a diversity of creative endeavors and approaches to handling the many challenges inherent in the craft of prevention. Prevention researchers and practitioners will find this volume a valuable addition to their libraries.


**Reviewed by Stephanie Riger,**  
Lake Forest College

Some of the innovative community-based interventions of recent years, such as rape crisis centers and battered women's shelters, have been developed by grass-roots feminist groups. Yet the contributions of feminists, both activists and academics, are frequently overlooked in community psychology. Few degree-granting programs in community psychology include a psychology of women course in their required curricula, and knowledge of research on women is rarely reflected in the pages of community psychology journals, despite the compatibility of feminism and community psychology (Mulvey, 1988).

An excellent resource to begin to remediate this situation is Bernice Lott's text, *Women's Lives: Themes and Variations in Gender Learning.* While several psychology of women text books are on the market today, Lott has the advantage of a decidedly feminist perspective. Consequently, she recognizes that psychology increasingly depends on women of color and various ethnic groups, sexual preferences, and social classes in her discussion. Her basic orientation is a social psychological approach, which she defines as a recognition of the mutual dependency of people and environments.

The objective of her book, as she states, is, "to trace the continuing socialization of contemporary American women in the United States from birth through old age, weaving the pattern of experiences with strands taken from diverse sources—from fiction, the realities of everyday life, and the data of social psychology." (p.5). While her book is solidly grounded in research studies, the addition of excerpts from fiction and personal observations enlivens and enhances the text, making it accessible and interesting to the reader. What makes her book especially valuable is that she examines socialization in its social context, reconceiving the role of culture in creating patterns of behavior for women (and men).

Lott covers the developmental stages of women's lives in chapters on infancy and childhood, adolescence, and middle and later years, and combines these with topical chapters (e.g., violence against women and girls, work and achievement outside the home). She compiles the material in a thorough, thoughtful way that goes beyond conventional approaches. For example, her chapter on "mental health and well-being" includes a discussion of "the hazards of deviation from the femininity stereotype," followed by "the hazards of deviation from the femininity stereotype." This chapter ends with a discussion of "power and control: keys to well-being," a statement which many community psychologists would endorse.

Lott's book goes beyond the academy in linking the findings of research with political action. The last chapter is a discussion of gains and challenges of the women's movement, emphasizing the movement's respect for all women.

In sum, Lott's book is philosophically compatible with fundamental principles of community psychology; it comprehensively summarizes a research literature not often cited in our field; and it is lively and well-written. Hence it provides an excellent resource for community psychologists who value diversity.

**Reference**


**Review by Richard Hirschman,**  
Kent State University

Although crises are at the core of many psychological disorders, rarely are they discussed comprehensively within an overall model. Gilliland and James do just that by building on the work of Lindemann and Caplan to develop an expanded view of crisis theory that anchors a general therapeutic Intervention strategy. Applications of the strategy are illustrated amply in the chapters on specific traumatic events. The result is an informative and enjoyable mix of conceptual themes and applied techniques with a heavy emphasis on the applied.

The conceptual material is presented in the first two chapters. In chapter one various definitions are incorporated into a composite view of crisis as a perception of situation exceeding a person's ability to cope with it. Nevertheless, Gilliland and James are aware of oversimplifying the construct as they introduce other aspects such as disequilibrium, faulty thinking, and the need for change in social systems that contribute to the process. Their eclectic view, derived primarily from theoretical sources, captures the complexity of the crisis construct as it might be useful to practitioners. The emphasis on theory unintentionally highlights the limitations of what we know about crisis in a scientific sense. There is no generally accepted operational definition of crisis or if crises represent distinct psychological states relative to other psychological problems.

An overview of crisis intervention with a six step model of systematic helping is presented in chapter two. Many of the ideas and descriptions of techniques such as facilitative listening and assessment of the personal and the crisis situation are not new but are packaged creatively into a coherent whole so as to be most useful for initial counseling skills that are nicely illustrated with worker/client dialogues. Caregivers in training or in need of an orientation to the basics will learn much about specific skills and the flow and timing of the intervention process. Few sources are available regarding the latter so the juxtaposition of client/worker dialogues with narratives in each subtopic should be particularly helpful.

The rest of the book is on prevalent and timely crisis categories—suicide, battered women, violent clients, severe physical limitation, post traumatic stress disorder, substance abuse, sexual assault, hostage crises, personal loss and burnout in human service workers. It is rare to have information about all of these crises in one source with each crisis being organized in a similar manner so as to facilitate understanding and cross...
comparisons to the conceptual material from the earlier chapters. The links are not strong because of the unique dynamics of each crisis.

What is most consistently and usefully applied from the early chapters are the intervention techniques. Typically each technique, such as facilitating, is illustrated with worker/client dialogue and descriptions of why the crisis works out or doesn’t. Live role plays and case presentation at the end of chapters aid in understanding the experiential dimensions of the intervention techniques and how they vary as a function of symptoms and goals.

The emphasis on the circumscribed assessment of psychodynamics reflects the typical time frame restrictions of trying to provide or catalyze relief for a client in crisis. How this is done will not necessarily be the same as how it is done during traditional counseling and therapy. The worker needs to assess and know quickly a person and context. The immediacy and intensity of crises require the worker to sift quickly through the details, and through themes and options that might allow a client to establish pre-crisis equilibrium. The imperative quality of crisis assessment and intervention may be unsettling particularly for students who expect to review a full social and psychological history before considering an intervention of choice. The reader is aided in this reorientation by information on statistical trends and psychosocial and cultural dynamics for each crisis with abundant worker/client dialogue on psychological mechanisms.

This is a “how to” book for the practitioner who needs a source of information about specific crises or for someone in training for a career in mental health service. As with most applied texts, there are heavier doses of art or science. This is not a criticism because the book is comprehensive and conceptual and is true to its purpose. Rather, it reflects how much more we need to know about this important area.

Human Services in Contemporary America, by
P. Schmolling, M. Youkeles, & W. Burger.

Review by Lee A. Jackson, Jr.,
University of North Carolina at Wilmington

Community psychology has a strong tradition of emphasizing the role of the “paraprofessional” and indigenous worker as a crucial part of community intervention. Butler (1989) and Kohn (1989) have pointed out that many people involved in the field now believe the more appropriate title for these providers should be “generalist human service worker.” Their book is an introductory text directed toward an audience of students in associate and baccalaureate degree programs in human services, mental health technology, social work and similar fields. Although it is addressed to potential practitioners in disciplines such as art therapy or social work, the book’s primary thrust is towards the generalist worker. Community psychologists may find the volume of value if they are involved in teaching a basic human services course or if they are interested in observing the changing role of the community intervention worker and the nature of the educational materials used in preparing students for these jobs.

As an introductory text, there is not much elaboration on most themes presented, but one is struck by both similarities and differences between the indigenous paraprofessional programs of twenty years ago and the contemporary view of the generalist human services professional. As in the past, emphasis is placed on the potential of such job functions as advocate, case coordination, community organizer and outreach worker despite the fact that the likelihood is that relatively few people will perform these tasks. A major shift in viewpoint, however, can be seen by the authors’ description of the professionalization of the field by the development of recommended curricula, professional organizations, journals, and the like. Reflecting this recent professionalization, scant mention is made of the special contribution which indigenous workers could make to community well-being and the role of paraprofessional training as a mechanism for empowering both workers and the general population.

From the viewpoint of a psychological perspective Schmolling, et al. (1989) have made an important contribution by introducing beginning students to the concepts of prevention, the development of social policy and some of the current controversies which impact upon community interventions. The author’s notion of the human services model of behavior and social change is akin to many community psychological approaches. One might wish that criticisms of the human services model were presented in the same manner as they were for the medical model and that the notion of the medical model was extended to interventions other than biological treatments. It may be difficult for the reader of this text to understand that many therapists who never prescribe drugs may be as closely wed to the medical models as practitioners who rely heavily on biological approaches.

In the preface the authors state that in writing their book they have “sought a balance between idealism and realism.” p. vi7 Their hope was to give students a realistic picture without dampening their enthusiasm. They discuss the realities of such topics as deinstitutionalization, budget limitations and conflicts between professional providers. Ironically they did not do as much to arm the reader with the realities which come from the information uncovered by community psychological research. For example, there is a discussion of the importance of social support, but little mention is made of the role of perceptions of social support and social competence in determining the positive effects of friendship. Students who limit their intervention attempts to increasing the density of social networks are likely to be disappointed (Gesten & Jason, 1987). In general, the book seems to underestimate the importance of the interaction between person and environmental variables described in the accumulation of research evidence. In turn the impression of the nature of behavior left by the volume may lead the student to underestimate the difficulties of intervention.

As an example, in the chapter on “target population,” less emphasis was placed on the competencies of the people being served than many community psychologists would find congenial with their approach. For example, in the discussion of the elderly as a target of service the authors failed to point out the distinction between usual and successful aging and the role of competency building interventions to increase successful aging (Rowe & Kahn, 1987). The concept of empowerment was given scant attention.

In reading any book one must be careful not to impose the expectations of an audience for which the work was not written. The Schmolling, et al., volume was produced as a text book. As such, community psychologists should find the book useful for introductory classes of human services students. If the instructor were to take a community oriented model as central to the course, however, it would be necessary to elaborate on some of the points in the book. Additional lecture or reading might be indicated even in a truly introductory and nontheoretically based course. Practicing community psychologists should not expect extended treatment of topics from a basic book, but they should find Human Services in Contemporary America to be an interesting glimpse into the conceptual models used in the education of the generalist human service workers who serve as colleagues.

References
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Report on APA Sponsored Conference on Community Research

Patrick Tolan & Leonard Jason, DePaul University
Fern Chertok, Boston, MA
Christopher Keys, University of Illinois at Chicago

On September 9 and 10, 1988 a conference on planning, conducting, and evaluating community research was held at DePaul University in Chicago. The conference was made possible by a grant from the APA Science Directorate and financial and other in-kind contributions from the hosting Psychology Department of DePaul University, University of Illinois at Chicago, and Roosevelt University. Over 80 invited researchers, students, and leading contributors to the field from academic institutions and agencies from across the United States attended.

The conference arose in response to a felt need to discuss, formally, the issues most of us face in trying to conduct research on community problems. Ours is a field that constructively struggles with the tension between rigorous methodology and the values of social action. Also, there is disparity between research rhetoric and our research methods. The concurrent maturing of the field scientifically and the frustration with the constraints of predominant models for psychological research prompted the idea for a conference. The purpose was to share ideas about where we were and where we should try to go with our research.

Careful consideration of these concerns indicated that multiple questions need to be addressed to move our research efforts forward. For example, what are the implications of underlying assumptions of traditional research models for community research? How can we capture our interest in the individual context? What are the limitations of traditional statistical methods for our research? How might qualitative methods enrich our understanding? The lack of a forum for a formal exchange about these concerns had left researchers to construct individual, and often unsatisfactory, solutions. The conference was designed to bridge the gap between positions of either blindly transferring traditional methods and assumptions or rejecting the values of science uncritically. The spirit of the endeavor was captured by Jim Kelly's description, during a pre-conference planning session, that we were interested in understanding and developing criteria for guiding "adventurous research." The hope was to specify what qualities of research conception, design, and implementation we, as a scientific community, consider desirable.

The need for the conference was evident by the response among colleagues to the conference theme as well as the energy invested by participants. A number of very busy colleagues prepared working papers with short notice, or agreed to respond to presentations or to organize discussions. A number of graduate students, under the leadership of Nancy Burgoyne, helped with the planning and logistics so that the conference flowed smoothly.

The conference focused on four major topics: Key concepts and theoretical approaches, hypothesis generation, issues in analysis (especially the concern with multiple level data to evaluate the person and the setting), and implementation. Each topic was addressed through a three-step sequence consisting of a presentation to the whole group, followed by small group discussions to reflect on and build from the large group presentation, and concluded by reconvening the whole group to synthesize information generated in the small groups. Each presentation to the large group was based on a working paper sent to participants prior to the conference. The framework for the small groups and the goal of the synthesizing meetings were to offer "criteria for excellence" of recommendations about how we might conduct research and advance our knowledge. These recommendations sometimes took the form of suggested standards, sometimes were presented as challenges to the field, and sometimes took the form of important questions for us to address.

As will occur in such discussions, many more questions were raised than answered. Some themes that seemed prominent across presentations, discussions, and recommendations were 1) knowledge is contextual and constructed; 2) most useful explanations are multivariate and involve multiple-level phenomena; 3) how we conduct our research is as important as what we study, both for expressing our values as well as determining the type of information we will obtain; 4) research methods need to be "de-ritualized"; meaning that we should be conscientious so that our work is designed by its purpose rather than by what has been done previously or is conventional; and 5) progress of the field is marked by new and more complex questions that enrich our understandings. Among the many valuable contributions was an affirming bemused comment by Bill Davidson highlighting the inherent complexity of our research and encouraging us to embrace the challenge of considering values, methodological rigor, and "adventurous research" simultaneously.

The conference presentation, small group outcomes, and commentaries provided the basis for a monograph to be published by the APA Science Directorate. It is scheduled for publication in 1990 and is titled Researching Community Psychology: Issues of Theory and Methods (Tolan, Keys, Chertok, & Jason, in press). One effect of the conference has been that the Executive Committee of the Council of Community Psychology program Directors have undertaken to gather information about research training in graduate programs. This undertaking is designed to develop an understanding of what type of training students are getting and to identify resources for those training students.

Anyone with questions about the conference or the monograph can contact any of the authors of this manuscript, who were the conference organizers.
What I Learned About Community Psychology From My Bout With Cancer

Elsie R. Shore, Ph.D.
The Wichita State University

Community psychology was not the first thing that sprang to mind when the physician said that the lump in my breast was probably cancer. After the first months of fear and confusion, however, I found that a number of my experiences were relevant to my work and thinking as a community psychologist. Two areas of interest to community psychology were especially meaningful as I dealt with my diagnosis, treatment, and the reactions of others. These areas are social support and victim blaming. Consider this a report from the front.

Supporting the victim

People get upset when they hear that someone they know has been diagnosed with cancer. A number of people I told began to cry. People said they would pray for me. All this might sound like an outpouring of love and support, but it was also was scary. For a while I reacted to any expression from others with anger, feeling that everyone thought I was dying. At times I worried that my understanding of my illness was incorrect, reasoning that others must know something that I don't about my prognosis or that I was denying the seriousness of my condition. I spent a lot of time reassuring others, trying to feel that they weren't viewing me as a person with "one foot in the grave."

These reactions make social support a more complex issue than it might at first appear. While having people around me to help and support me was invaluable, it was also a burden, taking energy I needed for other things. There is, however, one exception to this ambivalence. I quickly discovered the comfort of being with other people who were diagnosed with cancer.

As a researcher in the field of alcohol abuse, I was familiar with the Alcoholics Anonymous self-help model and understood intellectually the value of being with others who are similar to you. I had heard AA members joke with each other and call outsiders "Earth People." Through my own illness I learned that the advantage to being with other "insiders" is that you can relax around them. The information and advice they gave was helpful, but the most important part was having someone to complain to and joke with.

For example, one day some colleagues asked about my chemotherapy. After telling them about the regimen one listener invited me to agree with her that it was wonderful that such potentially lifesaving drugs were available. I couldn't respond. You see, I hate my chemotherapy drugs. I loathe ordering them from the pharmacy, smelling them, feeling them in my hand, and taking them. But to express this to her would involve a lot of explaining, assuring her that I don't intend to stop my treatments, stating that, of course, I am glad we have these drugs, etc. I don't have to do that with another cancer patient. When a woman also being treated for breast cancer fairly spit out the name of one of her drugs I understood what she was feeling. When I complained that I was tired of being bald, a colleague with cancer didn't tell me I looked great, urge me to hang in there, or get teary. He simply said "I know." Similarly, when he and I joke about our experiences we are being funny, not poignant, touching, or brave. It's good to be able to gripe and joke unself-consciously.

Blaming the victim

In America if you are sick it is your own fault. If you die it is because you didn't visualize well enough, or laugh hard enough, or, as Edwin Newman cited in a talk about language, "fulfill your wellness potential." In the first days after my diagnosis a close friend told me that my cancer was caused by stress. "I told you that you were working too hard," she said. I did not need that accusation added to all the other things with which I was coping. I also did not need the intense anger her comment generated and the distance I then placed between me and someone who could have provided considerable support.

Other cancer patients I know have had similar experiences. The explanations vary (you weren't right with God, you have a cancer personality) but the locus of blame is the same. Having been blamed once I believe we become sensitive to other expressions of blame. At a lecture by former senator William Proxmire I was sitting next to a colleague's partner who also was dealing with cancer. Proxmire began by discussing advances in health care. After his comment about people's involvement in their own health care she and I immediately looked at each other. "They think it's out fault that we're sick, you know," she said. I know.

Those of us who respond with anger to these interpretations of our illness recognize that we are being blamed and recognize that these attributions are wrong. But what about people who don't see the victim blaming and accept the idea that they caused themselves to have cancer? What kind of pain do they experience by believing themselves guilty of a potentially fatal error in living?

Victim blaming interpretations unfortunately fit well with the attempt to understanding one's illness, especially the desire to explain why this has happened to you. For example, the Reach for Recovery volunteer assigned to help me after my surgery talked about her own illness and clearly was struggling to explain to herself why she got cancer. The explanations she tried out were personal ones and she either didn't understand or didn't accept my information about the prevalence of breast cancer among women in the United States.

American individualism reinforces this type of thinking. In the confusion and fear that is provoked by the diagnosis of cancer it is easy for victim blaming ideas to be accepted. It may not be pleasant to think that you brought on your own illness, but at least it is an answer to one of the many questions you have about your new situation.

The prevalence of victim blaming also has ramifications for our research endeavors. A medical colleague of mine is interested in studying stress and breast cancer. Community psychologists may understand the various sources of stress, but, judging from all the stress management courses and books, most Americans believe that stress is your own fault, too. Does this physician's study, by virtue of its existence alone, give power to the idea that stress causes cancer, thus legitimizing a victim blaming explanation? I am not saying that the study should not be done, but here too, we must remember that research has political implications.

Naming the victim

I have used the term victim in this paper although I am not comfortable with that word. Since the surgery removed the tumor, I'm not a person "with" cancer. I want to survive my illness, but I don't like the term survivor either. After a year of struggling with terminology I will accept that I am a cancer patient, even though the word patient is a problem for a community psychologist with a clinical psychology background. Although I know that I will always have to deal with my history of cancer, I am looking forward to the time when other labels are more immediately relevant to me.
Division 27 News

What's Happening 'Round the Regions: National Coordinator's Update

Anne Mulvey
University of Lowell

This report marks the end of my first year as National Coordinator and the time of Transition within our three year, three person rotational regional coordinator system. It's a good time to express gratitude to some of the many people who keep this unusual network going and to highlight some of their many accomplishments.

First, I want to especially thank the seven people who are completing three year terms as Regional Coordinators (RCs) for all the hard work and positive energy they have contributed to their regions and to the Division: Thanks to Paul Toro in the East; Jim Emshoff in the Southwest; Lavone Robinson in the Midwest; Vicki Sloan in the Southwest; Sharlene Wolchik in the Rocky Mountain area; and Ana Marie Cause in the West. Thanks also to Geoff Nelson for his contribution as Canada's rep.

Four new RCs began their term of office at APA. I want to welcome Andrea Solarz (East), Jeff Mayer (Southeast), Barton Hirsch (Midwest), and Steve Chris (Canada). Their addresses and those of the other RCs are listed on page 27 of the Newsletter. Please let them know if you'd like to get more involved in your regional activities. We still have openings for first year RCs in the following regions: Southwest, Rocky Mountain, West, and Latin America. Contact me or the RCs if you are interested in taking on one of these jobs or in getting involved in some other way in your local or regional area.

This spring a number of RCs developed programs and hosted social hours at the Regional APA Meetings. At MPS (Midwest Psychological Association), the Division 27 Interest Group Program included five symposia (e.g., "Primary Prevention in the Chicago Public Schools: The Second Year" and "Collaborative Advocacy") and a poster session. The SEPA (Southeastern Psychological Association) program included three symposia (e.g., "The Role of Community Psychology in Public Policy and Program Development," and "Adolescent Health Issues") and a party at Jim Emshoff's house! Much community psychology programming was also evident at the Ontario Psychological Association Meeting where a symposium was presented on "Mental Health Policy, Planning, and Practice," along with several other sessions, and Julian Rappaport was a keynote speaker.

Besides organizing and supporting the work of Division 27 members and community psychology efforts in their own regions, RCs have done networking and coalition building nationally and even internationally, primarily at the Biennial and APA Conferences. Expanded networking with the regions was begun by both the Committee on Women and the International Interest Group, recently renamed the International Network on Community Research and Action.

At the Biennial, several people agreed to serve as regional and local resource people for the Committee on Women and to work collaboratively with the RCs using and developing regional networks. Wolfgang Stark and Agnes Joester of West Germany met with the RCs and others to work out better strategies for collaboration. They asked me to let you know about their efforts which concern not only different countries, but also multi-cultural differences within a given country. Although geographic distance and cultural differences pose special challenges, all agreed that the benefits far outweigh the costs. The newly formed International Network on Community Research and Action has a position paper that I would be glad to send anyone who is interested. The Network is affiliated with Division 27 but also has a broader membership.

The roundtable that the RCs hosted at APA, "Community Psychology Regional Networks: Challenges and Possibilities," had a much better turnout than last year: All of the regions but one were represented as well as Canada and Western Europe. The session built on the networking and coalition building work begun at the Biennial Conference and continued at the second annual and very successful working breakfast with the Executive Committee held earlier at APA. A number of people volunteered to get more involved in their regions or local areas. There seems to be a consensus that we must support and continue common inter-regional activities and communication and at the same time strongly encourage each region to develop agendas and adapt structures that best fit its unique needs and resources.

Building on the success of past Eco conferences, three regions are hosting regional conferences this fall. The 3rd Southeastern Eco-Community Conference is scheduled for September 28-30. The University of Virginia is sponsoring the conference and UVA graduate students are serving as the Planning Committee. The Midwest Eco-Community Conference will be student run (a first in this series!) and will focus on the creation and development of collaborative linkages with academic and applied settings.

After reviewing and past year's accomplishments by the RCs in their local and regional areas and reflecting on our work across long distances and face to face, I am encouraged by our ability to maintain such a broad and personal network that so well represents community psychology in action.
# Division 27 Regional Coordinators
## 1989-1990

**National Coordinator**  
Anne Mulvey  
Department of Psychology  
University of Lowell  
Lowell, MA 01854  
(508) 934-3965 (w)  
(508)465-6809 (h)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Year</th>
<th>Second Year</th>
<th>Third Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrea Solarz</td>
<td>Jacob Kraemer Tebes</td>
<td>Ann D'Ercole</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Technology Assessment</td>
<td>The Consultation Center</td>
<td>NY Psychiatric Institute, Box 102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Congress</td>
<td>Yale University</td>
<td>722 W. 168 Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington, DC 20510-8082</td>
<td>19 Howe Street</td>
<td>New York, NY 10032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(202) 228-8590 (w)</td>
<td>New Haven, CT 06519</td>
<td>(212) 740-5904 (w)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(202) 488-1982 (h)</td>
<td>(203) 789-7645 (w)</td>
<td>(212) 873-4103 (h)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jeffrey P. Meyer</th>
<th>Jeanne T. Hernandez</th>
<th>Melvin N. Wilson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. General Accounting Office 5741</td>
<td>Department of Psychiatry</td>
<td>Department of Psychology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>441 G. Street NW</td>
<td>Medical School Wing E334, UNC</td>
<td>University of Virginia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington DC 20548</td>
<td>Chapel Hill, NC 27514-7160</td>
<td>Gilmer Hall</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(202)275-1829</td>
<td>(919) 466-6812</td>
<td>Charlottesville, VA 22901</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(919) 942-6560</td>
<td>(804) 924-0673</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Barton Hirsch</th>
<th>Joan Rhodes</th>
<th>Tamar Heller</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anderson Hall</td>
<td>6 Florida Court</td>
<td>Illinois Institute for Developmental Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwestern University</td>
<td>Urbana, IL 61820</td>
<td>1640 W. Roosevelt Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evanston, IL 60208</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chicago, IL 60606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(312) 413-1537 (w)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Needs to be filled**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jennifer Kelly</th>
<th>Judy Fleishman</th>
<th>William L Mermis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Health Science Center</td>
<td>Department of Psychology</td>
<td>Employee Assistance Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dept of Psychiatry &amp; Behavioral Sciences</td>
<td>Southwest Texas State University</td>
<td>Community Services Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Univ. Of Texas, P.O. Box 20708</td>
<td>San Marcos, TX</td>
<td>Arizona State University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Houston, TX 77225</td>
<td>(512) 245-2526 (w)</td>
<td>Tempe, AZ 85287-1008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(713) 797-2732 (w)</td>
<td>(512) 474-0912 (h)</td>
<td>(602) 965-2270 (w)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Virginia C. Shipman</th>
<th>Tom Olson</th>
<th>Western Europe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dept of Counseling &amp; Family Studies</td>
<td>Deschutes Mental Health</td>
<td>Wolfgang Stark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College of Education</td>
<td>Bend, OR 97701</td>
<td>Selbsthilfzentrum Munchen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of New Mexico</td>
<td>(503) 388-6601 (w)</td>
<td>Auenstr. 31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albuquerque, NM 87131</td>
<td>(503) 389-3997 (h)</td>
<td>D-8000 Munchen 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(505) 277-4316</td>
<td></td>
<td>West Germany</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**South Pacific**  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>David Thomas</th>
<th>Max Abbot</th>
<th>Turkey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department of Psychology</td>
<td>Mental Health Foundation of New Zealand</td>
<td>Gunduz Vassaf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University of Waikato</td>
<td>P.O. Box 37-438, Parnell</td>
<td>Cakkusu 11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailton, New Zealand</td>
<td>Auckland, New Zealand</td>
<td>I. Levent-Istanbul</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>011-64-71-62-889</td>
<td>001-64-9-31-516</td>
<td>Turkey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introducing the New Student Representatives

Karla Fischer
University of Illinois

As my first official duty as the "senior" national student representative to Division 27, I am pleased to inform everyone of the new regional and local student representatives who allowed themselves to be recruited at the Biennial conference. Student participation in the conference, incidentally, was even higher than the first Biennial; attendance at the student meeting was equally good. I was impressed with the energy of those who volunteered to be division representatives, and many did so for the first time. I look forward to working with all of them.

Before listing the new representatives, I would like to describe the student representative structure in the Division. The system is three-tiered, as there are representatives at the local (school), regional, and national level. The primary goal for all the representatives is to work together to increase student membership in Division 27 and to encourage student participation in conferences, newsletters, and publications connected to the Division. The local reps, one for each school that has an academic community psychology training program, disseminate information to students at their schools and serve as information links to the regional and national student representatives. Regional reps provide a link between the national student reps and the local student reps, as well as promote the development of regional student newsletters, conferences, and other related activities. The main duties of the two national student reps are to attend the meetings of the Executive Committee as voting members and to report decisions and information from these meetings back to the local and regional reps. In order for the student representative structure to function, all the reps must communicate with each other as well as with the students and faculty in their programs.

The following is the most recent edition of the student representative list. If your school or geographical region does not have a representative and you would like to fill that role, please contact me at the Department of Psychology, University of Illinois, 803 E. Daniel, Champaign, IL 61820.

Division 27 Student Representatives
August 1989

NORTHEAST:

Regional Representative
Debra Srobnik
University of Vermont

Local Representatives

UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
Bethany Brand

RUSSELL SAGE
Gretchen Heilman

UNIVERSITY OF VERMONT
Debra Srobnik

SOUTHEAST:

Regional Representative
Lisa Anyan
University of Georgia

Local Representatives

UNIVERSITY OF GEORGIA
Lisa Anyan

UNIVERSITY OF SOUTH CAROLINA
Lisa Neuson

MIDWEST:

Regional Representatives

UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA
Gabe Kuperminc

DePaul University

Kerry Vachta
Michigan State University

John Cuccaro

Local Representatives

BOWLING GREEN
Michael Griffith

DEPAUL
Brenda Greiner

INDIANA UNIVERSITY
Petri Truelsa

MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
David Canales

ROOSEVELT UNIVERSITY
David Henry

UNIVERSITY OF KANSAS
Melody Embree

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-CHICAGO CIRCLE
Eileen Altman

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-URBANA
Mark Salzer

WAYNE STATE
Elizabeth Thomas

SOUTHWEST/ROCKY MOUNTAIN:

Regional Representative
Hugh Green
University of Texas at Austin

Local Representatives

UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT AUSTIN
Norma Rodriguez

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY
Amy Wrabetz

WEST COAST:

Local Representatives

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA-BERKELEY
Marc Schultz
A Summary of the Division 27 Executive Committee and Business Meetings and APA (8/10-14/89)

Roger P. Weissberg
Division 27 Secretary-Treasurer

The primary purposes of this column are to provide Division 27 members with: (a) a brief overview of the organizational structures involved with Division decision making and agenda setting; and (b) updates regarding major Division activities and undertakings.

Division 27 business is organized and coordinated by an Executive Committee (EC) that is elected by the membership. The 1989-90 EC members are: Lenny Jason (President); Jean Ann Linney (Past President; Beth Shinn (President-Elect); Judith Albino (APA Council Representative); Roger Weissberg (Secretary-Treasurer); Anna Mulvey (National Coordinator); Irma Serrano-Garcia, Meg Bond, and LaRue Allen (Members-at-Large); and Karla Fischer (National Student Representative).

There are also several Standing and Special Committees that (a) carry out essential Division operating functions (e.g., Nominations and Elections, Awards, Membership, APA Program Planning, Publications); and (b) focus on issues that are extremely important to the Division (i.e., Ethnic and Minority Issues, Women, Social Policy). The Division also sponsors six Interest Groups for community psychologists in the areas of Aging, Applied Settings, Children and Youth, International Community Psychology, Rural Psychology, and Self-Help.

Generally, EC meets twice annually to work on Division business. There is a 3-day Midwinter EC Meeting in January (Note: The next Midwinter Meeting will take place in NYC on January 19-21, 1990). In addition, at each APA Convention there is an Ongoing EC Meeting (8/10/89) and an Incoming EC Meeting (8/14/89). There is also a Division 27 Business Meeting (8/13/89), attended by EC Members and all interested Division 27 members, during which we review major initiatives undertaken since the last APA Convention.

For the masochists or obsessives who want detailed accountings of these meetings, I invite you to write to me (Department of Psychology, Box 11A Yale Station, Yale University, New Haven, CT 06520-7447) to request copies of my minutes or report submitted by EC officers and chairs of our Standing Committees, Special Committees, and Interest Groups. For those who are content with surfacely summaries, the remainder of this column highlights an array of relevant updates and Division activities that have occurred during the past year.

Meeting Highlights

1989 Election Results. Beth Shinn has been elected President-Elect. LaRue Allen has been elected Member-at-Large. Both individuals will serve 3-year terms on the EC.

Awards. Five Division awards were given during 1989. The awards and recipients are: (1) Distinguished Contribution to Theory and Research in Community Psychology - Edward Zigler; (2) Distinguished Contribution to Practice in Community Psychology - Frank Reissman; (3) Special Award for Advancing the Goals and Objectives of the Division of Community Psychology - Joyce Lazar; (4) Dissertation Research Award - John E. Prustby; and (5) Henry V. McNeill Award for Innovation in the Field of Community Mental Health - Consultation, Education, and Prevention Service, Washenaw Mental Health Service.

Report of the Fellowship Committee. Ken Heller (Chair) reported that the Committee again was proactive in developing fellowship applications. The APA Membership Committee accepted 11 Division 27 Fellowship nominations including: Oscar Barbarin, Joseph Duralk, Steven Hoberli, John Lounsby, Deborah Phillips, William Shadish, Jr., Marshall Swift, Mary Ann Test, Alan Vaux, Brian Wilcox, and Gail Wyatt. One "old" fellow, E. Scott Geller, was also approved.

Division 27 Membership Figures. Tina Mitchell (Membership Co-chair) reported that the Division currently has 984 APA members, including 665 members, 54 associates, 133 fellows, and 132 dues-exempt members. In addition, there are a total of 84 affiliates and 212 student members.

Membership Recruitment. The number of paying members—with the exception of student—has declined considerably over the past few years due to the approval when dues increased from $7 to $29. Cathy Stein (Membership Co-chair) is in the process of developing and implementing membership recruitment and retention strategies. This will be one of the Division's highest priorities during the next few years.

Report of the Secretary-Treasurer. Roger Weissberg reported that Division finances are currently in excellent condition. By the end of the year, the Division should have a cash reserve of close to $30,000. The Division now has 501(c) 3 tax exempt status from the IRS. Roger suggested that the EC devote time during the 1990 Midwinter Meeting to develop long-term financial plans so that the Division will not have to raise dues again during the next few years.

Report of the APA Council Representative. Judith Albino presented an overview of major issues currently being considered by the APA Council. (See summary of these issues in this issues of the Community Psychologist). Report of the APA Program Planning Committee. Carolyn Swift (1989 Program Chair) described the 26 hours of Division 27 programming at APA. Irma Serrano-Garcia, Meg Bond, and LaRue Allen will coordinate the Division 27 Program for the 1990 APA Convention in Boston. They are working on innovative strategies to increase paper submissions from Division members. The "State of the Art" symposium will be "Empowering the Silent Ranks."

Report of the Biennial Planning Committee. The Biennial Conference at Michigan State University from June 22-24, 1989 was a terrific success in every respect. The program was excellent. Participant enrollment was high. Involvement in Division activities and Interest Groups reached an all-time high. In addition, the Division made money on the Conference! A final Biennial report and evaluation will be submitted in October to the EC. The 1991 Biennial Planning Committee is being constituted and will be chaired by Beth Shinn. Announcements about plans will be shared at the Midwinter Meeting.

Report of the National Coordinator. Anne Mulvey has a column in this issue of the Community Psychologist highlighting the recent activities of the Regional Coordinators. Many of these undertakings were shared at the Regional Coordinators annual APA round table, "Community Psychology Regional Networks: Challenges and Possibilities."

Report of the Publications Committee. John Morgan and Joe Gelano (Co-editors of the Community Psychologist) reported on the topics to be highlighted in the Division newsletter through the summer of 1991. Julian Rappaport summarized the editorial and publication activities of JCP. The Publications Committee has recommended that a monograph could optionally be published as the 6th issue of the year in JCP. The Committee also recommended, with EC approval, that the Division start a book series in Advances in Community Research and Action.

Report of the Special Committee on Ethnic and Minority Issues. The three current chairs of this Committee are Anna Marie Caucho, LaVonne Robinson, and Neil Wilson. They recommended—and the EC unanimously approved—the establishment of a new award for Outstanding Contributions to the Mentoring of Ethnic and Minority Community Psychologists.

Report of the Special Committee on Women. The current chairs of the Committee are Ann D’Ercole, Helena Carlson, and Mary Kennedy. The Committee currently publishes a regular column in the Newsletter. They plan to survey their members about important Social Policy issues for the Committee to emphasize. Current Committee priorities include sexual harassment, women’s professional development, identifying mentors for Division 27 women, and the effects of homelessness on children and families.

Report of the Special Committee on Social Policy. Brian Wilcox and Deborah Phillips (Co-chairs) submitted a proposal to establish a Task Force on Homeless Children and Families. The Task Force will write a policy report which will be completed within 2 years. The EC allocated $800 for this project.
Consortium on Children and the Law. During 1989 and 1990, the EC pledged $250 each year to support the efforts of this Consortium led by Gary Melton. The Consortium has conducted 8 briefing luncheon meetings with an average of 60 Congressional Offices represented. Several Division members have presented at the briefings. In addition, our sponsorship has brought good visibility to the Division.

Report of the Council of Community Psychology Directors. The major current initiative of the Council is to work with publishers of textbooks (introductory, social, abnormal, and developmental) to include sections or inserts highlighting the contributions of community psychology.

Interest Group of Community Psychologists in Applied Settings. Tom Wolff summarized a variety of Group projects. The Interest Group has been actively involved in selecting the first winner of the Henry V. McNally Award. The Group is currently developing a survey for Division members to identify future initiatives to pursue. The EC allocated $200 for this effort.

Proposal to Create a New Interest Group on Self-Help. A proposal to establish this new Interest Group was unanimously approved by the EC.

1991 APA Centennial. The EC will select a member to serve as our Division's liaison to APA's Centennial Planning Committee. The EC will support efforts to involve the Division actively in this undertaking.

The EC Unanimously Endorses the Nomination of Judith Albino for APA Treasurer. Charlie Spielberger will vacate the position of APA Treasurer in January 1990 as a result of his election as President-Elect of APA. Judith Albino, our current APA Council Representative, has been encouraged to submit her name in consideration for the nomination. Based on her outstanding performance as Division 27 Secretary-Treasurer (as well as several other positions), the EC voted unanimously to work actively on her behalf to support her nomination by the APA Board of Directors.

Membership Vote to Change the Name of the Division. The results of this voting, which concluded on August 31, will be reported in the next issue of the Newsletter.

Many Thanks to Those Who Have Served on the ECI. The ECI expresses its appreciation for the outstanding service of three Division officers who finished their terms: Ken Heiler (Past President), Carolyn Swift (Member-at-Large), and Nancy Burgoyne (National Student Representative). In addition, we thank Jean Ann Linney who has been a dedicated, productive President during the past year.

Report of Interest Group on Children and Youth

Irwin Sandler

The Interest Group on Children and Youth had a very successful meeting at the Biennial Conference. The meeting was attended by 25 people who were interested in a wide range of issues involving children and youth. These included school-based interventions, prevention, social competence, social policy, child abuse, day care, development of babies who are addicted to cocaine, child stress, impact of minority status and multi-level community interventions. Two basic issues were discussed during the meeting: 1) the organizational issues of what the interest group should consider as projects and objectives and 2) a proposed social policy alternative regarding school-based social competence promoting programs.

Since this was the first meeting of the interest group there was wide ranging discussion of our objectives and purpose. Several possible objectives were: 1) development of programs at conference such as APA, SRCD, and the Biennial conference, 2) getting involved in child advocacy projects 3) promoting the exchange of resources - articles, evaluations, handbooks, etc. among members of the interest group and between community psychologists and other groups such as teachers, administrators, etc. In search of a place to start, everyone at the meetings was asked to describe what they would like the interest group to do. The areas of greatest interest seemed to be the development of school based interventions, social policy and advocacy, and collaboration with other groups.

Roger Weissberg, Len Jason, Ruth Schelkin, and Maurice Elias presented some ideas about potential social policy statements that the interest group should advocate concerning the need for monitoring and evaluating school-based social competence development programs. The concern is that many un-evaluated programs are being widely adopted as prevention without appropriate appreciation of their limitations. We discussed several alternative actions the interest group could take. The point was made that the educators that these programs were under pressure to select programs without much helpful sources of guidance. Skepticism was expressed that a simple public policy statement by us would have much impact. Two ideas were agreed as points to follow-up. One was that the Weissberg, et al., group would work with Roy Lorion in advocating experimental trials of the "best practice" of these programs with people at the Department of Education. Second, that the W.T. Grant Consortium of Social Competence programs would further consider steps to address this issue.

Formation of a New Interest Group on Self-Help Groups and Mutual Support

A new Division 27 interest group is being initiated on self-help groups and mutual support. The purpose of this group will be to exchange ideas about relevant research and action, encourage interventions and research, promote collaboration among psychologists and community-based service delivery systems, and link community psychologists with professionals from other disciplines interested in the self-help approach. Members of Division 27 who wish to join this group may do so by sending their names and addresses to Dr. Gregory J. Meissner, Psychology Department, The Wichita State University, Wichita, Kansas 67208-1595.
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The APA Council of Representatives met on Thursday, August 10, and Monday, Aug. 13. As is the custom, the various caucuses of Council met on Wednesday evening. As Council Representative for Division 27, I have found that our division's interests are reflected by several of these caucuses, and I tried to participate in each, in spite of their somewhat overlapping meeting schedules. The Division of Community Psychology has formally affiliated with the Public Interest Caucus, the Women's Caucus, the Research Academic Caucus, and the Scientist/Practitioner Caucus, and I have served this year as Nominations Chair for the Women's Caucus. The purposes of these groups include providing a forum for more extensive and informal discussion of the issues that will come before Council, the development and communication of positions before Council, and the development of communication of positions shared by those participating in the respective caucuses. This year the work of the caucuses was especially effective in preparing for the Council resolution on abortion.

APA President Joe Matazorzo repeated the successful experiment begun last year by Roy Fowler, when he began the Wednesday morning meeting by randomly assigning Council members to small "break-out" groups for discussion of these questions: (1) How can APA and APS (American Psychological Society) interact in ways that would promote psychology and avoid conflict? (2) How can the directorates - Science, Practice, Public Interest, and Education - work together cooperatively? (3) How should we celebrate our centennial?

While the wording was somewhat different in each case, most groups indicated that APA and APS cooperation must be issue-focused. An example used by several (prompted by the caucus discussions of the previous evening) was that of abortion legislation in the state legislatures and the need for scientific information of the psychological effects of abortion. This is clearly an issue in which both practitioners and scientists can and should participate, and each organization has its strengths in helping to address the questions raised. It is fair to say, however, that the subject of APS continues to be a distressing one for many on Council, even though the two organizations apparently are laying the groundwork for more amicable relations. The very recent resignations of two APA Board members (Sandra Scarr and Marilyn Brewer), who have elected to dedicte their energies more exclusively to APS, have fueled the negative feelings of some.

The APA-APS discussion flowed naturally into a consideration of how the APA directorates might be more effective, since the problems perceived in this area seem to be related to the relative emphasis on practice and science issues. Again, most agreed that there is a need to focus on issues rather than structure, although APA's commitment to finding a new head for the Science Directorate (Alan Kraut has resigned to serve as executive officer for APS) and the recent appointment of Frances D. Horowitz as scientific advisor are seen as encouraging signs that APA intended to be responsive to the needs of scientific psychologists. Finally, the small group discussion of APA's centennial generated a number of interesting ideas that will be forwarded to the centennial committee.

Perhaps the major action item at Council was the motion that APA would undertake an immediate initiative to disseminate scientific information on reproductive freedom to policymakers, to the public, and to state psychological associations and APA divisions. Although there was considerable discussion of this issue and some reluctance to act before the recently commissioned APA report on psychological sequelae of abortion has been made public, the final vote was overwhelmingly positive. In other action, the Council approved the formation of a Division of Peace Psychology, upheld previous action on accreditation that requires one year of full-time residency but allows for individual (not programmatic) exceptions, and approved establishment and a temporary oversight structure for the Education Directorate.

The report on APA finances revealed an increasingly positive picture. You may recall that major deficits were discovered in the 1988 operating budget, unrelated to but following negotiations related to sale of the APA buildings and Psychology Today. Emergency cost-cutting measures were implemented, and the organization appears to be back on a sound footing, with essentially a break-even situation expected this year. The 1990 budget will anticipate a 7% growth in expense, and no deficit. The membership increase for the organization was considerably larger than expected this past year, reflecting a positive picture on the revenue side. The finances of the organization now appear to be well managed with significantly improved planning functions in place, although I am concerned that APA needs to begin rebuilding its cash reserve position, which has been so seriously eroded in recent years. Plans for the new building are proceeding well. The sale of the identified property to APA and the organization's partner, Trammell Crow, has been approved by the redevelopment Land Agency of the District of Columbia. The construction of the building is now expected to be completed within 22 to 24 months, and favorable long-term lease arrangements with the partnership have been completed. It is important to note that the terms of the partnership with Trammell Crow are such that Crow is assuming virtually all of the financial risks of this project, and the Officers of the Association are uniformly optimistic about the outcome of the undertaking.

Two new members of the APA Board of Directors were elected in recent ballot of Council members. They were Bruce Bennett and Richard Quinn. The two candidates receiving the next largest numbers of votes were Steve Morin and Brewster Smith, and they will fill the terms vacated by Sandra Scarr and Marilyn Brewer, as mentioned above. All of these appointments will take effect in February, and there was considerable discussion off the floor of Council over the fact that the Board may be without a single woman member at that time, since Pat Bricklin's term will also be ending. It should be noted that several women have expressed an interest in the position of Treasurer, however. I have done so, along with Cheryl Travis, Noreen Johnson, and Pat Bricklin. This position is an extremely important one, particularly in light of APA's turbulent financial situation of the past few years and the current plans to build a new headquarters near the Capitol. The office of treasurer was vacated when Charlie Spielberger won the Presidential election this past summer, and it will be filled by a special vote of Council this fall.

If any Division 27 members have specific questions on any of the Council business that I have described, or if you wish to share your views on issues that will be coming to Council, I would be pleased to talk with you at any time. I can be reached by phone at (716) 636-2899.
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Fall Eco-Community Conference: A Seasonal Highlight

The Fifth Annual Southeastern Eco-Community Psychology Conference was a successful highlight of Fall, 1988. Georgia State University hosted this year's event, which was held during the weekend of Oct. 7-9 at Eagle's Nest Camp near Brevard, North Carolina. This repeat location was chosen by popular demand. 47 people including academic and applied psychologists, students and friends and family members participated in the program. The theme of this year's program was Activism and Other Isms. Jean Ann Linney and Sandra Barnhill were our keynote speakers. Jean Ann Linney, who is well-known in these parts, and is current president of Division 27, delivered an address on Isms in Community Psychology. Sandra Barnhill is an Atlanta, GA attorney who works with child visitation rights of imprisoned mothers.

Other sessions were organized more informally and included discussion on coalition building (Copper Coggins), families of mentally ill (Chas. Brady, Shelly Norton, and Diane Ursone) promoting healthy youth (Scott Banderhoff, Jeanne Hernandez, and Wade Silverman), general health promotion (Ron Illitch), opposing oppression through empowerment (C. Coggins, Laura Magzis, Judy Pohl, and Melvin Wilson).

Jim Cook, Denis Gray, Jim Emshoff, Frank Smith, and Debi Starnes served as a panel that discussed "diversity in roles and settings for community psychologists." Recreation and social events included, but were not limited to, exploring a ropes course and partying to Square Dance tunes.

Community Psychology at SEPA

Division 27 had an outstanding program at the Southeastern Psychological Association Meetings in Washington, D.C. Our meetings were scheduled for the second day of the conference, March 24. We were able to develop a full and cohesive program, focusing on the current topic in community psychology. Three symposia were presented: 1) The role of community psychology in public policy and program development; 2) work and technology and; 3) adolescent health issues in community psychology. Finally, separate meetings were held for community psychology program directors and graduate students. In general, the four hour block of time was devoted to enjoyable, collegial discussions. A social hour (party) was held at Jim Emshoff's place. Jim is spending the year in Washington at the Office for Substance Abuse Prevention of the USPHS Drug Prevention Program.

Upcoming Eco-Community Conference

Planning is underway for the 6th Southeastern Eco-Community Psychology Conference to be held September 29-30. This year University of Virginia will sponsor the event. The graduate students in the UVA community psychology program are serving as the planning committee. The conference theme is Focus on Families and Children: Policy, Prevention, and Poverty. Keynote sessions include: Prevention in Virginia (Joe Galano and John Morgan), Policy (Brain Wilcox), and Poverty.

New Southeastern Regional Coordinator

Susan McAmmon has resigned as the 1st regional coordinator. She was recently awarded a new grant. Jeanne T. Hernandez has graciously agreed to complete Susan's term. Jeanne's address is below.

We are once again asking anyone who is interested in serving as Southeastern Regional Coordinator to volunteer. Jim Emshoff is nearing the end of his term. Those who have attended the SEPA conventions and recent Eco-community Conference know that Jim has been an integral representative, coordinator and organizer of activities in the Southeastern Region. Jim, you have this region's heartfelt appreciation for the services you have rendered. Thank you.

Regional Coordinators

Melvin Wilson, Department of Psychology, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22903. 804-924-0673.

James Emshoff, Department of Psychology, Georgia State University, Atlanta, GA 30303. 404-658-2283.

Jeanne T. Hernandez, Department of Psychiatry, Medical School Wing E-334, University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, NC 27514-7160. 919-466-6812 or 942-6550.

Site Sought for 1991 Biennial Conference

The planning Committee for the 1991 Biennial Conference on Community Research and Action is soliciting names of potential sites for the meeting. Ideally, the site should be an on-campus facility with dormitory-style housing and conference center facilities, comparable to what we have enjoyed for the previous two conferences at the University of South Carolina and Michigan State. A weekend in early-to-mid-June is preferred.

If you are interested in hosting the conference or if you have site recommendations for the committee, please contact Beth Shinn (212) 988-7920 by December 1, 1989.
Committee on Women

May Kennedy

The Committee on Women of Division 27 held several exciting roundtable discussions at the Biennial conference in Michigan. New co-chairs were announced, regional representatives were recruited, ambitious plans for ongoing committee activity were outlined, and enthusiastic new-comers were linked with this ten year old network.

In addition to ongoing concerns about sexual harassment and professional development of the women in community psychology, participants voiced interest in feminist curricula, research topics and methods, and in public policy affecting women and families. An international perspective was also endorsed. Particularly refreshing were the contributions of a group of Canadian students who represented a feminist community psychology Ph.D. program in Ontario. We can all learn about their curriculum and activities in the article appearing in this issue of the Community Psychologist. Elsie Shore has agreed to edit a regular column on women's issues, thus providing a forum for both substantive contributions and resource sharing. Ideas for articles should be submitted to Dr. Shore at the Department of Psychology, Campus Box 34, Wichita State University, Wichita, Kansas 67208. She will be assisted by Melody Embry, a student in the graduate program at Kansas State.

Other plans made by the Committee on Women at the Biennial Conference include compiling and distributing a directory of individuals in the Division interested in women's issues, beginning active efforts in an area of public policy that impacts women, developing a workshop to be held at APA, and regional conferences that would allow students to "Rent a Mentor" (i.e., top spend time with a faculty member from another program to discuss research, professional or personal issues), and supporting the activities of the Committees on Public Policy and Minority Affairs. A questionnaire will be distributed to the Division membership soliciting input and participation in these activities.

The leadership structure has become more formal, and now included three year periods of office for active, former and chair-elect co-chairs. New co-chairs on the committee are May Kennedy, 503 E. Nelson Ave, Alexandria, VA 22301, and Eileen Kohlberg at the University of Puerto Rico. Claudia Zinardi from New York University will continue to serve as co-chair this year from her base in Genoa, Italy. Regional representative are Amy Wrabetz, Tempe, AZ (West), Anne Mulvay, Lowell, MA (Northeast), Terrie Sterling, Decatur, GA and Sarah Erwin, Charlottesville VA (Southeast), Susan Green, Lake Bluff, IL, and Melody Embry, Lawrence, KS (Midwest), Janice Ristock, Peterborough, Ontario (Canada), and Agnes Yoester, Berlin, West Germany (Europe).

Outstanding Contribution to the Mentoring of Ethnic Minority Community Psychologists

The Ethnic and Minority Issues Committee of the Division of Community Psychology is pleased to announce an award for outstanding contribution to the mentoring of ethnic minority community psychologists in academic settings. This is the first of what we hope will become a biennial award to be given to a Division 27 member who has had a positive impact on an ethnic minority graduate student or beginning level graduate or who has consistently fostered a climate in their setting conducive to the growth of ethnic minority graduate students or beginning level graduates. The goal of the award is to acknowledge the importance of encouraging ethnic diversity within community psychology and supporting the efforts of groups of individuals who have been historically more limited in their access to higher education within our field.

Nominations should consist of a letter (no more than three pages long) stating the contributions the mentor has made to the career of one or more ethnic minority graduate student or beginning level graduate and the curriculum vitae of those who were mentored by the nominee. Nominations from colleagues, those who have been mentored, or self-nomination from mentors are welcome. The award(s) will be given based on (1) the quality of mentorship (e.g., outstanding contribution to the development of one student/graduate); and (2) consistency of contributions in the area (e.g., a record of working to increase the pool of ethnic minority community psychologists). Award(s) will consist of a plaque to be awarded at the meetings of the American Psychological Association.

Send nominations to LaVonne Robinson, Psychology Department, University of Maryland, College Park, MD.
Interest Group of Community Psychologists in Applied Settings:
Report from the Chair

Tom Wolff

The Michigan Biennial provided a wonderful occasion for the Interest Group of Community Psychologists in Applied Settings to be reenergized. The interest group held a public hearing on the issues of applied community psychology, and held a number of smaller follow-up meetings regarding specific activities.

The public hearing noted that although community psychology is a field for both practice and research, Division 27 has been dominated by a focus on academic research and university-based practice. Questions remain regarding what practitioners of community psychology really do, what settings they work out of, how amenable these settings are to their work, and how their practice relates or does not relate to the research base of the field of community psychology.

The discussion noted that the place of applied community psychology in the field remains quite unclear. Students emerging from training programs who wish to practice find it very hard to know where to turn for jobs and where to turn for role models. Indeed, what has actually happened to community psychologists who have turned to practice as their professional focus and their livelihood, is almost an unknown and unanswered question. For us, the new impetus for the interest group of community psychologists in applied settings seemed quite warranted.

It was important to note that these questions were as much a concern to the academic psychologists who attended these meetings as to those who worked in applied settings, acknowledging that there is a great mutual interest in having a thriving group of community psychologists in applied settings in order for their field to continue to move forward.

The Interest Group developed a comprehensive plan for the coming year including:

1. Membership Survey—Based upon the results of the Division 27 postcard survey the interest group will now know which members within the division identify themselves with the applied settings group. Those who do identify themselves that way will receive a survey that will attempt to identify ideas for new division activities, redirect recommendations to the executive committee, recruit applied community psychologists for division activities, and finally, and most importantly, lead to the publication of the Directory of Applied Community Psychologists. This survey is being developed by Jeff Anderson, Ann D’Ercole, Pat O’Connor, Jim Cook, and Tom Wolff. The survey will identify the interests of the division members working in applied settings and those concerned with issues of applied community psychology. All members of the Interest Group are urged to fill out the survey promptly when it arrives this Fall. It is important to note that almost half the membership of the division pays the APA special assessment, which seems to indicate a high level of practitioner memberships within Division 27.

2. The McNeill Award—The 1989 award went to Washtenaw Community Mental Health as announced in the last Community Psychologist, and a committee has been formed for the coming year that will include David Weed, Ruth Schelkin, Ann D’Ercole, and will be chaired by Tom Wolff. Others wishing to join the committee should be in touch with the Chair.

3. Much discussion focused on increasing the involvement of applied community psychologists in Division 27 activities which led to the nomination of three members of the interest group for the next biennial planning committee.

4. A variety of other issues were discussed, including working with Cathy Stein to recruit more applied community psychologists to the division. Much discussion also focused on the needs of students who expressed the desire to have greater access to applied community psychologists as role models, speakers, and sponsors of internships. A concept of applied community psychologists creating internships within their agencies was also discussed. Finally, there was a push to have the division sponsor continuing education units (CEU’s) for Division 27 activities, which was also seen as a way of meeting the needs of community psychologists in applied settings. Others interested in working on these tasks should also be in touch with the Chair.

Members of the interest group who were part of these discussions in Michigan felt reenergized to tackle a number of thorny issues and welcome the assistance of other members of the Division.

Henry McNeill Award Nominations

The American Psychological Foundation and Division 27 seek nominations for the Henry V. McNeill Award. The $500 award is made to individual practitioners, neighborhood organizations, or community mental health centers that have developed an innovative practice in community mental health service, stimulated participation in local community activities, and/or transferred their expertise to the community. Contact Thomas Wolff, AHEC, 24 South Prospect Street, Amherst, MA 01002.
**Job Opening**

Seeking Ph.D./2 years experience of MA/4 years experience to develop and implement a community-wide drug prevention approach in Santa Clara County, CA. Must have experience in community organizing and familiar with community develop- ment principles and application and multiple service coordination. Will supervise a minimum of two people. This position is part of the prevention office. Salary range $31,982-37,926. For more information contact: Andrea Schneider, (408) 229-2304.

**PostDoctoral Fellowships**

The Developmental Psychopathology Research Training Program at Vanderbilt University is soliciting applications for two positions. This NIMH-funded program provides a stipend, support to independent research and travel, and opportunities for research training with faculty mentors in the areas of descriptive psychopathology and prevention. Send inquiries to: Kenneth Dodge, Program Director, Box 86 GPC, Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN 37203.

**Ontario Prevention Congress IV**

The Ontario Prevention Clearinghouse is sponsoring Prevention Congress IV, Healthy and Supportive Communities: From Commitment to Action, November 13-16, in Toronto. The Congress is a forum for over 1000 representatives from health, human service, and other organizations interested in prevention. Presentations include keynote addresses by Steven, Canada’s former (1984-1988) Ambassador to the United Nations, and Dr. Lois Wilson, former Moderator of the United Church of Canada. Registration information is available from the Clearinghouse at 984 Bay St., Suite 603, Toronto, Ontario M5S 2A5, or calling collect to (416) 928-1838.

**Congress for Clinical Psychology**

The Congress for Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy will meet in Berlin, West Germany February 18-23, 1990. Since 1980, the Congress has been one of Europe’s most important meetings for researchers and practitioners in clinical psychology, community psychology, and mental health. From 1500-2000 professionals from various countries will discuss their work. Wolfgang Stark, Division 27 European representative, will be organizing an international gathering and presenting the International network on Community Research and Action. For information write to Deutsche Gesellschaft fur Verhaltenstherapie e.V., Postfach 1343, 7400 Tubingen.
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Editor's Corner

Division 27 Gets a New Name: The Society for Community Research and Action

Our Division is entering the 90's with a new name: The Society for Community Research and Action: The Division of Community Psychology. This new name reflects both the involvement of our members in research and applied settings and the varied disciplinary backgrounds of our membership. The decision to change the Division's name was affirmed in a recent vote by an overwhelming majority. Our Division already had a sizable number of affiliate (non-APA) members who are employed in a rich array of community settings and who are trained in such areas as sociology, public health, and anthropology. The name change also reflects the Division's commitment to translate our ideology into practice and actively encourage others who are interested in "socio-environmental and prevention issues" to fully participate in Division activities. We hope that our name change will be viewed as an invitation to them and that we will collectively do a better job of attracting those persons in the future. Welcome to the Society of Community Research and Action.

-- Joe Galano & John Morgan, Editors
Behavioral Community Psychology: Merging Methods and Mandates

David W. Thompson
New Medico Rehabilitation Center of Wisconsin

John W. Fantuzzo
University of Pennsylvania

Both the behavioral and community movements in psychology were movements away from unverified, disease-model approaches to treat persons suffering from mental disorders. The behavioral psychology movement was propelled by two major thrusts: (a) the systematic translation of laboratory-tested principles of learning into applied treatment technology, and (b) the development of precise behavioral analytic methods to scientifically evaluate behavior change. Concurrent with these developments, pioneers in community psychology were hard at work exposing the inadequacies of one-to-one (doctor-to-patient) tertiary service delivery models and creating more innovative and functional approaches. The major objectives of this movement were to promote mental health by developing comprehensive prevention interventions for large groups that were carefully designed to maximize community resources while being sensitive to ecological issues.

Behavioral community psychology is a synthesis of these methods and mandates. Behavioral community psychologists are both behaviorally and community oriented. They are behaviorally oriented in at least three ways: First, they are concerned with targeting observable and measurable behaviors (e.g., street gang membership, number of cigarettes smoked, seatbelt usage). Second, they use tests technology derived from learning theory, such as positive reinforcement and modeling strategies. Third, they attempt to identify lawful and functional relationships between behavior and behavior change strategies. Behavioral community psychologists are community oriented in that they are focused on the investigation of large-scale behavior change intervention, use nontraditional service delivery mechanisms (e.g., paraprofessionals or mass media), and emphasized primary and secondary prevention efforts rather than the treatment of well established maladaptive behaviors.

The purpose of this special issue is to present a sample of both theoretical formulations and practical intervention strategies that reflect this unique orientation. These papers demonstrate behavioral community psychology in action, and show the utility of this approach in disease prevention, education, developmental disabilities, and theoretical studies. Although this special issue represents but a small sample of the behavioral community literature, it is our intent that community psychologists and behavior therapists alike will be stimulated to continue to merge their skills, technologies, and foci toward the goal of promoting more adaptive human behavior change.
A Taxonomy of Behavior Change Techniques for Community Intervention

E. Scott Geller, Timothy D. Ludwig, Michael R. Gilmore, & Thomas D. Berry
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

For more than two decades, behavior analysts have targeted a number of community problems (e.g., litter control, resource recovery, energy conservation, road safety); and, as a result, an arsenal of behavior change techniques is available for solving community-based problems (cf. Greene, et al., 1987). However, there has been little attempt to categorize these techniques in terms of relative effectiveness; as a result the community programmer is faced with the formidable task of choosing an intervention program from an incomplete and disorganized list of potential behavior change procedures. This paper offers a framework for conceptualizing the social validity and large-scale significance of behavior change strategies, and for predicting the relative behavioral impact of particular intervention programs. Two theoretical models are offered: (a) a multiple intervention level (MIL) hierarchy to categorize behavior change approaches and evaluate the cost-effectiveness of successive interventions for large-scale behavior change, and (b) an intervention impact model to guide the development of more effective community interventions.

A Multiple Intervention Level Hierarchy

The multiple intervention level (MIL) hierarchy depicted in Figure 1 is characterized by dividing interventions into multiple tiers or levels, each defined by its ability to influence the targeted population. At the top of the hierarchy (i.e., Level 1), the interventions are least intrusive and target the maximum number of people for the least cost per person. At this level, an intervention is designed to have maximum large-scale appeal, while allowing only minimal contact between individuals and intervention agents. Those showing the desired target behavior change at a particular intervention level may continue to benefit from repeated exposure to similar interventions; but we assume that those individuals uninfluenced by the first exposure to a particular intervention level will “fall through the cracks” and be uninfluenced by repeated exposure to interventions at the same level. These individuals require a more influential (higher level) intervention.

The MIL model in Figure 1 indicates that individuals who are influenced by a particular level of the intervention hierarchy may become intervention agents for the next level of intervention effectiveness (cf. Katz & Lazareff, 1955). Thus, after individuals have adopted a particular target behavior, it is not cost-effective to include these persons among the targets of another program to motivate the occurrence of that behavior. Instead, these persons need to be enrolled as agents for more effective intervention programs. In other words, “preaching to the choir” is not as beneficial as enlisting the “choir” to preach to others.

An Intervention Impact Model

Behavior Change Techniques

Table 1 gives brief definitions of 24 different approaches to change behavior, distilled from a review of the behavioral community psychology literature, especially publications in the Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis (cf. Greene et al., 1987). Eighteen behavior change techniques occur before the target behavior, and are considered antecedent procedures (from the antecedent-behavior-consequence model of applied behavior analysis). Each represents an attempt to persuade individuals or groups to emit a desired response.

Feedback, reward, and penalty consequences can be given to an individual or to a group, and therefore Table 1 defines six different consequence procedures. Rewards include pleasing items or events as well as opportunities to escape or avoid unpleasant situations; whereas a penalty can be the presentation of an unpleasant event (e.g., a jail term or requirement to do community service) or the removal of a pleasant item or privilege (e.g., money or a driver’s license).

Intervention Impact

We hypothesize that five factors determine the effectiveness of an intervention program, as measured by the proportion of a target population showing desired behavior change over the short and long term. Based on our literature...
review, we theorize that the immediate impact of an intervention is a direct function of: 1) amount of participant involvement; 2) degree of social support; 3) amount of specific response information transmitted by the intervention, facilitated by increasing the salience of the information presentation and the proximity between the behavioral request and opportunities to emit the desired response (cf. Geller, Winett, & Everest, 1982); 4) degree of extrinsic control determined by reward or penalty contingencies; and 5) the target individual's perception of self efficacy or autonomy regarding the behavior change techniques (cf. Bandura, 1989; Deci & Ryan, 1987).

Table 2 depicts our initial taxonomy of behavior change techniques for evaluating intervention impact and for guiding the development of more effective community interventions. To derive the factor scores for each behavior change technique, we defined each technique according to relevant community-based applications (see Table 1), and then judged whether the procedures of each technique included aspects of the five evaluation factors. A simple all-or-none (a priori) scoring system was applied by assigning a "1" if the following questions per factor were answered affirmatively:

1. Involvement - Does the behavior change technique set the occasion for overt participant action relevant to the target behavior?

2. Social Support - Does the behavior change procedure include opportunities for continual support from program participants or others (e.g., family, friends, work groups)?

3. Response Information - Does the behavior change procedure offer new and specific information relevant to the behavior(s) targeted?

4. Extrinsic Control - Does the behavior change procedure manipulate a response consequence (i.e., a reward or penalty) in order to influence a target behavior?

5. Intrinsic Control - Does the technique offer an opportunity for personal choice or control? We only used this factor when totaling the points for the "Long-Term Effects" column. The literature on psychological reactance and intrinsic motivation (e.g., Brehm, 1966; Deci, 1975) persuaded us to assign a score of "1" to procedures which offer rewards or threaten penalties.

A particular intervention program usually consists of a number of behavior change components, and would therefore receive a composite score by adding the relevant numbers from Table 2. At the bottom of Table 2, four examples of community interventions to increase the use of vehicle safety belts are evaluated to illustrate the potential utility of this taxonomy. Johnson and Geller (1984) used written flyers (Technique #7) coupled with either non-contingent (no extra points) or contingent rewards (Techniques #12 & #15). Thus, the contingent reward group receives a composite, immediate effectiveness score of "5" (i.e., 1 point for the Written Activator, 3 points for the Individual Incentive, and 2 points for the Individual Reward) and a score of "4" for long-term impact (2 points were subtracted for the incentive and reward components). Johnson and Geller (1984) and Geller (1983) used similar programs in different settings, and found initial increases in safety belt use of 78% and 155% over baseline, respectively. After each program was removed, the follow-up evaluations showed significant declines of belt use, as shown in Table 2.

A more recent program involving pizza deliverers (Ludwig & Geller, 1990) included a Discussion/Consensus meeting, Group Feedback of deliverers' safety belt use during the meeting, pledge cards to obtain individual Commitment to buckle-up, as well as Written and Oral Activators. The immediate impact of this program produces a high composite score of "11", which is consistent with the dramatic increase in safety belt use (i.e., a substantial 271% increase over baseline). The composite score for long-term impact was reduced by 1 point because of the extrinsic control feature of feedback, and as predicted, safety belt use dropped significantly during follow-up.

Conclusion

Clearly these conceptualizations represent only a first approximation toward developing a reliable and valid taxonomy of behavior change techniques from which to choose a particular intervention program for community-based behavior change. Our scoring system for evaluating intervention impact is preliminary, and raises more questions than it answers. Indeed, several directions for empirical research are suggested. For example, empirical evidence is needed to verify the classifications of the behavior change techniques according to the five impact factors, and to develop a more sensitive scoring system than the "all or none" scheme used in Table 2. Moreover, intervention research is needed to develop a plan for operationally scoring the intervention, social support, response information, and intrinsic vs. extrinsic control of a particular behavior change technique. This research might also indicate a need to develop a weighting system to account for differential influence of the five impact factors, and to include additional impact factors to the scoring system. The benefits from such investigation will be numerous, including the refinement and enhancement of behavior change.

Table 1: Definitions of 24 Techniques to Motivate Behavior Change.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lecture</td>
<td>Unidirectional oral communication by an agent concerning the rationale for specific behavior change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demonstration</td>
<td>Modeling the desired behavior for target subject(s).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Policy</td>
<td>Written document communicating the standards, norms, or rules for desired behavior in a given context.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Commitment</td>
<td>A written or oral pledge to emit a desired behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Discussion</td>
<td>Bidirectional oral communication between agents of an intervention program and target subjects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Intervention Agent</td>
<td>A person promotes the desired behavior among other individuals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Written Activator</td>
<td>A written communication that attempts to prompt desired behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Oral Activator</td>
<td>An oral communication that attempts to prompt desired behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Assigned Individual Goal</td>
<td>An intervention agent decides for an individual the level of desired behavior or he should accomplish by a certain time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Individual Goal</td>
<td>An intervention agent encourages an individual to decide the level of desired behavior (i.e., the goal) that should be accomplished by a specific time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Individual Competition</td>
<td>An intervention promotes competition between individuals to see which person will accomplish the desired behavior first (or best).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Individual Incentive</td>
<td>An announcement to an individual in written or oral form of the availability of a response-contingent reward.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Individual Disincentive</td>
<td>An announcement to an individual specifying the possibility of receiving a penalty contingent upon a particular undesired behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Individual Feedback</td>
<td>Presentation of either oral or written information concerning an individual's desired or undesired behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Individual Reward</td>
<td>Presentation of a &quot;pleasant&quot; item to an individual, or the withdrawal of an &quot;unpleasant&quot; item from an individual for emitting a desired behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Individual Penalty</td>
<td>Presentation of an &quot;unpleasant&quot; item or event to an individual, or the withdrawal of a &quot;pleasurable&quot; item from an individual following undesired behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Assigned Group Goal</td>
<td>An agent decides for the level of desired behavior that a group should accomplish by a certain time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Group Goal</td>
<td>An agent encourages group members to decide for themselves a group behavior goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Group Competition</td>
<td>An intervention promotes competition between specific groups to see which group will accomplish the desired behavior first (or best).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Group Incentive</td>
<td>An announcement specifying the availability of a group reward contingent upon the occurrence of desired group behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Group Disincentive</td>
<td>An announcement specifying the possibility of receiving a group penalty contingent upon the occurrence of undesired group behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Group Feedback</td>
<td>Presentation of either oral or written information concerning a group's desired or undesired behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Group Reward</td>
<td>Presentation of a &quot;pleasant&quot; item to a group, or the withdrawal of an &quot;unpleasant&quot; item from a group or team following desired group behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Group Penalty</td>
<td>Presentation of an &quot;unpleasant&quot; item to a group, or the withdrawal of a &quot;pleasurable&quot; item from a group or team following undesired group behavior.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
theory and methodology with regard to its applicability in addressing community problems.
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**TABLE 2. A Taxonomy of Behavior Change Techniques for Predicting Intervention Impact**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior Change Techniques</th>
<th>Involvement</th>
<th>Social Support</th>
<th>Response Information</th>
<th>Extrinsic Control</th>
<th>Immediate Effects</th>
<th>Intrinsic Control</th>
<th>Long-Term Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lecture</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Demonstration</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Policy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Discussion / Consensus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Intervention Agent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Written Activator</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Oral Activator</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Assigned Individual Goal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Individual Goal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Individual Competition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Individual Incentive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Individual Disincentive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Individual Feedback</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Individual Reward</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Individual Penalty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Assigned Group Goal</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Group Goal</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Group Competition</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Group Incentive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Group Disincentive</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Group Feedback</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Group Reward</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Group Penalty</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Johnson & Geller (1984)**

- Prompts + Non-Contingent Rewards: 7 of 25%
- Prompts + Contingent Rewards: 7,12,15 of 48%

**Geller (1983)**

- Prompts + Contingent Rewards: 7,12,15 of 56%

**Ludwig & Geller (1990)**

- Discussion + Reminders + Feedback: 4,5,7,8,22 of 66%

Baseline Belt use: EFFECTIVENESS SCORES: Intervention Belt use: Follow-Up Belt use.
The Study Buddy Program: A Cooperative Learning Program

by A. Dirk Hightower, University of Rochester
and John W. Fantuzzo, University of Pennsylvania

The Study Buddy Program, a school based cooperative learning program, pairs students into dyads and provides an opportunity for them to develop academic competencies and social relationships. It incorporates the strengths of both community and behavioral approaches, which minimizes the collateral weaknesses of both approaches.

Strengths of a community approach include: understanding the situational context of the involved system, empowering participants to make informed decisions as to what is best for their particular circumstance, a focus on strengths and the development of social competencies, attention to prevention objectives as potential intervention outcomes, and a time perspective which includes the future as well as the present. These offset limitations associated with behavioral peer tutoring, peer management, group contingency approaches. Such limitations include: interventions targeted to individuals, a focus on academic behaviors, few strategies intentionally targeted to the development of social competencies, a lack of a prevention paradigm, and few mechanisms to facilitate teacher and school ownership.

Strengths of a behavioral approach include: clear definitions and descriptions of target behaviors, structured skill training techniques (e.g., modeling, rehearsal, reinforcement, and phasing from more structured and supervised tasks to more self-administered contingencies), technology for utilizing group oriented reinforcement contingencies, and systems for conducting problem solving consultation.

Limitations associated with a community approach, which can be offset by a behavioral approach include: a lack of technologies associated with learning specific tasks and interventions targeted to a "community," therefore, ignoring many individual needs.

The Study Buddy program intentionally diversified its portfolio of perspectives so as to minimize its risks associated with the limitations of one particular approach. In so doing, a program was developed that maximized the benefits for students, teachers, and the school.

The Study Buddy program is a class-based intervention for elementary age children. The program pairs students and allows them to work together at least twice a week for 30-45 minutes throughout most of the school year. A curriculum guide, teacher training, and consultation help teachers implement the program.

Study Buddy has four basic components: (a) pairing students; (b) peer meetings; (c) a curriculum guide for teachers; and (d) teacher consultation. Students are paired in dyads. In classes with an odd number of children, or in cases of absenteeism, triads are also used. Although same sex pairs have been used most often, mixed sex pairs have also worked successfully.

Pairs have been established in different ways. One approach was to use peer sociometric ratings to identify children with high and low social skills, and those with aggressive/externalizing and withdrawn/internalizing adaptive styles and, on that basis, to form dyads such that students with strengths in one area worked with students with weaknesses in that area and strengths in other areas. As a variant of that method, teachers rated students' interpersonal social skills along similar dimensions. That information, too, was used to form complementary dyads. Students have also been paired randomly. Whatever the pairing procedure, teachers have always been able to change dyads they believed destined to fail. Once the program started, however, teachers were asked to change pairings only as a last resort. Given that no single pairing procedure has been found to be more effective than others, the use of teacher pairings may offer the advantage of increasing teacher input and involvement.

The program to date has been used with urban 4th-6th graders. Presently it is being piloted with kindergarten and second graders. Typically, Study Buddy dyads met twice or three times a week for 30-45 minute sessions from late fall to late spring. Meeting less frequently poses problems because time and involvement are needed to develop and maintain good working relationships. Some teachers have opted for more than three Study Buddy meetings per week (e.g., daily meetings) with success.

Study Buddy has two formal curricular units: (1) Reciprocal Peer Learning; and (2) Cooperative Peer Relationships. These units include eight and sixteen lessons, respectively. Unit I provides a structured interpersonal experience for Study Buddies emphasizing a cognitive understanding of the program and cooperative learning targeted to academic goals. For example, in the first two lessons dyads complete a "Company Charter." In essence, the charter is a contract between the students and the chief "consultant," i.e., the teacher, which articulates the partner's responsibilities, (e.g., working cooperatively, striving to complete equal amounts of work, and trying to solve problems together before asking the teacher). During the last six lessons of Unit I, students work cooperatively towards shared spelling or math goals. Pairs establish goals by estimating how many quiz items they will answer correctly, help each other to complete student developed practice exercises, take the class administered quiz independently, and reconvene to decide if the "company" has met its collective goal. Overall, Unit I is task-oriented and structured.

Unit II first introduces skills associated with good interpersonal relationships and then promotes conditions under which Study Buddies can help each other to learn these skills, by providing a forum for practice and feedback within the ongoing relationship. This unit has four major parts: The first three lessons develop communication skills by having Study Buddies do structured interviews with each other. The next five lessons focus on developing cooperative work skills. For example, in one 2-lesson sequence, Study Buddies first decide where to locate their "headquarters" and then report their conclusions and describe their partner's contributions, to the class. Part three (four lessons) is built around structured activities designed to train effective problem solving skills, and part four provides an opportunity to practice these skills through skits presented to the class. After completing Units I and II, teachers are helped to develop and implement their own lessons using subject areas and specific topics of their choice.

The program's consultation component provides support for teachers during their first Study Buddy implementation year. Teachers meet with a consultant every three weeks to discuss problems and procedures associated with Study Buddy pairings, the curriculum, program implementation steps, and small group processes. Consultation also strives to enhance teachers' problem solving strategies in relation to effective program operation.

The Study Buddy program has been evaluated using quasi-experimental pre-post control group designs. Major outcome variables studied to date include: teacher, peer and self-ratings of school adjustment; student and teacher ratings of the class environment; academic achievement; and attendance. Study Buddy
children have been found to have: (a) better school adjustment as rated by teachers; (b) better peer social skills as rated by peers; (c) higher standardized achievement test scores; and (d) fewer days tardy and illegal absences (Hightower, Avery, & Levinson, 1988). More positive views of classroom environments have also been reported both by teachers and students.

A Behavioral-Community Approach

The Study Buddy Program's multiple elements evolved from multiple sources and multiple perspectives, including community and behavioral thinking. Program characteristics of these orientations will be described.

Community Characteristics

First, the initial teacher concerns regarding student behavior and lack of skills were situation and student specific. Taking those specific concerns about a few individuals and determining if those concerns were systemic and applicable to the general population followed a community psychology model. Similarly, designing a program to work with all children from a setting, not just those identified as having problems is another community characteristic. Third, the intervention took place within a community milieu, the classroom. Students were not exported to an individual's office or a treatment center. Fourth, the program was not imposed upon teachers, but formulated with them. From the beginning teachers assisted in the development and revision of the program. They were part of the process not adjuncts to it. And last, teachers, who participated in the program, had, upon completion of the program, the necessary knowledge and skills to continue the program without external assistance.

Behavioral Characteristics

The first Study Buddy unit, reciprocal peer learning, developed from the successful work of Fantuzzo and his colleagues (Fantuzzo, Riggio, Connelly & Dimoff, 1989; Pigott, Fantuzzo, Clement, 1986; Wolfe, Fantuzzo, & Wolfe, 1986). Study Buddy teams developed their own contracts, set their goals, worked cooperatively towards those goals, recorded their accomplishments graphically, and were provided group contingencies based upon the collective improvement of the team. Second, lessons were organized so that beginning ones had more structure and external control provided by the teacher, while later ones were less structured and allowed for more internal control. And last, many of the individual consultations provided to teachers were prototypical of Bergan's (1977) behavioral consultation model.

Summary

The Study Buddy Program used community approaches at the macro level of development and behavioral approaches at the micro level of consultation, teaching and learning specific skills. It has incorporated the strengths of various theoretical orientations to best meet the program's goals and identified needs. By blending approaches, the limitations of each individual approach has been counterbalanced by the strengths of the other. As such, a stronger program has evolved than if technology from only one approach had been used.
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The Use of Behavioral Strategies in a Multi-Media Based AIDS Prevention Program

Isiaah Crawford, Loyola University of Chicago
Leonard A. Jason, DePaul University
Doreen D. Salina, Illinois Institute of Technology

AIDS continues to pose a major threat to public health. Given that no cure or vaccine is expected for some years, prevention has been identified as the only effective strategy in managing this health crisis. Traditionally, prevention programs have focused on the presentation of factual knowledge aimed at individual consumption. There is growing evidence that the passive presentation of information alone is not effective in modifying behavior. It is theorized that strategies attempting to intervene at a systems level that have accompanying behavioral components may be more effective. This article describes a multi-media based project that presented both factual information about HIV transmission and behavioral exercises aimed at increasing communication about AIDS, sexuality, drugs, and decision making. The program was evaluated using seventh and eighth grade students and their parents. Results indicate that after exposure to the multimedia based project, both adolescents and their parents report increased communication centered around sexual topics and AIDS.

Acquired Immune Deficiency Syndrome (AIDS) and its multiple modes of transmission represent a rapidly growing threat to public health. Effective measures are not developed to modify lifestyle behaviors associated with Human Immunodeficiency Virus (HIV) transmission. There are estimates of more than 1.5 million people in the United States alone who are HIV positive and who are asymptomatic (Coffin Report, 1996), yet capable of transmitting the virus to others.

Up to the present time, the majority of persons with AIDS have been homosexual and bisexual men and intravenous drug users. However, former Surgeon General, C. Everett Koop projects that adolescents and young adults could become the next delineated group to become greatly at risk to HIV infection (Koop, 1987). Although most parents and young people are loath to confront the issue of sexual behavior in young, unmarried, teenagers, clear evidence that many adolescents are sexually active is apparent by the more than one million pregnancies among American teenagers each year (Zelnick, Kanter, & Ford, 1981). In fact, the Guttmacher Institute (1981) reports that the United States has the highest rate of unintended teenage pregnancy in the western hemisphere. According to studies conducted at Johns Hopkins School of Public Health (Zelnick & Kanter, 1980; Zelnick & Kanter, 1983), 60-70% of older, unmarried, female, teenagers have experienced sexual intercourse. In every age bracket, African-American youths were initiating sexual behavior in greater numbers than their Caucasian counterparts.

Since a vaccination for AIDS is not expected to be developed for at least a decade (Hall, 1988), the only possible successful intervention effort is prevention. Since many persons with AIDS are under 30, and the virus is presumed to be able to remain asymptomatic latent for up to 10 years (Hall, 1988), it is possible that many persons with AIDS contracted the virus while still in their teens. The most frequently recommended mode of prevention has been to provide education to the public in general, with specific emphasis directed toward groups believed to be at higher risk of HIV infection (Koop, 1988). Although rates of seroconversion have not reached predicted levels, the specific effectiveness of AIDS prevention programs have not been clearly demonstrated (Stall, Coates, & Hoff, 1988). For example, two programs designed to reduce the incidence of sexually transmitted diseases provided specific counseling and free condoms, but these preventive measures did not reduce the prevalence of sexually transmitted diseases in the adolescent sample (Margolis, 1988). Results from many studies of educational programs increase knowledge regarding sex and sexually transmitted diseases, but appear to have little measurable impact in the modification of behaviors and attitudes (Office for Technological Assistance, 1988). In addition, studies conducted with high school students indicate this population still has an alarming deficit in accurate knowledge of which behaviors increase their risk of HIV infection and how the virus is transmitted (D' Clemente, Zorn, Temoshok, 1986; Strunin & Hingson, 1987). Strunin & Hingson report that 22% of the respondents did not know they could get AIDS from semen, 29% did not know that a person could contract the virus from exposure to vaginal fluids, and virtually the same percentage stated that one could get AIDS from toilet seats. More than half (i.e., 60%) believed that one could get AIDS from saliva, with an additional 9% unsure, even though there are not documented cases of HIV transmission through contact with saliva. D' Clemente et al., (1986) examined the level of AIDS knowledge of 1300 high school students ages 14-18. While almost all knew that sexual contact was one way of getting the disease, only 60% knew that using a condom can reduce the risk of transmission. Only 66% knew that AIDS could not be transmitted casually by using someone's comb or hairbrush. These studies indicate that there is still much confusion and uneven levels of knowledge regarding modes of transmission. Given the long latency of the virus, many of these adolescents may unknowingly be exposing themselves to HIV. This is especially worrisome because 54% of the respondents report that they are not worried about contracting AIDS, which suggests that they are not attempting to prevent transmission of the virus.

Generally, AIDS prevention efforts have focused on increasing knowledge about HIV transmission, but increasingly, data suggest that knowledge alone is not associated with risk reducing behavior (Baldwin & Baldwin, 1988). Until recently, AIDS prevention programs that have attempted to provide change strategies have done so at the individual level or within small groups (Becker & Joseph, 1988). These prevention programs usually involve providing education about transmission, and distributing condoms (Kelly & St. Lawrence, 1989). Many of the intervention programs aimed at adolescents stress abstinence as the sole form of preventive behavior without regard to their current level of sexual activity. In addition, while government publications (Koop, 1988) frequently stress the role of parents in the formation of responsible attitudes and values about sexual behavior and AIDS prevention, few programs address whether parents are actually discussing these topics with their children. With regard to AIDS prevention for adolescents, appropriate strategies need to be developed at the family and community level aimed at increasing family communication about attitudes and lifestyle behaviors associated with drug and sexual behavior (i.e., behaviors most associated with HIV transmission). Adolescence is a developmental period often marked by exploration of new experiences. Adolescents are especially
susceptible to influences from others regarding behaviors to engage in and are at increased risk to succumb to peer pressure when values and alternative health promoting behavioral strategies are not available. Increasing family communication about drugs and sexual behavior may be timely and efficient strategies to promote discussion of lifestyle behaviors associated with HIV transmission. The mass media represents an avenue to assist families in this process and may play a significant role in implementing change at a community and systems level. The media is ideal for conveying positive health promotion messages. The vast majority of children and adults regularly watch television, listen to radios, or read newspapers. Not only are these sources in almost all the homes of Americans, but many hours each day are devoted to these leisure time activities. Our project, entitled Families In Touch: Understanding AIDS, resulted from the collaboration of a variety of disciplines including community psychologists and media specialists. The media has been utilized successfully in the past to increase knowledge and facilitate health behavior change in many areas (Jason, Crawford, & Gruder, 1989; Winett, King, & Altman, 1989). The media holds the potential for reaching large numbers of individuals over a relatively short period of time, thereby providing intervention at the community, family, and individual level. Families In Touch utilized the print and visual media in presenting information about HIV, high risk behaviors, statistics, and exercises aimed at increasing communication patterns in families. The project is unique within two parameters: the utilization of the mass media for provision of behaviorally oriented group exercises and a specific evaluative component aimed at AIDS prevention programs. The project is described in complete detail in Crawford, Jason, Riodan, Kaufman, Salina, Sawalski, Ho, & Zollik, 1989. In November 1988, a 16 page supplement was distributed in the Sunday Chicago Tribune. Distribution of the supplement exceeded 1.2 million copies. Concurrently, starting on the day the supplement was distributed, WGN TV, a major local television station in the Chicago market, broadcast five to ten minute segments about AIDS and the family for six consecutive days on its noon and nine p.m. news broadcasts. While the focus was by necessity different for the two media forms, experiential exercises were provided in the supplement to enhance the television broadcasts.

These behavioral exercises were designed to increase parent's ability to communicate with their children about sexuality, drugs, health promotion, AIDS, decision making processes, and values clarification. The exercises were designed to stimulate dialogue within the family unit. Examples of the family based exercises included an AIDS Family IQ Test, role playing, imagining how one's heroes or heroines might respond to a peer pressure situation, discussing how information about the number of individuals diagnosed with AIDS makes one feel, drawing pictures of germs, viruses, and diseases. The crucial element to these exercises were that they involved overt behavior and action of the participants.

The program was evaluated in the Chicago Public Schools, utilizing 7th and 8th grade students and their parents. Participants were randomly assigned to be in either an experimental or control group. Approximately one week prior to the implementation of the program, the experimental group received the supplement in class and were told about the upcoming television broadcast and asked to watch it with their parents. Posttest data was collected from both parents and children in both groups, with anonymity assured by using only the child's birthday on both sets of measures. The control group was not given the supplement or told to watch the programs. Data was also collected at the conclusion of the program on both the experimental and control groups. Posttest data indicated that the children in the experimental group talked significantly more about sexual topics with their parents, and were more knowledgeable about AIDS than their control counterparts. Parents in the experimental group also reported talking more to their children about sexual topics (F(1,52)=5.33, p<.05) than did parents who did not receive the program. An important finding of this study was that approximately 79% of the 11-14 year old participants in this study could be considered "at risk" for HIV infection. At risk is defined as those children who either report using drugs, alcohol, or engaging in sexual behavior or have friends who engage in these behaviors. These "at risk" children reported talking more to their parents about sexual topics than did those children not at risk. The parents of the "at risk" children reported more discomfort in discussing sexually oriented topics with their children. This finding speaks to the timeliness of providing families with behavioral exercises to increase competency and prepare members with communication skills that will facilitate discussion and values clarification about attitudes and behaviors associated with HIV transmission. A more detailed description of the program evaluation component of the project can be found in Crawford et al., 1989.

This program is among the first to attempt to utilize media technology, behavioral strategies, and community collaborators to facilitate health promotion behaviors in the context of an AIDS prevention program. Currently, the project is under revision to include modifications aimed at reaching minority populations who are contracting HIV at an alarming high rate. The development and implementation of AIDS prevention programs that utilize behavioral strategies to enhance skill levels in various areas associated with HIV transmission appear to hold much promise.
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The Anomaly of Behavioral Community Psychology in the 1990's as Illustrated by Two Large-Scale Prevention Projects

by Richard A. Winett
Center for Research in Health Behavior
Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

About 15 years ago, a small group of young academic idealists thought they could revolutionize both behavioral clinical psychology and community psychology by merging the principles, techniques, and methodologies of the behavioral field with the vision, emphases, and mission of the community field. We excitedly created books, articles, and panels to explain and proselytize the new approach we called "behavioral community psychology." Now in 1990 it is a reasonable time to assess our impacts and directions. And, from my perspective, both impacts and directions present a fascinating anomaly that is, in part, illustrated by my own work.

The anomaly is that behavioral community psychology appears to have had very little influence on either behavioral clinical psychology or community psychology. The primary goal of changing clinical and community psychology is not been met; yet, behavioral community psychology's emerging impact outside of those two fields appears to be quite significant. With regard to the first point, it is difficult, for example, to find many illustrations of "large-scale, preventive interventions" in behavioral clinical journals, or community psychology interventions that rely on behavioral principles and methodology. The reasons for the lack of impact on our originally targeted fields have been discussed in detail elsewhere (e.g., Bogat and Jason, in press; Winett, King, & Altman, in press). Succinctly, the "world view" and methodology of the behavioral paradigm may not have been the best match for the perspective, goals, and methods of community psychology (as defined by the "traditionalists" in community psychology). Behavior therapy is just that, a sometimes very effective approach used with individuals and small groups, usually within mental health or medical delivery systems. Further, with the increase in third-party payments for such services, which are directed only toward certain types of problems and administered in particular ways, the incentives to expand beyond the usual (treatment) delivery systems have been diminished.

However, we seem to be having significant impacts in areas that can be grouped under the general rubric of "community health promotion," "health behavior change," and "health promotion sciences" (Maccoby & Altman, 1988). In other worlds, our principles, strategies, and methods and the emphasis on prevention have received a warm reception from diverse disciplines and federal agencies committed to improving the health of our nation through large-scale prevention efforts. Our failure to satisfy our first goal may result in reaching much loftier goals!

In many respects, the anomaly is solved when we realize that while we were never quite appropriate for clinical psychology and community psychology, we are an almost perfect fit for prevention efforts in the 1980s and 1990s. Current prevention efforts tend to emphasize education and behavior change, often coupled with more modest group, organizational, or community interventions. Thus, many "community health promotion" programs are virtually the same as many "behavioral community" programs.

Two of my current projects are good examples of our close fit with large-scale health initiatives. However, I would not describe the projects as either clinical psychology or community psychology, or behavioral community psychology for that matter. Instead, the projects draw on those fields and health psychology, but also communication psychology, social marketing, and public health.

Background

The background for the current projects is the series of studies I did in consumer behavior, with a special focus on media-based behavior change (Winett, 1986). Many of these studies were supported by the National Science Foundation (NSF) because the studies represented a different way to conceptualize and analyze a number of concerns and policy issues in consumer behavior.

I have also been fortunate in my 11 years at Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University to be able to work with top professionals in communication and instructional technology. In this way, it has been possible to develop quality media products to truly test concepts and delivery systems. The longest relationship has been with John F. Moore, Ed. D., who is Director of the Learning Resources Center and a collaborator in my projects.

The original approach to media-based behavior change in the NSF studies has been expanded into a framework for the design, development, implementation, and evaluation of diverse media interventions (Winett, Altman, & King, 1990). This framework particularly emphasizes a series of formative and pilot research steps that have often not been extensively followed in the earlier history and even present-day work in communication and health behavior change (e.g., see Kotler & Roberto, 1989). The framework for media products is also coupled
with a framework that integrates health psychology and public health (Winett, King, & Altman, 1989). These frameworks guide the projects. However, it would be a mistake to conclude that either of the two projects to be described here perfectly illustrates the framework. Interestingly, the projects include professionals who have not typically been involved in clinical psychology, community psychology, or behavioral community psychology programs. The projects represent a blending of the interests and talents of individuals in psychology, instructional technology, computer science, and health sciences.

Projects

Nutrition Promotion in the Supermarket

This project is supported by the National Cancer Institute (NCI) and is part of its broad initiative to change the dietary habits of Americans. The major macronutrient goals are to decrease fat in the diet from its present level of about 37% of calories from fat to 30%, and to increase fiber from about 11 grams per day per person to about 30 grams. The NCI (decrease fat, increase fiber and complex carbohydrates) are similar to those specified for reducing cardiovascular risk and for weight control.

Based on the prior work I noted in consumer behavior, we have designed, developed, and tested via experimental field studies an interactive public access information system for supermarkets that we call the Nutrition for a Lifetime System (NLS). The NLS includes a series of short interactive video programs set up in a step-by-step sequence (following a successive approximation strategy) and individualized feedback with specific goals (relating to fat and fiber) that are based on an NLS user’s food purchases.

The NLS is different form other interactive systems in at least three ways. Individual consumers are tracked and monitored over time because people enter the NLS with their social security number (following informed consent procedures). Individuals systematically use the NLS over many weeks. The NLS also has undergone extensive experimentation in the field.

These studies have shown that NLS users modify food purchases in expected and desired directions. For example, to date our most effective changes have been substantial reductions in the purchase of high-fiber cereals and grains. Interestingly, despite much current information about nutrition, control participants do not show any consistent changes in purchases.

The NLS’s design and testing has followed very closely our framework for the development of media-based interventions. Its content and format are derived from social cognitive theory and communication theory (Bandura, 1986). We have also been able to adhere to a sequence of formative, pilot, field test, and refinement steps so that the NLS can be continuously improved.

However, by “improved” we mean that not only will the NLS promote reasonable changes in purchases by consumers, but that the NLS can be sufficiently modified to attract different kinds of consumers. That is, our studies started with knowledgeable consumers in an “upscale” supermarket. We now are working on simplifying the interactions with the NLS and tailoring and individualizing its content to users’ interests and abilities. Of course, we will also be working on ways to help consumers maintain new types of food purchases and meals.

In the future, we plan on seeking additional funding so that the NLS is adaptable to individuals with limited education, shopping in supermarkets with a lesser variety of targeted items (e.g., produce, high-fiber cereals, low-fat dairy). Our goal is to create a “stand-alone” system that can be used in virtually any supermarket.

The NLS also illustrates what psychologists can probably do best in the overall health promotion initiatives, i.e., the design and careful evaluation of “delivery systems” for influencing health behaviors of many people. However, the NLS project, as noted, has involved a wide variety of professionals, including: John F. Moore, Ed.D., instructional technology; Lee A. Hite, M.S. and Michael Leathy, M.S., computer science; Janet L. Wallberg, Ph.D., nutrition; Jana L. Wagner, M.S.; Tamara Neubauer, B.S., W. Bruce Walker, Ph.D., David Lombard, B.S., Laurie Mundy, B.S., Susanne Martin, B.S., and E. Scott Geller, psychology.

AIDS Prevention: A Family Approach

This project is supported by the National Institute of Mental Health as part of its initiative in AIDS prevention. This project involves the design, development, and evaluation of a minimally interactive video program for home use by parents and young adolescents. The video program provides the most up-to-date information on teenage risk behaviors and situations, AIDS, and other sexually transmitted diseases (STDs). The video program also provides training for the parents and adolescents as a family and for the adolescent with a parent as a coach to learn specific skills and behaviors which should enhance family communication and help prepare adolescents to deal with various pressures and risky situations (e.g., pressure by peers to drink at parties; pressure to engage in unprotected sex).

This project has also included extensive formative research and pilot tests. Through these initial steps we have found that, in actuality, neither parents or adolescents are very knowledgeable about AIDS, STDs, and risk behaviors for adolescents once there are queries beyond rather general questions. For example, few parents or adolescents understand the difference between being diagnosed as having AIDS an being infected with HIV (and that infected individuals can, therefore, infect others).

We also found that parents and adolescents do have extensive conversations about a variety of topics including STDs. However, rarely are these conversations specific enough to offer behavioral guidelines, much less behavioral prescriptions. Thus we are experimenting with ways to teach families via the video program how to use problem-solving and role-play strategies.

At this point it is unclear whether our original idea of the “parent as trainer” will work. In our first prototype program, called “Cartwheels to Carwheels,” the parent’s role was to be an active trainer. Based on feedback from a pilot study, we will alter the role. The video program itself will be the trainer and the parent will be a coach or facilitator. This format is similar to other prevention efforts with young adolescents, such as those in schools (e.g., see Best, 1989).

At first glance, focusing on young adolescents (12 to 14 years old) may seem inappropriate. However, our own formative research and national data indicate that by 15 many adolescents are already sexually active (usually unprotected and use alcohol extensively). Additionally, middle and older adolescents tend to be much less amenable to parental influence. Thus a true prevention effort involving parents and adolescents seems to require focusing on 12- to 14-year-olds.

Finally, there are two important pieces of data within AIDS statistics that provide some urgency to push our efforts forward. Given the long incubation period (i.e., mean of eight years), many individuals diagnosed with AIDS in their early 20’s were infected in their early teen years. There is also a growing number of adolescents diagnosed with AIDS. However, this project is still in its early stages. We expect it will take many refinement steps to develop a video program that is acceptable to many parents and adolescents and leads to changes in family communication and adolescent risk behaviors.

The AIDS prevention project is a good example of integrating clinical psychology, community psychology, and health psychology perspectives with the goal of developing and evaluating a relatively unique delivery system. Individuals involved in this project have included John F. Moore, Ed.D., C. David Taylor, Ed.D., and Jeffrey Dalton, M.S., instructional technology, and Eileen S. Anderson, Ed.D., Kathy J. Sikkema, M.S., Richard J. Hook, M.S., Deborah A. Webster, M.S., Thomas H. Ollendick, Ph.D., and Richard M. Eisler, Ph.D., psychology. Jeffrey A. Kelly, Ph.D. and Richard I. Evans, Ph.D., serve as project consultants.

I conclude on a note of irony, which hopefully will not be construed as smugness. The work of a number of behavioral community psychologists retains its vitality and most of its distinctive elements, i.e., combining behavioral principles and technology with the larger-scale intervention and prevention goals of community psychology. Despite the relative uniqueness of the work, the primary original goal of influencing behavioral clinicians and community psychologists has not been met. However, we may be able to fulfill a loftier goal—playing a significant part in our nation’s health promotion and disease prevention initiatives in the 1990s.

(Continued)
A Behavioral Training Program to Teach Advocacy Skills to People With Disabilities

Fabricio E. Balcazar
University of Kansas

Involving people with disabilities in the process of advocating for improvements in services and the quality of life in their own communities is an important rehabilitation and independent living goal. This article summarizes the development of a behaviorally-based training program designed to teach advocacy skills to people with disabilities. The training format includes descriptions of the target behaviors, rationales, examples, and role-playing exercises. Training materials were pilot tested with a local consumer advocacy organization. Increases in the number of disability-related issues reported, and measures of group members' engagements with decision makers and service providers in the process of addressing selected issues suggested the effectiveness of the training procedures. The advantages of using these training materials with disadvantaged populations are discussed.

Active participation by people with disabilities in the process of advocacy for new or better services has been a central focus of the independent living (IL) movement (DeJong, 1983). Services for people with disabilities are typically vulnerable to budgetary cuts at local, state, and federal levels. Further, the quality of such services is frequently questionable, and many areas of the country are chronically underserved. Consumers can play a critical role in the process of increasing or protecting funding bases or expanding and creating otherwise unavailable services. Yet, despite the need for consumer involvement, only a few consumers actively participate in local advocacy efforts.

Efforts to develop advocacy skills have been directed at individuals or group of individuals (e.g., Checkoway & Van Till, 1978; Krauss, 1983) and have not always been successful (Berry, 1981). Many existing consumer advocacy organizations are frequently confronted with obstacles (e.g., low attendance, members' inexperience, lack of resources, etc.) that limit their effectiveness. Direct observations and interviews with experts and advocacy group leaders have also indicated several problems common among advocacy organizations (Balcazar, Seekins, Fawcett, & Hopkins, in press). For example, group meetings are frequently disorganized, discussion of one topic sometimes blends into another topic, members spend too much time and energy discussing internal organizational matters, and members spend little time discussing issues relevant to people with disabilities.

A group of researchers at the Research and Training Center on Independent Living at the University of Kansas have developed training materials to teach advocacy skills to people with disabilities (Seekins, Balcazar, & Fawcett, 1986) so they can effectively organize to address their needs. This training program was developed following an integrated model of research and development (Fawcett et al., in press) that includes the following phases: a) problem identification and analysis (i.e., gaining entry to the setting, identifying the concerns of the population, and analyzing the problem); b) knowledge acquisition and synthesis (i.e., using existing information sources, studying natural examples, and identifying functional elements of successful models); c) product design and development (i.e., developing an observation system, specifying procedural elements of the intervention, and developing a prototype or preliminary intervention); d) field testing and evaluation (i.e., selecting an experimental design, conducting a pilot test of the preliminary intervention, collecting and analyzing data, and replicating under field conditions); and e) dissemination and adaptation (i.e., developing the product for dissemination, identifying potential markets for the intervention, creating demand for the intervention, encouraging appropriate adaptation, and providing technical support for adopters). The utilization of this comprehensive research and development model is what distinguishes this product from other similar products developed in the past (Fawcett, 1988).

The training program has two main components: First, individual members receive instruction on how to identify and report disability-related issues at group meetings. Second, the chairperson or group leader receives instruction on how to conduct action-oriented meetings, assist group members in developing action
plans, and monitor group members' progress in developing action plans, and monitor group members' progress in actions taken in the community. In addition, group members use a guide for taking action on identified issues that provide a menu of 35 different action strategies reflecting increasing levels of complexity and consumer involvement. Group members can then select a specific course of action that reflects the group's goals for each identified issue. Training materials include detailed descriptions of the target behaviors, rationales, examples, and role-play exercises. During training, we emphasize hands-on experience to sharpen skills.

A pilot test of the training procedures and materials was conducted in collaboration with a consumer advocacy organization of people with physical disabilities associated with a local independent living center. Consistent increases in the number of issues reported by group members and the number of actions taken in the community to address identified issues were observed following training (Balcazar et al., in press). These procedures are now being replicated with five consumer organizations. Measures of group members' engagements with decision makers and service providers in the process of addressing identified issues, as well as resulting outcomes, are being collected with those five groups. Up to now, these measures suggest that group members can effectively plan and implement actions, therefore replicating the findings of the pilot-test. Participating groups have been instrumental in improving the accessibility of their communities and generating new or better services for people with disabilities.

To illustrate the benefits of the training program, we can cite the activities of the Illinois Coalition of People With Disabilities, who have been using these training materials for the last 3 years. They have successfully increased their membership, and through effective consumer involvement, they have been able to open new service delivery agencies for people with disabilities (independent living centers) in areas of the state that were previously underserved. Consumers themselves have become the leaders of those organizations, and their operational funds have come from effective lobbying at the state capital and the fact that they have an organized constituency.

Finally, we are currently conducting an adaptation of these training materials in cooperation with the Stanford Center for Research in Disease Prevention. Our aim is to produce a manual that could help communities organize and mobilize resources to address health-related issues at the local and state levels. This is just another example of the many opportunities available in this area of research.
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Commentary on the Special Issue: The Adolescent Identity Development of Behavioral Community Psychology

David S. Glenwick
Fordham University

The five papers in this special issue represent a fine cross-section of current thinking and research in behavioral community psychology at the approximate midpoint of its second decade. They provide an excellent jumping-off point for consideration of several important issues related to its development: (a) where behavioral community psychology has been—as manifested by the differences between it and what can be termed “mainstream community psychology,” (b) where it is now—as suggested by recent developments and current trends, and (c) where it is going—as prosaged by challenges facing it.

Mainstream Community Psychology and Behavioral Community Psychology: Where Behavioral Community Psychology Has Been

As Winett notes in his article, behavioral community psychology has had disappointingly little impact on community psychology as a whole. This comparative absence of influence is perhaps understandable when one considers the different traditions from which mainstream community psychology and behavioral community psychology derive. Mainstream community
psychology was born largely out of the dissatisfaction of academicians and practitioners having a background in clinical psychology and orientations that were psychodynamic or client-centered. Though rejecting many aspects of the medical model of service delivery, community psychology's founders, and the second and third generations as well, were shaped greatly in their thinking by their professional histories and training. In contrast, behavioral community psychology's pioneers came from diverse academic origins, with advanced degrees in such subdisciplines as social psychology, human development, and general psychology, as well as clinical psychology, and were grounded more in a learning theory perspective; they, too, were products of their particular professional socialization experiences. These different roots have resulted, in turn, in differing viewpoints on several related dimensions, including (a) the role of theory in research, (b) the purposes of research, (c) research topics, (d) research methodologies, and (e) variables and measures.

1. Theory driven vs. problem-driven research. Research in mainstream community psychology often has been conducted to test, or to help construct, a specific theory or model. Examples include much of the research on stress and coping and on social support. Behavioral community psychology research usually has been more problem-driven, carried out in response to perceived real world discrepancies between extant and desirable conditions. Thus, for example, Salina, Crawford, and Jason's project addressed the pressing AIDS crisis, and Balcazar's work attempted to remediate a longstanding inadequacy in available resources for persons with disabilities. In the course of such research, findings relevant to theory-building many emerge, but these tend to be subordinate to behavioral community psychology's primary focus on the problem at hand.

2. Description vs. intervention. Mainstream community psychology has concentrated heavily on descriptive research, seeking to understand phenomena as they are, without necessarily aiming to alter them. (Clearly there are exceptions to this statement, e.g., training in social problem-solving in children). Such research is consistent with mainstream community psychology's interest in theory construction and with its respect for cultural heterogeneity. Behavioral community psychology is frequently more action-oriented, seeking to modify phenomena in line with what are viewed as desirable ends. Thus, for instance, the objectives of Winett's two projects were to change people's food purchase habits and to reduce adolescents' high-risk sexual behaviors. Such intervention work often is based on previous descriptive research and can, through the alteration of settings and behavior, lead to enhanced understanding of the phenomena under investigation, but this is usually a secondary objective. Geller, Ludwig, Gilmore, and Berry's taxonomy of behavior change techniques represents a valuable initial step in systematizing behavioral community psychology's various intervention strategies.

3. Emphasis on mental health vs. physical health. Not surprisingly, in light of its origins, mainstream community psychology has devoted primary attention to mental health phenomena, attempting to lower indices of psychological dysfunction and promote personal and interpersonal competence. Behavioral community psychology, for its part, has tended to be less interested in mental health issues and to become progressively more involved with physical health concerns. The projects on AIDS and on nutrition in this special issue exemplify this trend. Given behavioral community psychology's emphasis on measuring overt behavior where possible (see below), its attraction to health and behavioral medicine problems, where concrete, observable outcome measures often are available, is quite comprehensible.

4. Correlational vs. experimental designs. This difference follows from the above-mentioned difference on the description-intervention dimension, correlational designs being more appropriate for examining how phenomena naturally relate to one another, and experimental methodologies being more suitable for effecting change in those phenomena. Thus, each of the papers in the special issue describes some type of experimental approach to the problem under consideration.

5. Cognitive vs. behavioral variables. Mainstream community psychology has typically employed paper-and-pencil self-report instruments, believing that perceptions, attitudes, beliefs, values, etc. are worthwhile variables to assess, both as outcome and as mediating variables. The perception of social support, for example, is regarded as perhaps more meaningful than counting predefined supportive behaviors. Behavioral community psychologists, consonant with their learning background, have favored the assessment of either overt behaviors or the verbal report of such behaviors. Thus, Balcazar measured the number of actions taken by disability advocacy groups, and Salina et al. looked at reports of parent-child communication.

The above contrasts are intended to highlight some of the principal differences in how mainstream community psychology and behavioral community psychology conceptualize and address social problems. The contrasts noted are ones of central tendency. Creating a dichotomy between mainstream community psychology and behavioral community psychology on each dimension obviously is somewhat artificial, and there is a degree of overlap between the two on each dimension. Nonetheless, these differing emphases may help account for why mainstream community psychology and behavioral community psychology have coexisted as relatively independent strands during the past 15 years or so. Such a state of affairs, though explicable, regrettably has placed limitations on the field as a whole and the development of both behavioral community psychology and mainstream community psychology. What may be hoped for is an increased awareness that the two are complementary and not necessarily in opposition to each other and that greater attention by each to the strengths of the other might enrich community psychology both theoretically and empirically. Thus, for example, behavioral community psychology might benefit from more explicit consideration and inclusion of theory and values in its research, and mainstream community psychology could be well-served by incorporating some of behavioral community psychology's methodological approaches for producing change. Encouragingly, behavioral community psychology has demonstrated in recent years that it is capable of self-examination and self-modification in response to valid critiques, while remaining true to its behavioral heritage. To these new developments we turn next.

Current Trends: Where Behavioral Community Psychology Is Now

Recent developments in behavioral community psychology all point in the direction of less conceptual and methodological rigidity. Greater heterogeneity and tolerance are apparent with regard to such questions as (a) how interventions are developed, (b) with whom one develops them, (c) what behavior change techniques are favored, (d) how much interventions need to depend on external controls, and (e) what variables are appropriate to measure. Specifically, we may note the following trends, presented separately but in actuality connected to one another.

1. Greater involvement of target populations in all phases of the intervention process. There has been an increasing willingness on the part of behavioral community psychologists to turn to the target populations themselves for input concerning such aspects as problem identification, information on the problem, intervention design, and intervention acceptability. The result is a more collaborative process, in which (a) consensus between the intervention agent (i.e., the behavioral community psychologist) and the target population is sought at each step, and (b) the intervention process is more sensitive to the local ecology. This can be contrasted with the former predominance of "top-down" interventions in behavioral community psychology, with the target populations often having been left out of the process and essentially having being handed a finished product by the intervention agent (Glenwick & Jason, 1984). Significantly, Geller et al. included "bidirectional oral communication between [intervention] agents and target subjects" as one of the behavior change techniques in their taxonomy. Similarly, in their Study Buddy program, Hightower and Fantuzzo involved teachers in the program's development and revision. As a final example, Winett is interested in modifying his nutrition promotion program for different kinds of consumer, "tailoring and individualizing its contents to users' interests and abilities."

2. Increased collaboration with other professions/disciplines. Behavioral community psychology has evidenced greater awareness that by itself it possesses only a limited per-
spective on a given problem and that collaboration with other professions and disciplines can have synergistic effects, producing a more potent intervention than would otherwise be possible. Thus, Salina et al. turned to the media for assistance in mounting their AIDS prevention program, and Winett worked with professionals from communications, computer science, the health sciences, and nutrition in designing and implementing his nutrition promotion project.

3. Greater emphasis on antecedent behavior change procedures. In behavioral community psychology's first decade, most of its research was based on consequence procedures (e.g., rewards and penalties). Increasingly, behavioral community psychologists have developed an awareness of how changing setting factors preceding the target behavior can increase the likelihood of desirable behavior change. It is striking that 18 of the 24 change techniques listed by Geller et al. are categorized by them as antecedent procedures. Balazar's program to teach advocacy skills included as core features descriptive and illustrative information and role-playing exercises. Likewise, modeling, role-playing, and problem-solving training were key components of Winett's and Salina et al.'s media-based projects on nutrition and AIDS.

4. Increased fostering of target subjects' personal control. Behavioral community interventions historically have been criticized for their reliance on external controls (a characteristic tied to behavioral community psychology's above-mentioned traditional operant emphasis on response consequences). Current projects, however, are beginning to place conspicuous emphasis on encouraging internal control—i.e., control by the participants—as part of the behavior change process. Thus, in their formula for predicting long-term intervention impact, Geller et al. deduces points if the behavior change technique employs rewards or penalties 'and if it does not allow an opportunity for personal choice or control.' Hightower and Fantuzzo faded out external controls and structure over the course of their Study Buddy curriculum and gradually built in more internal control, decision-making, and problem-solving by both pupils and teachers. Finally, in Balazar's project in which empowerment of people with disabilities was an explicit objective (advocacy skills being the target behaviors), consumer groups were given 35 action strategies from which to choose, depending on their particular goals and issues.

5. Greater Inclusion of subjective variables in the evaluation process. Related to the facilitation of personal choice and internal control, this is one dimension where behavioral community psychology has been moving closer to mainstream community psychology. Ranging from the relatively less influential behavioral rating scales (e.g., Hightower and Fantuzzo's use of peers' ratings of social skills and teachers' ratings of adjustment) to instruments assessing such more unobservable and subjective constructs as social validity and self-efficacy, cognitive variables are receiving growing acceptance in behavioral community psychology. Such variables, behavioral community psychologists are realizing, can be valuable both in evaluating previously overlooked aspects of change and in understanding the process by which change occurs or, in some instances, fails to occur. That Geller et al. highlights the importance of such seemingly mentalistic constructs as reactance and intrinsic motivation speaks to behavioral community psychology's increasing flexibility with respect to constructs that are only indirectly measurable.

Challenges Lying Ahead: Where Behavioral Community Psychology is Going

Behavioral community psychology has experienced an infancy marked by considerable promise and by somewhat unfulfilled expectations. It is now well into the process of forming its identity as an adolescent, defining its distinguishing characteristics and taking stock of its competencies. As it continues to mature and to develop a realistic sense of self, noteworthy challenges remain, among them the following:

1. As the articles in this special issue show, behavioral community interventions have been conducted successfully across a range of intervention levels similar to Geller et al.'s hierarchy. For example, Hightower and Fantuzzo's Study Buddy program was implemented at the large group (i.e., classroom) level, Balazar's advocacy skills program at the organizational level, and Winett's nutrition promotion program at the community level. Particularly exciting are the possibilities that in multilevel interventions, such as Salina et al.'s AIDS prevention project, which utilized a community level intervention (i.e., the media) to facilitate an intervention at the small group (i.e., family) level. Multilevel interventions potentially have the twin virtues of targeting large numbers of persons while influencing them with maximally effective behavior change techniques.

2. A number of creative demonstration-type projects have been mounted by behavioral community psychologists during the past 15 years. Unfortunately, these have all-too-seldom been adopted by the host settings on an ongoing basis (Jason & Glenwick, 1984). The challenge is to design cost-effective, user-friendly interventions and to work with the target populations involved (as Hightower and Fantuzzo did with Study Buddy teachers) to enhance their ability to, and the likelihood that they will, keep the program operational without outside assistance. In this manner the program becomes incorporated into the setting's routine mode of functioning.

3. As important as program maintenance by target populations is program dissemination, both within and outside of psychology, to relevant applied researchers, human service organizations, government bodies, etc. Getting information about effective behavioral community programs to those who might profit by knowing about them is a vital initial step in the adoption process and may well require behavioral community psychologists to venture beyond conventional psychology outlets.

4. Although behavioral community psychology has been displaying increasing openness toward collaboration with other professions and disciplines outside of psychology, there remains room for further incorporation of concepts and theories from other subdisciplines within psychology. Geller et al.'s use of psychological reactance and intrinsic motivation theories to help account for the absence of long-term effects in some behavioral community interventions illustrates how researchers can draw productively from social psychological theory. Other areas that would seem to possess especial value for behavioral community psychologists are environmental/ecological psychology (e.g., the idea of the interdependence of systems) and developmental psychology (e.g., the notion of transactional influence processes between persons and their environments) (Jason, 1990).

5. Though behavioral community psychology remains a rivulet in comparison to the "mainstream" of community psychology, its potential influence on preventive interventions outside of psychology appears to be considerable. Winett cogently underscores this potential with reference to health promotion, and similar promise exists with respect to interventions in education. One is reminded of the man who, much to his surprise, discovers at the age of 40 that he has been speaking "prose" all of his life. Most preventively oriented and community-based interventionists in health and education undoubtedly would be rather puzzled to discover that they were really "behavioral community psychologists." Yet, if we examine current work in these areas (e.g., health screening and substance abuse education), we see that much of it is indeed grounded in the application (be it rigorous or fuzzy) of learning principles to preventive and early interventive goals. How to increase behavioral community psychology's influence on such applied research in health, education, and other fields represents an exciting challenge and an opportunity to contribute to significant social change in the coming decade.
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Clinical Psychology and Later Life

Division 20 will offer a one-day workshop entitled "Clinical Psychology of Later Life" on August 9, 1990 at Boston University. Assessment strategies, the effects of medical problems on psychological performance, methods of determining competency, psychotherapy and the elderly, behavioral approaches in the community and institutional environments, and issues involved in working with elderly clients in private practice will be discussed.

For more information, contact Rachel Prucno, Philadelphia Geriatric Center, 5301 Old York Road, Philadelphia, PA 19141.

Call for AJCP Monograph Manuscripts

AJCP is embarking on a new venture. A page increase was negotiated with Plenum when the journal became a Division 27 benefit of membership, and there is now space to publish one monograph supplement each year. The last issue of any given year in which an appropriate manuscript is available will be a Community Research and Action Monograph.

The advantage of the monograph series is that it will provide an outlet for the publication of longer articles (up to 300 manuscript pages). Comprehensive projects can be reported in a single place rather than broken up into separate articles in different journals. A single author also can use the pages for the kind of integrative theoretical piece that is difficult to publish in current journals.

Potential monograph topics are, of course, the same as those of the journal itself, but a monograph can provide greater opportunity for theoretical exposition, ethnographic description of community processes or detailed description of research and intervention procedures. In this way, monographs can facilitate research replication and the adoption of promising interventions.

Prior consultation is available to help determine the scope of a planned monograph manuscript. Proposals and correspondence concerning monographs should be sent to Kenneth Heller, AJCP Associate Editor for Monographs, Department of Psychology, Indiana University, Bloomington, IN 47405.

For APA Members with a Disability who are Planning to Attend the Annual Meeting

The Board of Convention Affairs would very much like each person with a disability who is planning to attend the Convention in Boston, Massachusetts, August 10-14, 1990, to identify himself or herself and to provide information on how we can make the convention more readily accessible for his or her attendance. APA will provide a van with a lift as transportation for persons in wheelchairs, interpreters for hearing impaired individuals, and escorts/readers for persons with visual impairments. We strongly urge individuals who would like assistance in facilitating their attendance at the convention to register in advance for the convention on the APA Advance Registration and Housing Form which will appear in the March through May issues of the American Psychologist. A note which outlines a person’s specific needs should accompany the Advance Registration and Housing Form. This is especially important for persons who require interpreting services. The deadline for registering in advance for the convention is June 25, 1990.

Teaching Health Psychology and Wellness

Help! If you are teaching a course (or can provide a lead about a colleague who is) in Health Psychology and Wellness or a related topic, please send a copy of your course outline, reading list, syllabus, etc. The VCPPP Clearinghouse did not have a single one. I would be happy to share any materials received with those with similar needs. Many thanks.

Please send materials to:

Joe Galano
Department of Psychology
College of William and Mary
Williamsburg, VA 23185
(804) 221-3878

International Association of Applied Psychology

The International Association of Applied Psychology (IAAP) is holding its World Congress meeting in Kyoto, Japan, July 22-27, 1990. Psychologists from different countries will be attending the meeting to present papers, sponsor workshops, and participate in symposia. IAAP, the oldest world-wide association of scholars and practitioners in the discipline of psychology, is organized into several Divisions. The Division of Clinical and Community Psychology is interested in recruiting new members and in strengthening clinical-community activities. For further information on membership, Congress meeting programs that have been scheduled, or IAAP activities, please contact the Division President Stanley Sue, Department of Psychology, University of California, Los Angeles, CA 90024-1563.

Public Policy Fellowship

SPSSI (APA Division 9) invites applications for a one year Public Policy Fellowship. The Fellow represents SPSSI in relevant policy activities and works with APA’s legislative staff. Activities include preparing legislative briefing materials, policy research, advocating legislation, and SPSSI/APA committee activities.

Qualifications: Applicants must have a psychology Psy.D. or Ph.D., be a current APA member, and join SPSSI before the appointment date (June 1, 1990).

Award: One year appointment beginning June 1, 1990 or later. Stipend of $25,000 plus favorable benefit package. Must reside in Washington, DC area during Fellowship.

Application: Submit in triplicate (1) a detailed vita, (2) names and addresses of 3 references, (3) 300-600 word biographical statement of experience and interest in policy activities, and (4) 300-600 word testimony on a social issue to a legislative body using social science data or theory. Send materials, postmarked by March 1, 1990, to:

Ms. Lynda J. Fuerstenau, Administrative Officer
SPSSI Central Office, P.O. Box 1248
Ann Arbor, MI 48106-1248
Toward the Integration of Personal Action and Ideology

by Leonard A. Jason

DePaul University

No doubt many of us feel, and rightly so, that there exists a compatible integration of our own activities and our belief systems, particularly as they relate to community psychology. For many, our personal actions are related but possibly not central to the behavior settings we inhabit in our private lives. That is, we frequently offer our services to individuals, groups, community organizations, and other political bodies because we feel we have perspectives or strategies for gaining information or understanding phenomena which allow us to be helpful either to the immediately involved citizens or to individuals who might confront similar dilemmas in the future. To the extent that these collaborative activities advance the public good, an integration of personal action and ideology has potentially occurred. However, my remarks in this column will not refer to these types of activities, rather to how our viewpoints are integrated within those agencies or settings to which we devote our working hours.

Several questions instantly come to mind. How do I and my colleagues think about this issue? What barriers to such an integration exist? Are there public forums for celebrating victories? Does our profession encourage or discourage these types of activities? To the questions above, I could easily add a half dozen more, but I think the point is made: the topic can generate a host of potentially useful questions. I recognize my remarks have been up to now somewhat abstract, so let me be a bit more concrete and personal. I know my own employment setting better than many other agencies to which I consult, because I also know its hidden complexities, barriers, and personal risks of change. I am more reluctant to undertake analyses and change efforts in it—despite the fact that it is the setting which I not only know the best but also have the most potential to affect. This point seems so intuitively obvious, and yet by its absence in our discussions, we deny, in some ways, its legitimacy.

After I arrived at DePaul University in 1975, most if not all of my areas of concern focused on external phenomena, ones which had few linking points to my setting of employment. For example, even though I was part of a clinical-community program that served minority populations in a variety of ways, there were no minority graduate students. I considered this rather odd, but this situation did not seem atypical. There were few faculty who recognized the apparent contradiction, and no internal or external influences to alter the situation were manifest. I had several options: a) to deny the problem, b) to recognize the problem but remain passive, c) to support marginal efforts for reform, d) to begin the process of understanding system regularities that were unstated but functioned to preserve the status quo, or e) to try to introduce major reforms into the system. I believe that at different times because of our needs we will resonate to different strategies, regardless of how well those solutions might be useful for the problems within our settings.

After several years of employment, and with some added security, I began to question my lack of action. Subsequently I attempted to encourage quality minority students to apply to our program, and several were admitted. Although on the surface this was a positive first step, in actuality the action was, I believe, at best a learning experience for me and at worst a damaging humiliation for those minority students who tried but were unable to survive in our program. Without doubt, barriers existed and I’m sure they continue to exist at my setting and others (e.g., rigid course requirements and standards, inadequate financial aid, nonsupportive peers, harsh and critical faculty interpersonal styles). My guess is it was foolish to hope for any but the actual outcome. Only by attending to these issues and barriers, over a period of ten years, has our graduate program made real progress in this area (it is beyond the scope of this brief essay to describe the process, but LaVonne Robinson and Edwin Zolik deserve a large share of the credit for the system changes).

The absence of minority students in clinical-community psychology programs represents one salient problem, but many others could have been selected. If one were to ask how much time we devote to initiating changes in our own settings versus other settings, would the former percentage be rather slim? Some might argue that our “real” work might suffer if the ratio of time shifted, and in fact many feel too much time is currently devoted to mundane administrative tasks. But I am not arguing for more internal system maintenance time, but rather collaborative, exploratory, opportunity-enhancing expeditions into the realm of our own work worlds.

Community oriented employees, staff, graduate students, and faculty are often in work settings where they represent non-mainstream points of view. Change and agitation could compromise career opportunities, advancement, or even survival. The resistance to initiating these types of analyses is vividly captured in the types of comments we hear from peers and students (“Don’t try to change things here, no one is interested,” “I’m going to get credentials, and departmental work won’t help me,” “Be careful with ruining your career with too much involvement with this place,” “Get smart, keep a low profile, anything else will just get you into trouble”).

A call for an integration of personal action and ideology needs to be approached cautiously, for multiple assaults on diverse problems might weaken one’s credibility and resources for accomplishing any changes. On the other hand, an absence of reflection on this topic, or merely superficial attention, is bound to compromise our objectives, our values, and our integrity. Can we champion injustices in the world when our own settings are in disarray? Of course, I am not suggesting that all of our work settings are either demoralized or undemocratic.

Rather, I am arguing for new procedures and processes that might be instituted over time. Examples might include regular assessments of social climates among staff or students and development of action plans to correct abuses; targeting specific and racial compositions of training programs and staff and designing short and long term strategies for accomplishing these objectives; identifying courses or programs that no longer are functional and engineering humane ways of better using existing talent; forging closer linkages between events and processes within our work settings and external real world phenomena; devising new, more democratic processes for setting policies and resolving conflicts; and vigilantly and sensitively monitoring the life stream within our settings, to insure that our imaginations are being actively challenged and liberated as opposed to being harnessed and drained.
The Dakota LEADers Project: A Test of Empowering Approaches to Leadership

Bruce B. Roberts and Howard I. Thorsheim
St. Olaf College

"Exodus from North Dakota" was the title of the massive painting hung in the new University of North Dakota Art Gallery. A stream of emaciated people stares blankly in all directions. The words "Do as taught" and "fear as told" are prominently written in their exodus road. The depressed community attitudes and tragic economic conditions prevalent in North and South Dakota are symbolized for us in that picture. Whole communities are dying. Passing time brings a lower population to entire regions. The latest Rand McNally U.S. coffee-table atlas left out North and South Dakota. They no longer exist. Though "invisible" in the atlas, these people from the Dakotas are industrious, religiously committed, deeply rooted, and intelligent (e.g., 90% church membership, among the highest average SAT/ACT scores in the nation). Their young adults search for a small-town atmosphere to raise their families. They can't stay in their jobless home towns, so they seek similar communities, but ones with employment opportunities. Yet the migration is not to Lead or Beulah in the Dakotas, but to Dakota population centers like Fargo and Sioux Fall, or to out-of-state metro areas like Minneapolis-St. Paul or St. Louis.

Amidst this rather desperate scene, the 41 applications from six-person community teams to be among the 32 small communities across the Dakotas selected for participation in the Dakota LEADers Project are often filled with hope and a powerful commitment to keep trying. The W.K. Kellogg Foundation has sponsored this nearly $1 million project, with an interest in finding models of leadership that will work within the changing political environment in the United States. Thanks in large measure to the visions of Kim Nesvig, Project Director for the Dakota LEADers Project in the Center for Rural Health, and Jan Moen Kelly, a sociologist at the University of North Dakota, the focus of the Dakota LEADers Project is on empowering leadership.

We were invited to create and conduct a workshop for a dozen professional leadership trainers from the Dakotas because of our developing experience and research with empowering models with people from many sides of communities, e.g., church congregations, college students, and elders. The 12 leadership trainers, in turn, will be responsible for the workshops and seminars with the six-person teams from the 32 selected communities. All of the 12 leadership trainers have deep personal, family, and community roots in the region themselves. Such an experience-based understanding of rural community life will be an important factor as they attempt to bring empowering community leadership to regional workshops over the next year.

Empowering Community Leadership

Empowering Community Leadership has two meanings for us: (a) it is a process—a way of working collaboratively with people, and (b) it is a goal—its purpose is to empower people within the community.

The Empowering Community Leadership approach explores and builds on people's existing unique abilities and experiences. These abilities and experiences are strengths for people working together. It includes their awareness of themselves, their contexts, their tasks, and the needs of their communities. The Empowering Community Leadership approach is a way to examine empowering leadership dynamics together in a give-and-take atmosphere where there is an equality and reciprocity of giving and asking for help, support, and resources. Key to the approach is that diverse life experiences across several contexts count as much as professional expertise or status that comes from title, money, position, or degree.

During our mid-October (1989) two-day workshop in Grand Forks, North Dakota, we helped the leadership teams participants name and affirm their existing schemas and leadership training styles that could be identified as modeling empowering approaches. That is, rather than attempt to change their basic ways of thinking or behaving, we helped the leadership trainers name the ways the they already could do leadership training that could be empowering of others. We then worked on rehearsing those skills, and on conceptualizing how to integrate and use those characteristics in their subsequent Dakota LEADers work.

One anonymous written comment to a "listening skills" rehearsal exercise (in which pairs of people reflected together on what is personally important and on their mind at the moment) typifies responses during the workshop: "My partner and I share common concerns. When I heard what was on his mind, I realized that was on my mind, too. Children exiting our state and, in a very real way, our lives, causes concern personally and professionally. He listened very well to me and I was reluctant to have him quit talking when I was the listener." This comment underscores also the crucial leadership skill of listening in order to help others keep thinking out loud.

In turn, we encouraged the leadership trainers to use the Empowering Community Leadership approach as they worked with community teams—that is, to help the members of the teams identify and name their attitudes and patterns of behavior that are empowering of others, just as they were experienced in the workshop; then to rehearse those skills together as they consider how to engage and empower ever-larger numbers of people from their communities.

We used two written resources: (a) an earlier summary of our research leading to an identification of ingredients of empowering leadership, Empowering Leadership: A Brief Introduction, and (b) a combination content and process booklet called Empowering Leadership: Building Community Through Human Development, that we wrote in preparation for the Dakota LEADers Project.

The thrust of the second booklet, the workshop we conducted, was to examine vision for the subsequent evolutions of the entire project, rest upon the critical nature of the development of equality, reciprocity, trust, and resourceful relationships among people "in community" as the necessary base on which creative, empowering action can take place. We argue that such socially-elaborated processes are essential (a) among team...
members, (b) between team members and community information, and (c) in the growing connections between team members and the larger community in which they are embedded. The diversity of understandings about people, information, and resources that comes from these processes is a key ingredient for successful community development.

Evaluations of the Empowering Community Leadership workshop by the 12 leadership trainer/educators were uniformly positive. The following paraphrase of anonymous written evaluations from trainers characterizes the nature of the responses: "You recognized and appreciated the skills we had as we started this workshop. That really helped. It made it easier for me to pick up and integrate some of the new material that made the most sense to me. I will be able to use many of the ideas about empowering leadership in my Dakota LEADers Work." It seems to us that the success of this three-year program will depend upon the ability of the Dakota LEADers Project to continue to embrace community-wide empowering processes. Our concern is that the potentially-blinding schemas of "Do as taught" and "Fear as told," which historically tend to reinforce hierarchical relationships, middle-age male status, and other conservative and/or traditional attitudes will limit the integration of creative new visions of elders, women, youth, and diverse partnerships as necessary resources.

When there have been crises in the rural areas, the tendency has been to do the same thing "harder" and to keep quiet about one's troubles. In contrast, the Empowering Community Leadership approach urges the sharing of personal issues in a open and honest manner, and reflecting together upon new resources (to integrate into, no replace, traditional ways.) However, it is not yet clear to us that the people on the teams or in the communities will devote the necessary time to establish a diverse base of honest and trusting relationships as they begin doing things that they think will make an economic difference in their communities.

Each six-person team was to be composed of a representative from the farming/ranching/mining, religious, political, medical, economic/business, and educational sectors of the community. But it is already apparent that volunteers from the political and economic/business sectors are easy to find, whereas those from the religious and medical sectors are more reluctant to volunteer (or to be asked to participate?). Church congregations are an absolute mainstay in almost all rural communities in the Dakotas, yet in past development projects they have been virtually ignored (as have the elderly, the youth, and all too frequently, the women).

Whether the Dakota LEADers Project will have more success in empowering a larger segment of the community remains to be seen. But in communities where a wide range of people is seen as a resource, becomes actively empowered, and participates fully, we suspect that a richer quality of life and a broader economic base can more easily be created than in the past.

---

Rutgers University—University of Medicine and Dentistry of New Jersey—CMHC Prevention Program Receives National Validation

The Improving Social Awareness-Social Problem Solving (ISA-SPS) Project, a decade-old collaboration among Rutgers University, the UMDNJ-CMHC at Piscataway, and the New Jersey public schools, has received federal approval by the U.S. Department of Education's Program Effectiveness Panel as a nationally validated prevention and social competence promotion program. Furthermore, this was followed up by the ISA-SPS Project's receiving a 4-year Developer/Demonstrator grant from the U.S. Department of Education's National Diffusion Network. These funds are earmarked to assist program dissemination in key states surrounding New Jersey, with gradual expansion into more distant states.

The main thrust of the ISA-SPS Project is to train educators and parents in curriculum-based and systems-level techniques to foster thoughtful social decision making, self-control, and social awareness and group participation among regular and special education students. While the focus is on elementary schools, research and development work is progressing in the area of middle school programs. Individuals and/or leadership teams from school buildings or districts are trained either at the ISA-APA Project's Continuing Education Center for Social Competence Promotion and Prevention at the Rutgers Center for Applied Psychology, or on-site at the district, conducted by a training team from ISA-SPS Project's service delivery arm, the Social Problem Solving Program at the UMDNJ-CMHC at Piscataway, directed by John Clabby.

Approval by the P.E.P. followed submission of extensive documentation of project findings, organized as "claims" to be substantiated. These materials were reviewed by educational researchers; only programs receiving a certain rating or above are granted approval. From 1987-89, only 14 projects for all areas of education received P.E.P. approval. The ISA-SPS Project is among very, very few validated projects devoted to social competence promotion and a primary prevention emphasis. The NDN funding allows the Project to establish a liaison with NDN facilitators for public and private schools in all 50 states. These facilitators work to help get P.E.P.-approved and NDN-funded programs into the schools.

For further information, write to Maurice Elias, Co-Director, ISA-SPS Project, Rutgers University, Livingston Campus, Tillett Hall, New Brunswick, NJ 08903.
Spreading the Word about Community Psychology through Undergraduate Textbooks

written in collaboration with Mark A. Small, University of Nebraska, Lincoln

As noted previously in this column, (James Cook, "Undergraduate Education in Community Psychology: A Call for Action," Fall, 1987) there is little or no mention of community psychology in introductory psychology textbooks for undergraduates. This omission is also noticeable in undergraduate texts for social, developmental, and abnormal psychology. In addition, community psychology, when it is covered, is often described in terms of community mental health concepts and interventions. The distinctive interests, values, and work of community psychologists are not communicated (Cook, 1987). Consequently, students become exposed to the concepts and ideas of community psychology relatively late in their psychological education, if at all. Because many of these classes are surveys of topics in a particular field, they should include some mention of the particular orientation of community psychology.

One strategy for exposing undergraduate students to community psychology is to attempt to have placed in textbooks some information about community psychology, or at the very least provide some instructors with some materials they may use to convey the essence of community psychology. Therefore, the Council of Community Psychology Program Directors has commissioned a project to construct a packet or set of packets that may be of use to textbook authors and instructors. Gary Melton and Mark Small, at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, are collaborating on this project.

Each packet will include a (a) table of contents, (b) a brief description of community psychology, (c) an outline of a sample lecture, (d) a brief annotated topical outline of community theory, research, and practice, (e) 10-15 "boxes" that highlight various aspects of community psychology, (f) reprints of excerpts about community psychology, and (g) a reference section pointing out various additional sources of information about community psychology. The project is nearing completion; one decision still remaining is whether to distribute one packet for all of the four courses listed above, or to assemble four packets, each addressed to a particular course.

After review, the packet will be available for any community psychologist interested in "spreading the word." Indeed, the success of the project hinges on community psychologists providing colleagues with information about community psychology and the current neglect of community psychology in textbooks. Only by disseminating information about what community psychology is all about will the discipline achieve its deserved status.

If you have any suggestions concerning this project, or if you wish to review or receive a packet when available, please contact Mark A. Small, Psychology Department, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, NE 68504.

The experiences reported by Jean Ann Linney at the East Lansing Biennial Conference suggest that we need not only a packet, but a strategy for systems change. She reported successful lobbying of a colleague and textbook author, who agreed to read key community psychology articles and write a section for his introductory text. However, the author's addition of community psychology material to his next edition was stricken by the publisher. Publishers, in a sense, are conservative—they gauge the appropriateness of textbook content in part by examining what competing textbooks cover (and sometimes by surveys of instructors). Thus we need to educate not only textbook authors, but textbook salesmen, editors, colleagues who make textbook selections, and possible others. Perhaps a coordinated strategy is needed. In the Community Psychology Education Connection, we wish to continue discussion of this topic, and of the general issue of the visibility of community psychology to undergraduates. Send your ideas or potential columns to Maurice or Jim, or call us, at the addresses above.
Caroline Sparks: Living Feminist Psychology
Gloria Levin, Editor

A major element of Caroline's nature is entrepreneurship, i.e., creating new programs to address needs. Her family has a history of civic and church activism, so she comes by her public entrepreneurship naturally. She was raised in Birmingham, Alabama and was a young adult during the civil rights movement in the early 1960s. Although she was appalled at the violence taking place in her state, her actions were restricted to "arguing with super-conservative, southern white males" at her undergraduate school, Auburn University. She was a liberal intellectual, but not an activist.

A series of events in her life transformed Caroline into the social activist she is now. "One of the watershed events of my life was sitting down with the New York Times (and comparing it with the Birmingham newspaper) during the civil rights marches. I realized with a shock what had actually been happening." The making of her as a feminist activist came from experiencing rejection and career blockages as a female. "I had to finally get a direct connection to something that was oppressive happening to me to become an activist in my own behalf and in behalf of other women."

She often thinks about what will motivate today's young women to identify with feminism, noting that they are experiencing discrimination later in life than had her age cohorts. However, young people are becoming activated as access to abortions is threatened. Another galvanizing issue for young women is violence against their bodies. Interestingly, this issue—which developed out of the earliest consciousness raising groups—prompted many women from her generation to become feminist activists.

When asked to discuss the relevance of the organized field of community psychology to her work, Caroline observed: "It's a mystery to me why community psychology isn't talking about feminist issues more. I think the work I am doing easily fits within a community psychology framework, but I feel isolated from the developments in the field, in general."

(Caroline Sparks, Ph.D., can be contacted at The Feminist Institute, P.O. Box 30563, Bethesda, Maryland 20814. If you would like to be featured in this column in a future issue or can nominate a "living community psychologist," contact Gloria Levin, 7327 University Avenue, Glen Echo, Maryland 20812.)
Promoting Health by Martin McCarthy, Jr.

The American Public Health Association Annual Meeting in Chicago in mid-October was large and chaotic and informal and friendly. Like an APA convention, but more interactive and democratic. A real cornucopia of information and people. The organization has fewer members than APA, but it is a large entity (approximately 51,000 members), and like APA it is divided into sub-divisions with more specific focus.

The membership includes a full range of health care, social science, research methodology, intervention methodology, and statistical disciplines. APHA is also politically effective, and can and does influence national health policy.

A number of papers by community psychologists were presented under various auspices at the Fall meeting. Len Jason from DePaul University, in association with collaborators from other universities in Chicago, described a broadcast multi-media based AIDS prevention program. Beth Weitzman and Beth Shinn, of the New York University community program (with Jim Knickman, a health economist at the Graduate School of Public Administration at NYU), participated in a session on psychiatric epidemiology. They presented a paper on mental health problems as risk factors for family homelessness. Susan Hughes and colleagues from Northwestern (including Martin McCarthy), presented an evaluation of the effectiveness of a national program to coordinate community-based home care services for the elderly. Brian Flay, a social psychologist and director of the Prevention Research Center at the University of Illinois at Chicago, presented research on media influences on substance abuse, and on drug education strategies. David Altman, from the Stanford Health Promotion Resource Center in Palo Alto, authored a number of papers at the meeting, including an analysis of effective coalitions to enhance community health promotion activities.

It seems to me that a natural alliance of values and interests exists between community psychologists and public health workers. Both groups subscribe to an ecological perspective. Both wish to promote the health and mental health and well-being of individuals, considered in their social context. Both focus on primary prevention issues. Both develop interventions that are intended to strengthen the competencies of groups and populations. Both follow an ethic that includes the measurement and evaluation of programmatic efforts. Both value equity and social justice, and actively foster social change.

An awareness of these commonalities has been growing among Division 27 members since the early 1980's. (While this statement is certainly true for this Division member, it may have been the case even earlier for other people.) Ira Iscoe, in an article about community health psychology in the August, 1982 American Psychologist, reiterated the familiar, important themes of moving beyond a one-to-one treatment orientation to identifying and promoting the health and mental health needs of entire communities. Lourdes Garcia-Averastri, and others, in an instructive series of articles in the Journal of Community Psychology for 1985 discuss the structure and functioning of community health and community medicine programs in Cuba and Puerto Rico. George Albee, in many of his writings, has subscribed to a public health philosophy for the primary prevention of psychopathology (see his article in the American Psychologist, August, 1986). Cheryl Perry and colleagues (in the June, 1988, Journal of Clinical and Consulting Psychology) describe the need for an increasingly multi-disciplinary research focus, in developing community-wide strategies for the prevention of cardiovascular disease in youth. David Altman, drawing on the 15 year knowledge base of the Stanford Heart Disease Prevention Program, has presented a framework for evaluating community-based prevention programs (in Social and Science and Medicine, for February, 1986).

It would seem that the history of the public health movement in England and the United States (and more recently in the developing countries) can provide some useful lessons and models for community psychology. For instance, it is a well-documented fact that the most dramatic increases in life expectancy have resulted from public health measures emphasizing prevention rather than the cure of disease. In the large cities of Great Britain during the middle part of the 19th century, the average age at death was 36 years for the gentry, 22 years for tradespeople, and 16 years of age for working class people. Following a series of revolutionary epidemiologic studies, highly effective public health sanitation programs and educational efforts in personal hygiene were instituted. Over a sixty year period these community-side interventions resulted in a doubling and tripling of the life span, and reduced the amount of variation in mortality between social classes. (See John Hanlon and George Pickering's 1984 edition of Public Health, and other texts for more discussion on this history.)

Perhaps the learning curve for efforts to improve the quality of life and mental health within communities can be even more dramatic, with a steeper slope. The health promotion revolution has certainly been proceeding quickly, with notable reductions in the prevalence of cardiovascular diseases. If Arthur Schlesinger's hypothesis about cycles in American history is correct, we are on the edge of another era of progressivism. There will be opportunities to participate in another round of cultural change and in the construction of a more genuinely supportive social infrastructure.

As we move towards the end of this century, environmental, lifestyle, and stress-related disorders are increasingly significant sources of health problems in American society. This column will be reporting on the activities of a number of the APHA Sections that are concerned with affecting the causes of morbidity and mortality and improving the well-being of communities. A partial list of the Sections includes: Community Health Planning, Mental Health, Alcohol and Drugs, Maternal and Child Health, Gerontological Health, Environment, International Health, Public Health Education, and various Minority and Women's Caucuses. This column will also serve as a forum to highlight community-wide health promotion and disease prevention programs, and to identify cost-effective resources available on the Community Psychology side of the interface.

Well, that's the menu and the first course. I would like to hear from people who have thoughts on this plan of action and/or news to report. I would also appreciate hearing about projects just starting up or accounts of work in progress. Perhaps at some time we could set up an electronic network on some information utility such as BITNET or GENIE or COMPUSERVE. Appropriate protection from computer viruses will be made available. In the meanwhile I will be compiling a listing of community psychologists and public health researchers working in these areas. Let me know if you would like to be included and participate.

Martin McCarthy, Ph.D., is Assistant Director of the Center for Health Services and Policy Research, at Northwestern University. He is a graduate of the New York University Community Psychology program, and is interested in the social marketing of health promotion and disease prevention programs, among other things. His office address is 629 Noyes Street, Evanston, IL 60208.
Abortion, the *Webster* Decision, and Psychology

Elsie R. Shore

*Wichita State University*

The recent Supreme Court ruling known as the *Webster* decision has significantly altered America's response to the issue of abortion. Across the country states are considering changes in their abortion laws while citizens who have been silent are becoming more active in the political process. It seems likely that psychologists also may become involved or be called upon to enter the debate.

In 1969, five years before the Supreme Court ruled in *Roe v. Wade* that a state may not unduly restrict a woman's right to an abortion, the American Psychological Association (APA) identified freedom of reproductive choice as a mental health and child welfare issue. Since that time, APA has been involved in the abortion issue, offering expert testimony at government hearings and submitting *amicus* briefs in selected abortion cases.

In 1989 the APA Board of Directors ordered the development of a state-of-the-science paper on psychological responses to abortion. A panel of abortion research experts found many methodological flaws in the existing studies, including failure to use representative samples or appropriate comparison groups, failure to use scientifically sound measures of subjects' psychological condition or include factors which may influence vulnerability to stress, and failure to assess response to abortion over time. The studies did, however, demonstrate repeated findings and permit the panel to draw conclusions regarding the psychological effect of abortion on women.

The data showed that both unwanted pregnancy and abortion are stressful for most women, but that, for the vast majority, abortion relieves the stress of unwanted pregnancy. Although negative emotions such as guilt are also reported, the most common emotions reported are relief and happiness. The negative psychological consequences experienced by women usually are mild and tend to diminish rapidly over time. The panel stated that there is no evidence of the existence of a post-abortion syndrome.

The proportions of women reporting negative effects range from one-half percent to fifteen percent of the samples, with most studies reporting about ten percent negative responses. As with other stressful life events, level of support from significant others is probably the single most important determinant of psychological reaction to abortion. Women who initially intended to become pregnant, those with preexisting serious emotional problems, younger women, and those with negative religious or cultural attitudes toward abortion were found to be more vulnerable to negative consequences.

At its annual meeting in August 1989, the APA Council of Representatives passed a resolution calling for the dissemination of scientific information on abortion in order to counter false assertions being made in the debate. I became involved in the APA initiative by offering to disseminate information in my state. With the support of my department, I sent summaries of APA information to psychological associations, attorneys, and members of the state legislature. If you would like to become involved, you can receive research reports, *amicus* briefs, press releases, and other information from Gwendolyn P. Keita, Ph.D., Director of Women's Programs, Public Interest Directorate, APA, 1200 Seventeenth Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20036.

Although the provision of accurate scientific information to policymakers is part of the psychologist's role, it is not without hazard. Instead of viewing my efforts as educational, one state senator accused me of using state funds for lobbying, causing me and a number of people at my university some anxiety. There are, of course, no restrictions on your activities as a psychologist acting as a private citizen. I suggest, however, that you have the support of your colleagues before entering any activities under the auspices of your employer. Check with Gwendolyn Keita at APA, or with any legal or other experts if you have any other questions or concerns. You can call me, too, and we'll talk about the challenges of being a community psychologist.

---

*Elsie Shore can be contacted at the Department of Psychology, Wichita State University, Wichita, KS 67208, (316) 689-3170.*
The Making of an American Psychologist: An Autobiography

This autobiography would be better named "The Making of a Remarkable American Psychologist," thus characterizing its author as well as his book. Sarason is known for his clarity of thought and his ability to combine several approaches into one coherent whole. In the reviewer's judgment, the book epitomizes Sarason at his best. In some ways, it reads like a novel. A boy from a poor Jewish immigrant family somehow makes it to college and then beyond expectations goes on to graduate study for a Ph.D. in psychology. His first job is in an institution for the retarded, where his seminal work has enormous influence in the field. He then moves into academia and gains respect and tenure in a prestigious department of a conservative university. All the while, he maintains fierce independence of thought, defying pressures to specialize while carving out a name for himself amongst the greats in American Psychology. He influences the lives and careers of many of his students who also go on to be recognized in their own right. It's the American dream come true, only our hero does not join the establishment. He disagrees with it and rails against its misdirection and failure to deal with the subject matter that he considers essential for psychology.

It is for this reason that some persons may find this to be a very difficult and controversial book, he challenges the very premises on which American Psychology has rested and still rests today. For Sarason, psychology is not a closed system like physics, and the truly productive laboratories of psychology should not be located for the most part in universities, but rather in more natural settings such as schools and communities. By taking into account relevant cultural and environmental factors, Sarason's approach runs contrary to psychology's search for general laws of human behavior, independent of context, which Sarason feels occupy so much of the efforts of contemporary psychological research with so little to show for it in terms of our knowledge of social behavior and contributing little to the betterment of the human condition.

He cogently expresses his disappointment about the misdirection of psychology's efforts. He has done so in his past writings and presentations, but somehow in this book, he brings it all together. The rub is what he considers psychology's failure to address vigorously the task of dealing with the complexities of human beings: how they live and interact, how they develop or fail to develop feelings of belongingness and how they survive and cope. Basically, he is dealing with the aims and goals of a viable community psychology: one less concerned with psychic casualties and more concerned with the rich variety of human behaviors.

The book is also a welcome and rich history of the development of psychology, from the end of World War II (1945) to the present, a period of enormous growth. Older psychologists may tune into this part of the book more readily, but it is really younger psychologists and graduate students who would profit the most from it. Right after the war, psychology moved out of basements and attics into buildings of its own. Clinical psychology, fueled by financial support from the Veteran's Administration and later the National Institute of Mental Health, became a major area of study. Sarason expresses his dismay that American Psychology, in the form of clinical, directed so much of its energies to the "repair" of World War II psychiatric casualties. In doing so, he makes it clear that he is not against clinical, but the way that clinical psychology was taught and utilized. He expresses his disappointment as follows: "What I regret is that the emphasis on individual repairs has played into, indeed reflects, the Achilles' heel of American Psychology: its ahistorical, acultural view of the human psyche, a view impossibly both to the stance of prevention and to an understanding of life in America" (p. 400). For Sarason a much better and productive approach would have been the fostering of healthy human development, by psychologists working in public school systems, and directly with families, children and neighborhoods and dealing with a multitude of problems. Prevention and early intervention are the bywords. Since this approach was not followed, clinical psychology moved towards becoming much more guild and professionally-oriented. Sarason foresees the current schism in the American Psychological Association.

A reviewer frequently tries to "hook into" the motivations of a writer. Sarason helps us greatly in his first chapter entitled "Why Write One's Own Biography?" It is a fascinating ten pages. We find out he always wanted to be a journalist, and this may very well explain, for the reviewer at least, Sarason's ability to write so clearly about so many subjects. He also notes that he has followed a model of working on areas for a period of time, writing them up, and then turning to some of the new possibilities that his previous work has suggested. This is of course the exact opposite of narrow specialization.

Another aspect of this book is its intensely intimate and human quality. He takes us into his inner life, the processes involved in his recognizing and understanding his religious and ethnic origins, and his reasons for accepting certain types of employment and for espousing certain positions and approaches, some of them quite radical. He writes about his family, heroes, his collaborators, and others (not all of them psychologists) who have been of great significance to him in his personal life and academic career. The readers, even the readers who think that they have known Sarason well, may be in for some surprises here. All in all, this aspect of the book gives us a glimpse of the many influences that went into the making of a distinguished psychologist. Throughout the book he gives even-handed treatment to his critics and to persons with whom he strongly disagrees. In doing so, Sarason gives ample proof that he understands their positions and the research and motivations that led up to these positions. Many well-known names are up in various contests. Older readers will of course be more familiar with some of these key figures, but many younger readers will gain new perspectives.

The book makes a distinct contribution to American Psychology. It is especially appropriate for readers young and old with community psychology interests. Sarason reminds us again and again about the enormous complexity of human beings and the need to study and understand their behavior within their social context and support settings. The networks that connect individuals and groups are worthy areas of study and should be pursued avidly by psychologists. There is need for a genuine clinical psychology as opposed to a psychotherapeutic approach with a single individual or a small group.

For community psychologists, this book has a special significance: Will Sarason's recommended approaches fall on deaf ears or will psychology begin to change itsDirections towards an examination of the human condition and a myriad of social problems? He reminds us that after World War II and in the late '50s and
60s, psychology was little involved in dealing with key social issues. For the reviewer, as long as the laboratory of psychology remains in psychology buildings, there will be no great changes. The last chapter is difficult and very thought-provoking for all of psychology. Sarason questions whether American Psychology has a core. This is a question best left for readers to interpret themselves. For him, the major problem in the modern world is: 

"achieving a sense of community, the sense that you are not alone in the world, the only sense that can withstand the loss of the sense of transcendence” (p. 424).

Sarason, iconoclast to the last, asserts that "any psychology that does not comprehend that need for achieving a sense of community does not understand the public welfare" (p. 424). To which all dedicated community psychologists say "Amen."

Reviewed by Ira Isaac
University of Texas, Austin

---


Levine and Perkins have co-authored the first general textbook written in the 1980's for advanced undergraduate and graduate courses in community psychology. In so doing, they have performed a valuable service to the field and filled an increasingly critical gap in teaching resources. Levine and Perkins characterize community psychology as a way of thinking and declare their intention "to develop that way of thinking and to show how the perspective is applicable to a wide range of problems in contemporary society" (p. 3). They also examine community psychology as an ideology (i.e., set of beliefs) and as a scientific discipline.

The book is organized into an introduction and 12 chapters that present the major values, goals, beliefs, and scientific findings of community psychology. Woven throughout it are the now-familiar themes of social and historical context; community mental health; the ecological analogy; stress, coping, and social support; primary and secondary prevention; and community development and social action. Somewhat less familiar are extensive discussions of alternative conceptualizations of the environment, labeling theory, self-help, and school desegregation.

As a test, the book has many significant strengths. The authors do not shrink from addressing the difficult and controversial questions asked by students. For example, they plainly state that ecology as a fundamental metaphor in community psychology is consistent with democracy and equality as political objectives. They also explain, with abundant illustration, why problem definitions, research methods, ideological values, and the observer's social position are inseparable. Regarding the question of when the community psychologist should engage in social intervention, Levine and Perkins answer "whenever such means are necessary in advancing the core values of the profession — i.e., adaptive change in individuals and communities, prevention of disorder, enhancement of positive mental health, and protection of the free expression of human differences and cultural diversity" (p. 330).

Levine and Perkins are far from gung-ho interventionists, however. They repeatedly emphasize the simplistic, fragmentary nature of the theories which characterize community psychology, labeling them "the primary scientific shortcoming" (p. 63) of the field. Moreover, the authors stress, again with abundant illustration, the inherent danger of unintended consequences. Finally, they often speak more glowingly about the social changes brought about by ordinary citizens dealing with extraordinary circumstances than by supposedly more expert professionals.

The first chapter is an unusually creative and thought provoking development of the proposition that "life is a soap opera." By this Levine and Perkins mean that serious problems in living are normative, not exceptional. Given extensive epidemiological evidence, they make a strong case that many shortcomings of present human services can be traced to the erroneous assumption that most people will require services only briefly or not at all. Levine and Perkins argue for an epidemiology of events (as opposed to cases), which would reorient our thinking away from individuals and toward prevention of stressful situations.

Other especially valuable chapters are 3 (the ecological analogy), 6 (adaptation, crisis, coping, and support), and 8 (self-help). The treatment given each of these topics is among the best I have seen. Throughout the book, examples, illustrations, and case histories are used extensively to assist the reader. For example, different types of social support are clearly presented by referring to different kinds of assistance received from a well-functioning family. Each chapter is well summarized in a concluding section and has its own reference list. Footnotes are used skillfully and the transition between chapters is consciously facilitated. The writing style is crisp and clear. Obviously, the authors and/or a very competent editor take great care to smooth the flow of information.

No textbook of this breadth can be flawless, however. Psychodynamic concepts and language appear surprisingly frequently in a book of this nature. Labeling theory is presented extensively but apologetically, as if the authors themselves couldn't make up their minds about its value. Discussions of group sex and women's consciousness raising groups gave this reader an eerie feeling of being caught in a time warp. The confusion surrounding treatment versus tertiary prevention is acknowledged but continued by employing the two terms interchangeably. The chapters dealing with social intervention seem less well organized than others, with case histories preceding rather than following general principles and approaches.

The above quibbles and nitpicks should not overshadow the fact that Levine and Perkins have done an admirable job of presenting community psychology as an exciting, relevant, developing discipline. In my opinion, they fulfilled their intention very well and, to their credit, have produced the leading textbook in the field.

--- Reviewed by Bruce M. Tefft
University of Manitoba

The Ghetto Underclass: Social Science Perspectives. Edited by William Julius Wilson, In The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science. This volume of twelve articles on the underclass, edited by noted sociologist William Julius Wilson, offers multidisciplinary perspectives on the problems, processes, and proposed solutions of the growing urban underclass in America. The authors basically represent two divergent views of the underlying causes of the underclass, i.e., those who focus on macro-level structural and technological changes in the economy vs. those who focus on micro-level individual and group values, attitudes, and behaviors. While these views are not necessarily mutually exclusive, their qualitative difference is reflected in the lack of a precise and uniformly accepted definition of "the urban underclass" throughout this volume.

The "structuralists," represented by Wilson, Kasarda, Testa, McLanahan and Garfinkel, Tienda, Reischauer, Rossi and Wright, present convincing economic and demographic evidence that the major transition from a predominantly manufacturing and industrial economy to an information-processing and high technology economy has caused profound economic dislocations in Black male employment patterns and rates, thus contributing significantly to high unemployment rates, increased levels of family poverty, and accelerated social disorganization in inner-city communities. Kasarda's analysis of the relationship between urban industrial change, residential segregation and characteristics of the unskilled Black labor force lends strong support to the argument that there is a "mismatch" between the growth of specific job categories in the cities and suburbs and the lack of adequate education, job skills or transportation among these inner-city Black males. In her analysis of the higher poverty rates among Puerto Ricans as compared to other Hispanic groups, Marta Tienda also documents the effects of structural factors such as labor market stratification and the preference for certain ethnic groups in particular industries, a pattern that favors Mexicans and Cubans at the expense of Puerto Ricans, who are not associated with a specific labor market niche. Relevant to the issue of labor market stratification is Robert Reischauer's article on the impact of immigrant labor on the employment rate of
Blacks. As Wilson himself suggests in the final summary article, Reischauer's conclusion that immigration has had very little significant impact on native-born Black employment is based on rather old 1980 census data which will soon be supplanted by 1990 results. In addition, overall employment and unemployment statistics should be disaggregated so that the impact of immigration in specific cities such as Miami, Los Angeles and Houston, which have all experienced a large influx of immigrants in the past decade, can be analyzed for its effect on local pools of Black labor.

The findings of Testa and his colleagues that employment of single fathers and higher earnings of single women actually enhance marriage rates among inner-city Blacks contradict arguments that both welfare and higher female wages have negative effects on decisions of low-income employed men to marry. While McLanahan and Garfinkel recognize the contribution of male joblessness to the increase in female-headed families, their analysis of the factors which reinforce the "weak attachment" of these single mothers to the labor force fails to address the problems of low-education, poor work skills, and the lack of suitable job for this isolated group, as earlier delineated by Kasarda. Similarly, in their article on the "literally homeless," Rossi and Wright draw conclusions based on a Chicago sample, which does not reflect the growing number of homeless families with children who are increasingly straining the resources of cities like San Francisco, New York, and Washington, D.C. and whose problems require a different set of policies and programs.

In contrast to the economic demographic analyses of the "structuralists," the "behaviorists," represented by Anderson, Mercer and Mead, place greater emphasis on cultural, attitudinal and behavioral factors as underlying causes or major determinants of the problems of the underclass. Anderson's ethnographic study of sex codes and family interactions among inner-city Black youth, based on a small sample of poor youth and adults, presents a portrait of irresponsible and exploitative sexual relationships reinforced by male peer-group bonding and negative female expectations. Although Anderson's analysis lends implicit support to the conservative notion that Black Teenagers make conscious decisions to have babies out-of-wedlock to gain a welfare check, there is no empirical evidence to support this argument. Sullivan, in his analysis of the multiple effects of economic, social and cultural factors on unwed inner-city fathers, offers a more differentiated picture of competing attitudes and value systems of these young men. Notwithstanding the limitations of the ethnographic approach with very small samples of young Black, Puerto Rican, and white males, Sullivan's findings underscore the significance of differential job opportunities in decisions of single fathers to marry the mothers of their children. Mead's thesis, that inconsistent work patterns and negative attitudes toward low-wage jobs are major factors in the growth of the underclass, is contradicted by Kadara's careful analysis of economic dislocation in the inner cities as well as survey findings that Blacks and whites share similar work orientations. Moreover, Mead dismisses the "mismatch" theory of low-employment rates in the inner city by ignoring credible research which seriously undermines his rather naive views.

As Pearson (1989) recently pointed out in his critique of research on urban underclass, the current literature fails to identify and analyze...the processes that link changes at the macro level of the economy, culture or polity to the formation, maintenance, or prevention and remediation of the problems that fall within the conceptual umbrella of the urban underclass" (p. 23). Moreover, ideological biases have contributed to faulty assumptions, problematic research designs, and selective interpretations of data in order to advance particular political agendas rather than advance our understanding of a very complex social phenomenon.

The policy options recommended by these authors further reflect their underlying biases and assumptions about the causes of the underclass. The general consensus of the structuralists is to propose a set of comprehensive social welfare and employment policies which would address the problems of poverty, unemployment, and social isolation. While these proposals are certainly not new, the striking aspect is the unanimity of the scholars across disciplines that full employment, restructured family income supports, universal health care, low-income housing, increased job training, and counseling will greatly reduce the size of the urban underclass. Support for workplace was mixed, suggesting that more research is necessary to demonstrate its effectiveness. Hochschild's plea that comprehensive structural reforms in America's economic and social institutions are necessary to open up equal opportunity for the underclass recalls earlier cautions against piecemeal and incremental solutions to the massive social problems of this country. Perhaps Nathan's innovative challenge to public policy and behavioral science scholars to engage in collaborative consultation and evaluation research on the implementation of new programs and policies will energize a new generation of intellectuals to become involved in promoting and facilitating institutional change with the ultimate goal of eliminating the causes and consequences of the urban underclass.

Reference

--- Reviewed by Jewell Taylor Gibbs
University of California at Berkeley


With the increase in the number of homeless, there has been a parallel increase in the number of articles, dissertations, and books about them. It sometimes seems as though the more that is printed, the more controversy there is about the number of homeless as well as the causes. This may be because each study looks at only a part of the phenomenon, usually in only one major city, and sometimes deals with only one subgroup within that city, e.g., homeless families in Boston.

Ropers describes his book as "essentially a case study of the Los Angeles homeless population" (p. 31). He defines 'invisible homeless' as "those who are temporarily 'doubling up' with friends or relatives and those living in SRO's and other rooming houses" (p. 177). Despite his title, Ropers reports no data on those who were doubling up.

In the first chapters Ropers presents his data from two studies. One was based on interviews with some of those considered traditional homeless—residing in shelters, eating meals at a soup kitchen, and congregating in an empty lot known as a hangout for homeless individuals. The second was based on interviews with residents of SRO's in the skid row area of Los Angeles.

Next Ropers presents an explanation of homelessness, including a brief historical overview of homelessness from the Civil War era to the present, and a detailed examination of how recent changes in the economy and society have differentially affected minorities, especially blacks. 'Social disaffiliation' is next presented as the common characteristic among all defined as homeless; the long term unemployed (a group Ropers feels has been ignored by much of the existing research), alcoholics and substance abusers, and the chronically mentally ill (a group Ropers argues has received more attention than their numbers warrant). Ropers asserts that prolonged unemployment leads to housing displacement and consequent social disaffiliation. Using quotes from Karl Marx to argue that unemployment is an inherent consequence of capitalism, he concludes that without the safety nets of adequate welfare payments and low income housing, homelessness is an inevitable consequence of the current economic system.

In the last three chapters Ropers presents his solutions. First, he argues that creating more shelters while preserving and upgrading SRO's, although necessary and desirable, will not reduce but only institutionalize homelessness. Next he presents one possible way to fight homelessness—in the courts. As a result of a series of lawsuits filed by the Homeless Litigation Team against the county of Los Angeles, the general relief (GR) monthly allowance was increased, ID requirements and waiting periods for GR were dropped, assistance was provided to help applicants obtain GR, monies for emergency housing were increased, and SRO's in violation of city codes were excluded from the emergency shelter system. Finally, Ropers concludes that the solution to homelessness requires a major national low-income housing program, a national public works program, and a revision of the present welfare system.

This book is not without weaknesses. The designation of SRO residents as a homeless

This book provides an extended review of the literature on the role of socially supportive relationships in promoting health and buffering the harmful health effects of stress. The book is organized into two major sections encompassing eleven separate chapters. In the first section the author provides a succinct history of current interest in the concept of social support in the fields of sociology and psychology, followed by a review of current approaches to measurement. Subsequent chapters review the research evidence supporting alternative models of the effects of social support, discuss possible mechanisms for such effects, and suggest ecological variables such as social class which might alter the meaning and effects of social support. The second major section reviews interventions designed to promote social support. As with the first section the author first discusses general issues relevant to the design of such interventions, and then moves on to a more specific level in discussing illustrative approaches, such as mutual help groups. The final chapter of the book provides a brief reiteration of major points made in each of the previous chapters.

There are several positive features of this book worth noting. The review of the literature is thorough while at the same time not being mechanical. The author makes repeated attempts at synthesis and effectively uses tables, figures, and concluding sections to bring together the discussion and point to needed future research directions. The book is particularly good at capturing the complexity of conceptual issues which underly research with this construct (really a meta-construct as the author aptly points out). This includes explicit recognition that social support has both structural and functional features and is sensitive to developmental concerns, as well as exhibiting variations by gender, social class, ethnicity, and other ecological variables. Although this book often and necessarily treats such topics with some brevity, the sections do provide the reader with a useful introduction to a wide variety of topics in the field. For the seasoned researcher, these chapters provide useful insights into continuing debates (e.g., the main effects vs. buffering issues). For the more general consumer, this literature the book represents a useful roadmap into a complex area of research. The chapters on research instruments will also provide useful to those searching for ways to approach the measurement issue, without promising any quick fixes. In short, the review of the literature presented here will stand alongside, and in some ways goes beyond, some excellent reviews that have appeared in journals within the last five years.

One limiting feature of the review presented in this book is that it fails to adequately incorporate studies of a more experimental nature. The large literature in social psychology on help-giving and help-receiving is barely mentioned here. For example, the sometimes excellent papers contained in the three-volume "New Directions in Helping" series edited by Fisher, Nadler, and DePaulo are not discussed. This is not a surprising oversight given that the social support literature evolving from social epidemiology and utilizing non-experimental methods has evolved largely in parallel to this largely experimental social psychological research, but an opportunity was missed here to exploit the natural connections that exist between these fields.

The second section begins with an overview of conceptual issues relevant to the design and implementation of support interventions, which is followed by a discussion of illustrative types of such interventions. Such a format helps connect this part of the book with the previous discussion of research. Although not written as a how-to manual, these chapters do provide valuable guidelines to practitioners seeking to implement and also evaluate support interventions. It is always difficult to know how to organize such a review. The author decides to contrast types of interventions based on the social level of analysis (e.g., focusing on couples, families, groups, or communities). An alternative, and perhaps more effective, strategy would have been to illustrate support interventions around specific types of problems or stressors, such as bereavement, unemployment, physical or mental illness, divorce, etc. Such an approach may have provided a better view of how support interventions may complement or conflict with other forms of interventions (e.g., individual-based therapy or medical interventions).

Overall, this must be considered an important book at this time in the development of this field of research and practice. The author has done a fine job in pulling together work on social support theory, research, and intervention which up to now existed piecemeal in journal articles and a few edited volumes. His own status as a solid researcher in the field also adds legitimacy to the author's more speculative viewpoints. There is no question that this will become a widely cited work.

Reviewed by John Eckenrode
Cornell University


This practical, yet theoretically based volume is very readable. It summarizes much of the relevant research in health psychology without getting bogged down in details. Stress is dealt with from psychology, personality, family systems, social, occupational, feminist, and environmental perspectives. Several chapters

Reviewed by Walter Rucker
Illinois Masonic Medical Center
cover the how-to of stress management, nutrition, and exercise. Graduate and undergraduate classes in health education, health psychology, or community psychology can easily incorporate this book. It would also be highly relevant to behavioral science classes for medical students, nursing students, or other health professionals in training. Finally, it can provide a quick overview or review for health professionals. Professionals who have worked extensively in the area may find the chapters on areas outside their specialty to be useful. Community psychologists, for example, may welcome the concise reviews of stress physiology or various relaxation strategies.

This volume does, however, gloss over some important teaching points, makes some questionable assumptions, and presents some inaccurate information. I would therefore not recommend it as a self-help manual; however, an instructor would be able to provide corrected information and stimulate class discussions around the unsupported assumptions.

In the introductory chapter, 50% of all deaths were attributed to health behavior. This sounds as though it were the major cause of these deaths. This is overly simplistic and misses an opportunity to illustrate multivariable causation. The chapter is riddled with jargon, and skeptical readers may simply close the book at this point. It reads like a persuasion experiment...but why bother writing this way, since we know that information on the benefits of health behavior does not change behavior anyway?

In the chapter introducing stress theories, I found the distinctions between anxiety, conflict, frustration, and hassles to be quite useful. Unfortunately the examples used in defining stress were biased toward professionals. People without professional employment suffer from stress too! The section on "Type A" behavior pattern in women was worded in a way that could be considered sexist: Women who work in the home would not be pleased to find that the author does not include them in the category of "working women," which is clearly meant to denote employed women. The chapter on family stress defined family as a relationship by love, marriage, procreation, and mutual dependency. What about the families of gay and lesbian couples, or unwed couples? The chapter on victimization tells us that potential crime victims can protect themselves via "assertive use of law enforcement." The catch with this, however, is that in some areas police surveillance and intervention is insufficient.

A major concern with the information presented on personality and stress is that the discussion of the Type A behavior pattern presents it as 1) a personality trait with 2) a greater impact on coronary disease than all other risk factors put together. Based on the Western Collaborative Group Study done in 1965, this dramatic effect of Type A was not replicated in the more recent MRFIT study (Shekelle et al., 1985). At least some mention of this controversy should be made.

Several other strengths and weaknesses were apparent in this volume. The diagrams in the chapter on stress physiology clarify the interrelationships described; however, a diagram at the end of the chapter showing how the different systems described influence each other might have helped to crystallize what is described in the text. The chapters on nutrition and biofeedback effectively dispel common myths, and present relevant information of which many people are not aware.

In sum, the strengths of Stress and health lie in its clarity, relevance, and readability. Its weaknesses are not fatal, as they can stimulate useful discussion. Thus both its strengths and its weaknesses contribute to the value of this book as a teaching tool.

References
—Reviewed by Valerie Gruber


In the forward to Early Prediction and Prevention of Child Abuse we learn that this book is an outgrowth of a conference whose objective "was to bring together what is known that would be helpful in predicting and preventing the abuse and neglect of young children, and in particular to explore the ways in which the variety of skills and knowledge of psychologists could more effectively be integrated with the contributions from other disciplines" (p. vii). That is a tall order for any edited volume, but Browne, Davies, and Stratton have assembled an able group of contributors to tackle the task. The list of chapter authors include both researchers and practitioners, each with an impressive amount of experience in the field of child abuse and neglect. Given that the editors and most of the authors are from England, the volume has a distinctively British tone. While there are occasional references to local cases of child abuse (presumably well known to British readers) and to British governmental agencies and policies, Americans interested in the field of child abuse will not have any problems reading this book.

This eighteen-chapter volume is divided into three major sections: Prevalence and Prediction; Identification and Prevention; and Understanding and Treating Child Abuse in the Family Context. Each editor introduces one section and the book concludes with a summary chapter coauthored by all three editors.

The first section contains chapters that discuss the difficulties in clearly and consistently defining what constitutes child abuse and neglect; present current estimates of the incidence of child abuse in England; enumerate abuse risk factors; discuss problems and procedures with abuse screening techniques; and present factors that are associated with breaking the intergenerational cycle of repeating abuse. Each chapter serves as a good basic introduction to the topic addressed. There is very little new ground broken in these chapters, but it is convenient to have so much information available in one source.

The second section starts off with two excellent chapters on prevention and ends with two chapters that are very clinical and applied in their focus. David Gough opens the section with a very good summary and discussion of possible approaches to child abuse prevention. This chapter is followed by the presentation and evaluation of a program to train new mothers in behavioral techniques to better manage their child's problematic behavior. Both chapters are well written and informative. The concluding two chapters deal with diagnostic indicators of early sexual abuse and family patterns of functioning in child-maltreating families. These two chapters will be most helpful to the front-line professionals who are in the difficult position of having to investigate and substantiate reports of suspected child maltreatment.

The third section addresses the consequences of failed or nonexistent prevention efforts. Once maltreating families have been identified, what can be done to lessen the impact of abuse and reduce the risk of further abuse? After an opening chapter on the consequences of child abuse for the child, the section contains three clinically oriented chapters that describe treatment programs and strategies for physically abusive, emotionally abusive, and sexually abusive families. The section ends with a good review chapter by Jay Belsky on family systems approaches to the understanding of child maltreatment dynamics.

This book fills an important niche. It serve as an excellent introduction to the field of child abuse prevention and treatment. It will be particularly useful to those of us who confront child maltreatment as we go about our jobs. The book's applied focus, relevant reviews of pertinent literature, and theoretical integrations all suggest a basic introduction to the field of child abuse and neglect. It would also be appropriate for either advanced undergraduate or beginning graduate courses in the health care fields or in social sciences.

The book's strength is also its weakness. Because it attempts to serve as a basic introduction to the field, it sometimes presents an overly simplified account of the prediction, prevention, and treatment issues of child maltreatment. For example, let me briefly mention two issues from the first section. Susan Creighton's chapter on the incidence of child abuse and neglect presents data that show a steady increase in the incidence of reported child abuse in the last decade. Concurrently, there has been a steady decrease in the severity of the abuse cases reported. These data highlight one of the dilemmas of some child abuse prevention strategies; namely, when one raises the public awareness about — and intolerance of — child maltreatment, reports of abuse may actually rise. This is (Continued on page 38)
Graduate Training in Community Psychology: Integrating Primary Prevention into the Training and Repertoire of all Professional Psychologists and Social Workers

Elaine Thomas and Maurice Elias
Rutgers University

Psychologists who recognize the utility and importance of a systems-centered preventive focus in their approach to mental health practice must overcome a number of obstacles and acquire a specific set of skills to become effective. The most significant obstacle to be overcome is the tendency to approach prevention within the confines of the medical model and its treatment-centered approach. While a person-centered approach has merit, a more enduring approach will take systems-level factors into account and thus will incorporate a systems-centered focus as well. Although the importance of taking systems-level variables into account was recognized as early as the legendary Swampscott conference (Elias, 1987), a number of forces within the field as well as outside it interfere with such a focus. Professional training which focuses on conceptualizing problems within the medical model, a health care system geared toward this framework (including the Community Mental Health System), and a society which places great value in individualism characterize the proverbial tide against which psychologists and social workers must swim. Any of these are powerful forces to be reckoned with but take for example the health care system: Currently within the third-party reimbursement system for the payment of psychological services, no provision is made for even individual-level prevention services.

To be effective within a systems-centered framework, psychologists and social workers must have the tools necessary to understand the systems or settings in which prevention work is to take place. Specifically, this requires that practitioners interested in a systems-centered focus must become skilled in assessing organizations and communities and must be knowledgeable in organizational dynamics. More importantly, however, the community or prevention-oriented practitioner must be aware that his/her presence in the system or setting will affect the system; such practitioners bring, among other things, certain values and motives which will affect the system. In a sense, the preventive practitioner becomes a “participant” in the system, but in a different way than other members of the system are participants. To accomplish the goals of prevention, one needs to become a participant in order to understand the system to form the collaborative, trusting relationships with members that are essential to effective change. In some schools, for example, psychological intervention is regarded as exploitative by teachers and administrators. It is not uncommon for psychologists seeking to conduct interventions in the schools to be asked whose dissertation requirements will be fulfilled by the intervention being suggested. Such a perception on the part of the school system members will negatively impact the success of any prevention program. Thus, prevention-oriented practitioners entering such a school must become sufficiently part of the system to understand and later address this perception if a prevention program is to become successful.

A prevention-oriented practitioner must also become adept at recognizing and effecting second order change as opposed to first order change and differentiating this from first order change. That is, he/she must be clear whether an intervention is directed toward changing the surface characteristics of a problem (first order change), or whether one’s goal, and therefore one’s intervention, must be directed toward changing the underlying causes and structural relationships surrounding a problem. Regardless, an accompanying goal is to ensure that change is made to the setting so that the influence of any intervention continues after the intervention itself has terminated.

Given the above set of prescriptive for becoming an effective prevention-focused practitioner in systems, it is easy to see how individuals may become overwhelmed by the complexity of the task at hand and the tremendous amount of work that needs to be done. Typically, when individuals realize this, they come to believe that anything that they may be able to do would be inadequate; consequently they do nothing. A practitioner thus overwhelmed would be wise to heed the advice of Cowen (1977) and Weick (1984) who independently propose that as many individuals make small contribution, these will ultimately result in significant gains. Albee’s (1982) prevention formula which outlines the variables that affect the incidence of psychological disorders in individuals and Elias’s (1987) prevention formula which similarly addresses the incidence of disorders in populations, are useful guides toward action. Both formulas suggest strategies for embarking on prevention activities. Take for example Elias’s macrolevel formula. It states:

\[
\text{Likelihood of disorder in a population} = \text{socialization} \times \text{social support} \times \text{opportunity for positive practices} \times \text{resources} \times \text{connectedness}
\]

A practitioner can decrease stressors or risk factors in a setting, increase socialization practices, improve social support resources or increase opportunities for connectedness to produce gains toward primary prevention. Change need only be effected in one of these areas to reduce the likelihood of disorder in a population and thus promote prevention. The choice as to what is done depends on the practitioner’s resources and capabilities, and what may bring the largest population the best benefit given its needs and problems.

Say, for example, that prevention of teen...
age pregnancy is the area of interest. A practitioner in a Community Mental Health or Hospital setting may increase social support resources by setting up a program which offers education and counseling about contraceptives. A practitioner working in a school may attempt to improve socialization practices by ensuring that the school provides adequate preparation for adolescents who are about to become sexually active. The two strategies mentioned above may be among the most efficient for prevention of teenage pregnancy as it is estimated that approximately 75% of teenage pregnancies result from the failure to use contraceptives rather than any desire to become pregnant (William Grant Foundation, 1988).

If none of the resources required to implement these are available to the practitioner, however, three other areas of influence remain. To increase the opportunities for connectedness in a community where the rate of teenage pregnancy is high, one could provide consultation of existing Youth Groups on how to increase and maintain membership and/or to strengthen the organization and relationships among members. The formula suggests that any group or organization catering to the needs of adolescents would suffice — religious groups, sports groups, or creative arts groups are candidates. Decreasing stressors, such as the effect of living in a high density area, is yet another candidate for change. For a particular community, a practitioner could reduce the stress of crowding by teaching members of the community to maximize each individual's private time by rearranging schedules or by architecturally rearranging interior living space.

If the strategies suggested by the macro-level formula are beyond the resources of a given practitioner, Albee's formula suggests strategies for intervention at the individual and group level (person-centered). Prevention activities may be geared toward the reduction of organic factors, the reduction of stress, increasing coping skills, increasing self-esteem or increasing support groups. Neither of these broad approaches (person-centered or systems-centered) are "best"; rather each must be considered when designing prevention programs and the best prevention programs will contain aspects of both. Because of the dominance of person-centered approaches, however, more attention must be given to systems-centered approaches.

Either focus is well within the purview of many individual practitioners if they approach prevention activities using the strategies suggested by Abbe's and Elia's formulas. Both formulas serve to narrow the scope of activities which fall under the rubric of primary prevention thus placing prevention activities well within reach. Each of us can do something. A series of small seemingly unimportant, concrete outcomes of moderate importance or "small-wins" add up to significant gains (Weick, 1984). Weick (1984) also points out that social problems are often defined on such a massive scale that precludes our ability to do anything about them. He also gives convincing arguments and evidence as to why "small-wins" make good sense psychologically as well as politically. Cowen (1977) when discussing primary prevention, makes a similar argument; he suggests "...to genuinely serve mental health, primary prevention must be mortgaged and translated from vague, ponderous, infeasible 'giant-steps' to concrete, achievable 'baby-steps.'" None of us may be able to accomplish the overarching goal of primary prevention (the prevention of dysfunction and the promotion of health) for a population, group or even an individual, but each of us can make concrete, specific accomplishments which will, in the long run, bring the community of prevention-oriented practitioners progressively closer to the broader goal. And of course, the more "small-wins" and "baby-steps" achieved the closer the community of prevention-oriented practitioners will come to the broader goal or concept.

References


Comment on the 1989 Biennial Conference

Ruth Schelkun
Director of C,E&P
Washtenaw County Community Mental Health, Ann Arbor, MI.

As an "applied community psychologist," I've been practicing Consultation, Education and Prevention (C,E&P) "in the field" for the past two decades from a community mental health center whose locale is richly endowed with university-based psychologists and clinicians in private practice. Although C,E&P is an exciting field with numerous interdisciplinary activities and collaborations professionally, it can be darned lonely work.

In many ways, psychologists who deliver the goods for prevention do so on the fringe in the community mental health arena. No longer does the mission of a CMH define our work as "essential"; consequently, our resource foundation is always shaky; our colleagues are often transient; our programs are frequently shifting to meet new challenges and RFP's; and our identity as psychologists is vitiated because we often find ourselves to be only one of a kind—fairly exotic additions to a staff dominated by social workers, psychological assessors, case workers, psychiatrists, counselors, and others in the field of mental health.

There are trade-offs, of course. As psychologists who have no identifiable collegial cohort in the community, we are able to function as boundary spanners and as community psychologists; this offers us the objective distance which enables us to assist in others' territory and also to leave gracefully when our work is done. And our fragile political status within the field requires that we continually stay on the leading edge, responding to new and current needs with an understanding of the service implications of the latest research findings.

It's easy to become overwhelmed in such a buzzing professional hive. Periodically, we need to spend some time with other psychologists in our own guild—to catch up on what the other community-based practitioners have to teach us and to be sure we still know who we are. We need to discover what our academic colleagues have been up to and we need to remind ourselves that we have an important function in transferring research findings into policy and service. We need to renew our respect for the big picture and the "systems approach" so important to our field.

In short, I find that Community Psychology's Biennial Conferences on Research and Action offer exactly the kinds of mingling that bring necessary meaning to the literature I read and the work that I do.
Community Research and Action in the Regions: National Coordinator's Report

Anne Mulvey
University of Lowell

I feel confident that our new name, "Society for Community Research and Action" will mean increased activity at the local and regional levels. In clarifying and highlighting the purpose of the Division, it will simultaneously support the work of the Regional Coordinators (RC's). Our new name represents inclusiveness that spreads beyond disciplinary boundaries and a commitment to community based action as well as research. Certainly, this will translate into more innovative networking and community building in the regions.

Before I highlight some of the good work that has been going on the regions, I want to correct a "type" of sorts that appeared in my last article: The Northeast and Midwest regional conference plans were inadvertently "encapsulated" into one, and that one was attributed to the Midwest. Correct, updated information for each of these regions appears below.

Regional Highlights

Northeast. The Northeast Regional Community Psychology Conference was held November 4th at the University of Maryland. It was the first of the series to be entirely student run and focused on the theme, "Creating Collaborative Linkages." Iras Iscoe was the keynote speaker.

Midwest. The Eco-Community Conference sponsored by Bowling Green University was held October 13 and 14 at Camp Crosby in North Webster, Indiana. Contrary to the material that appeared in the last newsletter, the Midwest has a long history of student-run conferences, and this year adds to that rich tradition! There will also be a Division 27 interest group program at MPA (Midwest Psychological Association Convention) in the spring and a series of four meetings that will allow community psychologists to meet each other and network.

Southwest. A six-hour community psychology program is being organized for the SEPA (Southeast Psychological Association Conference) to be held in Atlanta, April 4-7. Jeanne Hernandez, second-year RC, is organizing a program that will include students and new and old Division 27 members from Kentucky to Florida.

Southwest. Things are "getting going" again in this area after a quiet time. Jennifer Kelly, second-year RC, did a mailing and is planning to follow up on area members' interests. She also recruited Joy Schmitz who has begun serving as the first-year RC. Welcome, Joy!

West. Two new RC's are needed here, and soon Tom Olsen, third-year RC, will complete his term, too. (David Ruedt moved out of the region just as he was to begin serving as second-year RC). Suggestions of organizing strategies and potential RC's are welcome.

Latin America. Since there has been no RC here for a few years, I sent a mailing to these members in the fall sharing Divisional news and asking for volunteers to serve as RC. I am happy to report that Luis Mendez has agreed to serve as RC in this region!

Canada. A regional conference is being planned jointly by Wilfred Laurier University and Ontario Institute for Studies in Education—two community psychology graduate departments—for April. The region is also developing a brochure suitable for faculty and students overviewing the nature (theory and practice) of community psychology. It is intended primarily as a mechanism for recruiting students. We look forward to seeing the results of this effort and hope it will serve as a model for other regions.

Incoming National Coordinator

It seems that each time I communicate through the newsletter, there is another "milestone" or marker event about to occur. It is now time to implement the rotational system for the National Coordinator (NC) for the first time since it was made an elected and voting position of the Executive Committee. The NC position carries a three-year term, the first year of which overlaps with the last year of the previous NC's term. Having the incoming NC functioning during the final year of my term should facilitate a smoother transition into the role and better continuity. I am looking forward to the support and networking the transitional year offers.

Division 27 Council Representative

Elected APA Treasurer

Judith E. N. Albino, Division 27's Representative to APA Council, has been elected Treasurer of APA for a five-year term. Her term began following the February meeting of the APA Council. As Treasurer, Judi will serve as senior financial officer of APA, supervising fiscal control of the organization and chairing the Finance Committee. The Treasurer also serves on the Investments Committee and, in an ex-officio capacity, on the Publications and Communications Board and on the Board of the APA Insurance Trust. In her statement for the ballot, Judi pledged to work to continue restoring APA to sound financial health and to maintain especially strong oversight of work on the new headquarters building in Washington, for which ground was broken in October. She also intends to pay careful attention to expenditures in the hope that increases in Association dues can be avoided over the next few years. Judi is concerned about the allocation of resources to APA's Practice, Science, Public Interest, and Education Directorates and supports the development of flexible budgetary mechanisms that will achieve true equity in funding the activities of these organizations.

Many members of Division 27 worked to obtain support from the APA's Board of Directors and the Council of Representatives for Judi's election, and she wishes to express her personal appreciation for that support. Judi succeeds Charlie Spielberg as Treasurer. Charlie served as President of Division 27 in 1974-75 and was recently elected President of APA, with that term to begin in 1991.
Division 27 Nominations for Office

This Spring, Division 27 members vote for a President-elect, a Member-at-large, a National Coordinator, and an APA Council Representative. Following is a list of candidates selected by the Nominations Committee and approved by the Executive Committee.

Candidates for President-Elect

Chris Keys

Education:

1968 B.A. with high honors in Psychology, Oberlin College
1971 M.A. in Psychology, University of Cincinnati
1973 Ph.D. in Clinical-Community Psychology, University of Cincinnati

Current Position:

Professor and Director of Clinical and Community Psychology Programs, University of Illinois, Chicago.

Division 27 Involvements:

Follow, Chair, Council of Community Psychology Program Directors, 1985-87; Chair-elect, 1984-85; Executive Board Member, 1983-87, 1989-92; Member, 1979-present; Editor, June 1987, Special issue of the American Journal of Community Psychology on organizational approaches to community psychology; AJCP Editorial Board, 1982-85. Editor, Summer 1988, Special issue of The Community Psychologist on graduate education in community psychology; Reviewer for AJCP, JCP, Division 27 APA Convention Program and Biennial Conferences; Midwest Regional Coordinator, 1982-84; Division 27 Committee on Social Policy, 1989-present; Organizing Committee, APA Science Directorate, Conference on Approaches and Methods in Community Research, Chicago, 1989.

Representative Publications:


Lonnie R. Snowden

Education:

1969 B.A. in Psychology, University of Michigan
1975 Ph.D. in Clinical and Community Psychology, Wayne State University

Current Positions:

Professor, School of Social Welfare; Affiliated Professor, Department of Psychology, University of California, Berkeley. Associate Director, Institute for Mental Health Services Research and Center for Research on the Organization and Financing of Care for the Severely Mentally Ill.

Division 27 Involvements:


Selected Publications:

Snowden, L. R., & Sheung, F. K. (in press). Use of inpatient mental health services by members of ethnic minority groups. American Psychologist.


Research Grants Awarded:

Center on the Organization and Financing of Care for the Severely Mentally Ill, NIMH, 3 years, 1988-1991, $792,000 (Co-Investigator).

Use and Financing of Mental Health Services to Minorities. NIMH, $175,000 (Co-Principal Investigator) 2/89-1/91.

Candidates for Member-at-Large

Thom Moore

Education:

B.S. Geneva College
M.A. West Virginia University
Ph.D. West Virginia University

Current Position:

Director of the Psychological Services Center, Department of Psychology, University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana. The Psychological Services Center at the University of Illinois arranges practica for clinical and community graduate students. These experiences range anywhere from traditional psychotherapy to developing community interventions. The diversity of available opportunities allows for rich, broad training experiences.

Division 27 Involvement:


Representative Publication:


Ana Mari Cauce

Education:

B.A. 1977, University of Miami
M.S. 1979, Yale University
Ph.D. 1984, Yale University

Current Position:

Associate Professor, University of Washington

Division 27 Involvement:

Student Regional Representative, Northeast; Regional Representative, Northwest; Member, Nominating Committee; Member, Dissertation Award Committee; Chair, Dissertation Award Committee; Chair, Ethnic Minority Concerns Committee; Reviewer, APA Convention; Reviewer, American Journal of Community Psychology; Editorial Board, AJCP.
Representative Publications:


Candidates for National Coordinator

James G. Emshoff

Education:

B.A. University of Illinois, 1974
M.A. Michigan State University, 1978
Ph.D. Michigan State University, 1980

Current Position:

Associate Professor, Georgia State University

Division 27 Involvement:


Representative Publications:


Joseph Hughey

Education:

B.A. Wichita State University
M.A. Wichita State University
Ph.D. University of Tennessee

Current Position:

Department of Psychology, University of Missouri-Kansas City

Division 27 Involvement:

Midwest Regional Coordinator 1986-88; Nominating Committee

Representative Publications:


Nomination for APA Council Representative

Robert D. Felner

Education:

B.A. University of Connecticut
Ph.D. University of Rochester (Clinical/Community Psychology)

Current Position:

Professor, Director of the Community and Clinical Psychology Programs and Associate Head, Department of Psychology, University of Illinois, Champaign, Illinois.

Division 27 Involvement:

Member, Editorial Board, American Journal of Community Psychology (1982-89); Chair-elect and Chair, Council of Community Psychology Program Directors (1981-89); Member of Council, Executive Committee (1981-89); Invited address for Division 27 and 17 (School), American Psychological Association Annual Convention (1988); Chair, Membership Committee, Division 27 (1982-85); Southeastern Regional Coordinator (1981-82); Northeastern Regional Coordinator (1978-81); Chair, Task Force on Internships and Fieldwork in Community Psychology (1978-80).

Representative Publications:


Procedure for Nomination to Fellow

Each year the Society for Community Research and Action/Division 27 recognizes individuals for "Outstanding and unusual contributions or performance" by nominating them for Fellow status in the Society and the American Psychological Association.

Nominations for Fellow may be self nominations or may come from a current Fellow of the SCRA. To identify nominees the chair of the Fellowship Committee solicits nominations from current Fellows and reviews of membership list for candidates deserving of recognition and election to Fellow status. However, with the diversity of activities and settings in which community psychologists work, each year deserving members are overlooked simply because the Fellowship Chair or other Fellows are not aware of the candidates contributions. Consequently, self nominations are genuinely encouraged.

All nominees provide a completed APA Uniform Fellow Blank, a statement describing their "outstanding and unusual" contributions, a vita, and arrange for three letters of support. These materials are reviewed independently by the members of the Society Fellowship Committee. Nominees receiving unanimous support from the SCRA Fellowship for election to Fellow are forwarded to the APA Fellowship Committee for consideration.

Defining explicit criteria and documenting "outstanding and unusual contributions or performance" continues to be among the most challenging tasks for the organization. In general, the nominee should have documentation of sustained productivity, unique contributions to knowledge and practice in the discipline which is recognized by others as outstanding, and impact beyond the immediate setting in which the nominee works. Documentation of these outstanding and unusual contributions may include such things as:
- The existence of publications
- Documentation of the impact of innovations
- Citation of the nominee's work by others
- Offices held in psychological associations
- Political and legislative activity with "more-than-local" impact
- Outstanding teaching
- Election to a board of editors or as editor of a major journal
- Impact on state/national programs
- Demonstration of leadership and initiative in identifying problems, formulating goals, formulating methods, and facilitating a productive exchange of ideas in the field
- Receipt of awards for teaching, service, or research activities
- Positions of increasing difficulty or responsibility
- Effective supervision of professional personnel
- Implementation of programs in an organization
- Appointment to study sections, major participation in scholarly reviewing activities
- Contributions through consultation to courts, legislatures, criminal justice systems, etc.
(Criteria drawn from the APA Fellowship Status Manual, 1969)

Individuals seeking Fellow Status should contact Jean Ann Linney, Chair SCRA Fellowship Committee, Department of Psychology, University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208 (803) 777-4301 for materials. All materials must be completed and received by April 23, 1990 for review by the Fellowship Committee. Nominees recommended for Fellow status by the SCRA Committee must be received by the APA Fellowship Committee not later than June 1, 1990.

Welcome Another National Student Representative

Karla Fischer and Brenda Greiner

This fall, the student affiliates of Division 27 elected Brenda Greiner, a doctoral student at DePaul University, to serve a two-year term as National Student Representative to the Division 27 Executive Committee. She joins Karla Fischer, a doctoral student at the University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, who is in her second year as National Student Representative. We both attended the midwinter meeting of the Executive Committee in January, the results of which we will report in the Summer issue.

We would like to take this opportunity to tell you something about ourselves and the goals we have for our term(s). Although we have quite different academic interests, we have both been involved in student activities in the Division almost since our arrival in graduate school. Brenda has served as the student editor of the Community Psychologist, as the local representative for DePaul, and as an organizer of the Midwest Eco-Community Conference. Before becoming the national rep, Karla helped organize the Eco-Community conference hosted by Illinois and served as the local representative. Academically, Brenda has worked on a substance abuse prevention program for inner-city youth, helped evaluate a large scale weight loss program that included the media and self-help groups, and is currently involved in a project that addresses the role of stress and coping in delinquent behavior among adolescents. Concurrently working on a law degree, Karla has researched the role of expert psychological testimony in sexual assault trials and is now beginning a project on legal interventions for battered women. We hope that the combination of our similar experiences with prior Division 27 student activities, through which we have met many students, and the diversity of our academic backgrounds will make us effective representatives for the student interests of the Division.

In order for us to be effective as the national reps, however, we need to hear from you. Our attempt to communicate with you has begun with the articles in this newsletter. We plan to strengthen the student representative system, increasing the involvement of the regional and local representatives. This should also improve the communication network between students in the Division. We would like to extend an open invitation for you to send us your concerns, complaints, kudos, news, and ideas to us. You can reach Brenda Greiner at 1509 W. George, Basement, Chicago, IL 60657 and Karla Fischer at the Dept. of Psychology, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign, 603 E. Daniel St., Champaign, IL 61820.
Interview with Deborah Phillips

Community Psychologist: How did you get interested in the day care issue?
Deborah Phillips: Day care has always been an interest of mine. I don't quite know where it began; actually I came to graduate school wanting to study child care. I think it interests me generically because it blends women's issues, child development issues, and social policy issues. So it's really at the intersection of those three areas of interest. I was also very interested in studying a social policy issue that is normative, not only in that it affects the majority of American children, unlike, say, child abuse, but also something that can be thought of as a support, not just something for "families in trouble."

CP: More a 21st century kind of issue: looking at the types of effects the changing family will have...
DP: It is actually a marvelous area to study as a sort of a window into social and demographic trends, and also trends in attitudes about public issues related to children and families. So it's always changing shape and color because of the changing times.

CP: Given that your training is as a developmental psychologist, do you see child care as a children's issue or as a women's issue?
DP: Both. Very much both. As a women's issue, it's both a women's issue for mothers, and a women's issue for those who work in childcare.

CP: There's a big discussion in Community Psychology now about advocacy, and research as advocacy. Is there a difference between policy-driven research, and an advocacy role? What do you see as the relationship between the two?
DP: That's a huge question. The research that tends to have the greatest impact on policy, I think, has two features. One is that it is scientifically very, very sound, and in that way policy research with an advocacy outcome, with an interest in affecting policy, is really no different than "regular research." It should be at least as good as traditional research - following all the protocols of validity, reliability, and so on.

The added element, in terms of the design of the research, is that you need to know what the policy questions are. It does have to be relevant. Now, sometimes, people get lucky and they do research, even on basic questions, that does have policy implications. But if you're very interested in having a direct impact, as opposed to a more diffuse, "over-time" impact on what policy makers think about, you really have to pay attention to the dimensions of the debate and direct at least a portion of your research questions to the policy questions.

Also, of course, there's a huge difference in how you go about reporting your findings — you have to allow for a major time commitment for dissemination. You're not done when you write a journal article! You become available to be called morning, noon, and night by Congressional staff, and the media, and others...

CP: You've talked before about "refiguring" research questions to have relevance to policy makers, and negotiating the political landscape. Now, if you reframe your question as a researcher toward policy, do you also then, as a female psychologist working on women's and children's issues, reframe the questions again, given that most of the policy makers are male? Because when you talk about negotiating the political landscape, you can't ignore gender politics.

DP: It really doesn't enter in consciously to me, that I'm mostly talking about women's issues to men... It is an issue, and we probably need to think about it more than we have.

It's probably not accidental that a lot of what is getting members of Congress to think about child care is not so much an aspect of child care that makes it a women's issue or even a children's issue; it's the economic arguments around child care, which almost turn children into economic "products." I find this very effective, but also in some ways very distasteful, that it was the business arguments and reports by groups, like the Council for Economic Development — a male-dominated business organization — that began to turn Congressmen's heads in the direction of child care — that there are cost implications to not offering decent child care.

CP: Are you comfortable with that route? Do you think working within that framework you can get quality day care, you can get the outcomes that you want?
DP: I think there are pros and cons to those kinds of arguments. You can't deny that they are effective, and one of your first tricks if you want to influence policy, is to get people to listen to you. If that's the door you need to go through, then you have to go through that door. Once you get inside, you can begin to try to reframe the debate and raise some of the shortcomings. You kind of have to accept that. So, on that level, I guess I feel pragmatic about it.

The shortcomings are that it's really not emphasizing investing in children for humanitari...
case for cost benefit effectiveness until you're way down the road - like Head Start — till you have years and years of accumulated evidence and longitudinal data to say, "See, it really does save money." So Head Start survives, because we now have 25 years of evidence on Head Start; and the WIC (Women and Infant Children, a supplemental food program) program survives because we have years of evidence that suggest that yes, you do get a return for your investment.

CP: How has watching Ed Zigler's 25-year long battle in child care advocacy affected your feelings about your own role as an advocate in this area?

DP: Ed has been very much a mentor for me. He's taught me that it takes unflagging optimism and persistence to be an effective advocate, and a tolerance for losing, and picking yourself back up, and going back into battle. If you look at his efforts in a more distanced, historical fashion, it really demonstrates the interaction between the role of a scientist, advocate, and the role of social and demographic change. Because how people are listening to Ed Zigler's message now is very different from how they were listening to it 10 or 15 years ago. You kind of have to figure out the right time to enter the debate.

CP: What are the risks of taking a strong advocacy role as an academic? Do you ever think twice before you take that position?

DP: I guess I feel a person in this role always has to guard against stepping beyond their data. The pressure in the public world is always there to do that...the media in particular want you to be controversial, and sometimes the data aren't, or they're not there, and you have to be willing to say that. In Congress, people do want information, but sometimes they push you to give them answers and recommendations, and there, you just have to be careful that your recommendations follow from your evidence. That's sort of one potential liability that you have to guard against.

The other, very practical side, is that it's very time consuming. A lot rewarded in the academic world. At best, well, I won't say at best they're tolerated, because I actually feel they're more than tolerated. The trick is you have to do every single other task of an academic extremely well, and then, in the best of all worlds, this policy work is considered frosting on the cake. But if at any point your more academic, empirical work suffers, you can expect to pay a price. So you're sort of doing double duty. And that can be a liability.

CP: Let's talk about the Staffing Study. Can you describe how you got involved with that study, and how it developed that you reported your findings to the press and Congress before publishing it in the scientific journals?

DP: That study really grew out of interests that developed when I was at NAECY. It was a job that for the first time put me very much in touch with the front lines of the child care workforce — those are the members of that organization — whereas before, I'd certainly looked at child care from an empirical perspective and a policy perspective, but not from a practitioner perspective. I was struck by the disparity between what the research said was important — that quality really boils down to the quality of that child care worker — and what I was seeing in the field... (I came) to understand the normal working conditions of the child care worker, the astonishing lack of social status and respect (child caregivers receive), and how that was beginning to affect the nature of the individuals in the field.

So I began to talk about my own interest in getting a much more careful look at the workers in child care — not only insofar as they interact with children, not as a mechanism for transmitting quality — but what is it that enables child care workers to create those environments for children — backing it up several steps. Because we've always looked at child care as a child development environment, not as an adult work environment. We need to put the two closer together.

Also in that job I met (co-principal investigator) Marcy Whitebook, who is an advocate, and who has been working on issues of child care work for over a decade. She runs this small organization out in Berkeley called the Child Care Employee Project. I also had known (co-principal investigator) Carollee Howes for quite a while and knew she was very interested in sort of non-traditional perspectives on child care, as well as more traditional child development issues.

The three of us had a very long conversation and sort of dreamt about this study and finally got to the point where we said, "Well, let's see if we can get enough money to do it." So we wrote a grant, and we spent a year mustering up the money to do that study — a full year of just background work needed to get the foundation support we needed to proceed.

CP: Was part of the grant that it would be disseminated in this way?

DP: Yes. It was explicitly designed with a two-pronged dissemination strategy, one very much directed toward policy and public kinds of vehicles, with those coming first, driven largely by the timing of the federal child care debate.

We wanted to make sure our findings would make it into the halls of Congress. We couldn't wait to publish empirical articles first to do that, because of the publication lag. Which is, frankly, the order of events in which I'm more comfortable — I'm much more comfortable, personally, starting with the scientific kinds of reports, getting everything peer-reviewed, critiqued carefully that way, then going from there to policy reports. That's my value system and that's where I put my trust. That's what makes me feel confident about disseminating findings. But, the train would have left the station long after we would have gotten to that point. So, I sort of took a leap of faith and went along with the interests in starting out with the policy reports. Now, of course they've been reviewed and critiqued by all sorts of people, including scientific people, but it's not the same as going through a peer review, journal kind of process...

CP: It sounds almost like performing without the net...

DP: Exactly. But (disseminating policy reports first) was what the foundations wanted, too. A lot of foundations are moving away from funding research that they don't see as having an immediate, practical application — which I see as a loss, I think you need both — but there was a lot of interest on the part of the foundations that we plunge right into the policy world.

CP: I had any idea that your announcement of results would coincide so closely with the vote in the House on the ABC bill?

DP: We got lucky. We got very lucky. We thought we would be close... We did it as quickly as we could. That's what determined that (announcement of the findings) date; we just pushed ourselves to meet it — we couldn't have done it a day earlier.

CP: It sounds as though you're being called upon by the media to discuss the Staffing Study...how has that worked into your academic schedule?

DP: I've had to minimize my involvement at this stage. My task at this stage is to write the scientific pieces — part of that is that it's my own timeline, and part of it is that I love to do that. And I think the scientific community needs to be informed about it, too.

So the bulk of the dissemination work is now being handled at the Child Care Employee Project (in Berkeley). That, again, was an agreement from the outset. We're in the final stages of the final report. It will be out in March. When that is all done I really will be turning away from the public/policy dissemination piece. Now, I don't mean turning my back entirely; I have two phone messages here from people who want to talk about the report, and I'll return them — but I have to balance that with other important work at this point.

CP: Do you have a feel for how often the Staffing Study has been cited already? Has it reached a wide audience, a wide variety of media?

DP: It has, actually. It's very encouraging, probably because of its magnitude. It's such a big study...

CP: Right, 27 day care centers.

DP: ...and five cities, which makes it seem national. I think it took such a different tack on the issue — and some of the results are shocking: the tripling of the turnover in a decade, and the sub-poverty level wages. It really makes it very stark. I think that it's all contributing to the interest in the report. That's very gratifying, because that's what we wanted to happen. It sort of made the years of work, and hair-pulling, and teeth-grasping worth it.

CP: Do you see projects of this scope for yourself in the near future?

DP: Certainly the Infant Day Care Study is about the same scope. Now, I'm not coordinating the
different sites; they’re being coordinated elsewhere, but a 5-year longitudinal study is a little daunting... and there is a piece of me that looks forward to doing, in the future, a small, nice, little solo study. But that’s my nature, I like to collaborate...

CP: Is that your commitment to the process of change, and putting the knowledge out there so change can happen?

DP: Oh, definitely. I couldn’t do research any other way. It’s a very important value of mine.

CP: So you don’t see research as isolating and ivory-tower...

DP: No, no. Not at all. Especially when you study something like child care. My other research, my perceived competence research, I do more in a very traditional vein, and I don’t publicize it, but on an issue like child care, I think it would be blatantly irresponsible not to disseminate results publicly.

CP: Any thoughts for the next generation of women in Community Psychology?

DP: It’s a field that needs female role models... I think it’s wonderful to have a (Women’s) column (in the Community Psychologist) because I think younger women and students need to be able to project themselves into the future in this field and understand what the women in the field are thinking about. I’m flattered to be asked to do this interview.

Deborah Phillips can be contacted at the Department of Psychology, University of Virginia, Charlottesville, VA 22903 (804) 924-3374.

Marcy Whitebrook can be contacted at the child care Employee project, 6536 Telegraph Avenue, Suite A-201, Oakland, CA 94609 (415) 653-9889.

Carolee Howes can be contacted at the Department of Education, University of California at Los Angeles.

(Reviews—Continued from page 29)

a critical problem in the evaluation of prevention efforts, yet it goes undecided in this chapter. Browne and Saqa’s chapter on screening presents research using a thirteen item screening questionnaire that has fairly typical sensibility and specificity figures. They point out that even if one screens all new families with this questionnaire, “for every 10,000 births screened it would be necessary to distinguish between 33 true risk cases and 1,195 false alarms” (p. 70). Their solution to this problem is to propose another layer of assessment with families labeled “high-risk.” There is no discussion of the costs of this massive mislabeling until the final chapter of the book. As community psychologists we must always be aware of the unintended harm our assessments and interventions can cause.

In summary, this is a fine edited volume and it can serve as a good introduction to the field of child maltreatment. It can serve as a vehicle for the interested practitioner or researcher to enter the area of child abuse and neglect.

Reviewed by Robert Caldwell
Michigan State University


Swimming against the tide of recent trends in professional practice, Robert Conyne provides a refreshingly “clean” look at the benefits of primary prevention and attempts to move the practice of counseling away from remediation and tertiary care. Directed at Counseling Psychologists and Counselors, the book’s chief goals is to show these practitioners how they “…can become primary prevention agents and …how this new approach is rooted in the very origins of counseling and counseling psychology” (p. iv). Were it not for this focus on counseling, the book might well be titled “The Practice in Primary Prevention in the Community” or “Approaches to Primary Prevention Practice.” The book’s actual title distracts the non-counselor from anticipating the depth and breadth of the book’s real strength: an overview and organizational map of practical applications of primary prevention. My initial confusion regarding the title verifies one of Conyne’s principle assumptions, that “counseling” does not currently view itself as other than a remediative, therapy-oriented discipline.

Fully one-third of the book (Section I) is devoted to providing an historical and conceptual undergirding for the practice of primary prevention within counseling. The first two chapters challenge the conventional wisdom regarding counseling and through overwhelming documentation and argument attempt to realign the discipline. As an outsider, I felt I was watching an attempt to change the orbit of a satellite knocked off-course by unplanned and apparently irrational forces. Many readers will easily transpose this struggle on to other disciplines, especially clinical psychology and social work. The third chapter is a good conceptual link to other prevention oriented approaches that are based on competency enhancement: ecological approaches, outreach and community counseling, psychoeducational skill development, and health counseling. In all these areas, Conyne emphasizes systems issues as well as competency enhancement in individuals.

Section II provides the central focus of the book, offering both a conceptual framework for understanding types of preventive interventions and introductions to actual primary preventive methods. The three dimensional model emphasizes two levels of purposive strategy—system change and person change, two classes of methods of change—direct and indirect methods, and six target classes, from individual and small group through community agencies. The next four chapters are split between direct approaches (education and organizing) and indirect approaches (consultation and uses of the media). A strength of these four chapters is that they present prevention strategies in a very practical and usable fashion. A group of mental health center practitioners trying to rewrite a Center’s mission to more fully embrace primary prevention would make good use of this material.

The book’s final two sections emphasize quality assurance and training. The former provides a good understanding of the importance of, and practical steps necessary to do, effective planning and program evaluation in primary prevention programs. The last section details recommendations about the material necessary to provide even a good basic introduction to primary prevention practice in graduate education. Conyne provides a real challenge in identifying core material that would cause most traditionally clinical graduate programs to substantially redirect their training priorities.

Although this book builds on the contributions of community psychologists in articulating a practitioner’s field of play for primary prevention, this book is a strong effort and helps to fill the large gap between one conceptual leadership discipline that remains largely isolated (community psychology) and the many practice disciplines that can make best use of the information on primary prevention that we have available. This book highlights two glaring issues: how little effective training literature there is in primary prevention, and how little we’ve done to impact on the core practice disciplines that continue to send large numbers of professionals into the field with very little usuable information about primary prevention interventions.

While the primary audience of this book will be graduate trainees in Counseling and Counseling Psychology, it will also be useful supplemental reading in other training programs and very useful to practitioners in the field trying to shift from clinical to preventive interventions. Workers in the growing array of non-clinical and non-traditional service settings—such as neighborhood justice programs, family service centers, and youth diversion programs—will also find this a rare opportunity to learn core methods in preventive interventions.

Reviewed by J. Dennis Murray
Mansfield University

We gratefully acknowledge the notable contributions of the reviewers and their significant effort in sharing their expertise. If you have ideas for future reviews, please let us know.

Expect future reviews in the area of violence toward women, stress, and alternative social agencies.
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REDUCING DELINQUENCY
Intervention in the Community
by Arnold P. Goldstein, Barry Glick, Mary Jane Irwin, Claudia Pask-McCarty & Ibrahim Rubama

"This is an outstandingly detailed account of community-based juvenile programs; something that is sorely needed for the literature on community corrections. I intend to use this fine text when I next teach the course."
—Raymond W. Sagedy, Salem State College

hardcover ISBN: 0-88-036818-2 $23.50

COGNITIVE-BEHAVIORAL INTERVENTIONS WITH YOUNG OFFENDERS
by Clive R. Hollin

This examination and discussion of the use of cognitive-behavioral techniques with delinquents covers in detail the techniques themselves, with illustrative case examples and a review of the literature. Different types of delinquency are examined (i.e. stealing, aggressive behavior, etc.) as well as a variety of settings in which interventions are carried out such as penal institutions, residential facilities and the community.

200 pp. 1990 softcover ISBN: 0-88-035871-3 $13.95*
hardcover ISBN: 0-88-035870-5 $23.50

PREVENTING SUBSTANCE ABUSE AMONG CHILDREN AND ADOLESCENTS
by Jean E. Rhodes & Leonard A. Jason

"This practical guidebook ... is a welcome addition to the prevention literature. ... Clearly, the usefulness of this edition, its timeliness, its foundation in current research, and its clear presentation, make it an important contribution to the field."
—The Community Psychologist

"... an excellent resource for practitioners ... the ecological focus is terrific and is presented in a fair, logical and compelling way."
—Jean Ann Linney, Past President of the APA Division of Community Psychology (Division 27)

hardcover ISBN: 0-88-035753-9 $23.50

HEALTH PSYCHOLOGY AND PUBLIC HEALTH
An Integrative Approach
by Richard A. Winett, Abby C. King & David G. Altman

"In this book the authors successfully provide a framework for bridging the gap between health psychology (application of the principles of clinical psychology to physical health) and public health (application of scientific and medical principles of preventing disease, prolonging life, and promoting health in a community context). This framework is integrative and comprehensive in its process and approach to health issues. Usefully organized and well written, this volume is further enhanced with helpful author and subject indexes and an outstanding reference section. This valuable contribution to the fields of health psychology and public health will be useful to all serious students of health promotion, disease prevention, and health policy."
—Choice

hardcover ISBN: 0-88-033641-8 $49.50
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