

**President**

Irma Serrano-Garcia  
University of Puerto Rico

**President-Elect**

Chris Keys  
University of Illinois, Chicago

**Treasurer**

Patricia O'Connor  
Russell Sage College

**Secretary**

Meg Bond  
University of Massachusetts,  
Lowell

**Editor**

Sharlene Wolchik  
Arizona State University

**Associate Editor**

Erika Schupak-Neuberg  
Arizona State University

**Publishing Editor**

Kathleen Morgan  
College of William and Mary

**Contributing Editors**

**BOOK REVIEWS:**

Leah Gensheimer, University of Missouri  
Paula Julian-Daws, University of Missouri

**COMMUNITY ACTION:**

David Chavis, Rutgers University

**COMPUTERS:**

William Hallman, Rutgers University

**EDUCATION CONNECTION:**

Maurice Elias, Rutgers University  
Jim Dalton, Bloomsburg University

**ETHNIC and MINORITY ISSUES:**

Thom Moore, University of Illinois, Champaign

**HEALTH POLICY:**

Martin McCarthy, Jr., Northwestern University  
Sara Murphey, Edumedia, Inc.

**JOBLINE:**

Joseph Ferrari, Cazenovia College

**LIVING COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY:**

Gloria Levin, National Institute of Mental Health

**NATIONAL PREVENTION COALITION:**

Sandra McElhaney, National Mental Health Association

**PUBLIC POLICY:**

Brian Wilcox, American Psychological Association  
Andrea Solarz, American Psychological Association

**STUDENT ISSUES:**

Melody Embree, Michigan State University  
Susan Li, Arizona State University

**TRAINING:**

Kenneth Maton, University of Maryland, Baltimore

**WOMEN'S ISSUES:**

Jean Rhodes, University of Illinois, Champaign

# The Community Psychologist

Volume 26  
Number 3

Official Publication of Division 27 of the American Psychological Association

The Society for Community Research and Action

Summer 1993

**COLUMNS**

- 2 **Editors' Column**
- 3 **President's Column** *An Alternative View of HIV/AIDS or What's Good About It?*
- 6 **Health Policy** *Mental Health Services Research and Mental Health Care Reform*
- 9 **Student Issues** *Student Practicum: An Orientation to Community Psychology*
- 10 **Computers** *Ecologically Correct Computing*
- 10 **Jobline**
- 11 **Training Issues** *The Practicum Experience: Defining Community Psychology Education*
- 13 **Public Policy** *Congressional Fellowship: Psychology's Chance to Influence Health Policy*
- 14 **Living Community Psychology** *"Since you interviewed me...": An Update*
- 15 **Education Connection**

**BRIEF ARTICLES**

- 16 **Systematic Approaches to Reducing a National Health Problem: Infrequent Blood Donations** *Joseph Ferrari*
- 19 **The Varying Faces of Graduate Education in Community Psychology: Comparisons by Program Type and Program Level** *Kenneth Maton, Gregory Meissen and Patricia O'Connor*

**FEATURE A Tribute To Julian Rappaport**

- 22 **Reflections on Julian Rappaport's Editorship** *Jean Ann Linney*
- 23 **Reflections on Rappaport's Contributions as AJCP Editor** *Leonard Jason, Paula Dvorchak and Robynn Kobayashi*
- 24 **Not Just T-Shirts** *Marybeth Shinn*
- 25 **A Tribute to Julian Rappaport as Editor of AJCP** *Lonnie Snowden*
- 25 **Divergence Within Convergence: The Rappaport Years** *Irma Serrano-Garcia*
- 27 **The Julianizing of the Journal** *John Glidewell*
- 28 **In Praise of Paradox: Or "If You're So Smart, How Come You Were a Journal Editor?"** *Ed Trickett*

**SOCIETY NEWS**

- 29 **In Remembrance: J.S. Tanaka**
- 31 **Society for Community Research and Action: APA Program**
- 37 **APA Reviewer List**
- 38 **Sarason Award Citation for Edward Zigler**

# An Alternative View of HIV/AIDS or What's Good About It?<sup>1</sup>

*President's Column*

Irma Serrano-Garcia



I have decided to focus my last column as President of SCRA on one of society's most pressing problems and one, which unfortunately, I believe community psychologists have paid scarce attention to. In the process of discussing the HIV/AIDS crisis, I will inform readers of the situation regarding the epidemic in Puerto Rico, and congruent with my role as a community psychologist, I will identify contradictions, paradoxes and alternate constructions of social problems.

HIV/AIDS has been labeled a tragic and virulent epidemic (Cunningham, Ramos, & Ortiz, 1991; Tabeere, 1993), the homosexual plague (Ortiz, 1991), a mortal enemy, a holocaust, a CIA experiment, an act of godly retribution and a national and international emergency (Patton, 1990). This should not come as a surprise knowing U.S. statistics. I will now present you with the facts in Puerto Rico.

Puerto Rico has one of the highest incidence rates of HIV/AIDS in the world. It is the eighth cause of death for the population, the first for women between 25-34 years of age, and for men between 25-44 years (Cunningham et al., 1991). In December, 1992, there were 8630 HIV/AIDS cases in Puerto Rico of which 81% were male and 19% were female. Sixty-eight percent of these cases were between 20-39 years old and there were 219 infected children. Sixty-four percent of the people were, or had been, intravenous drug users, 18% reported being gay or bisexual and 13%, half of which are women, report being infected through heterosexual transmission (Millán, 1992; OCAS, 1992). However, I will not focus this analysis on the catastrophic consequences of the ideas, which are evident, but instead on its positive consequences. I will demonstrate that despite the previously described facts, HIV/AIDS has generated positive consequences for our lives, by confronting ideologies and behaviors that have generated worse consequences than those we attribute to the virus.

## **The Paradoxes of HIV/AIDS**

Like every other disease, problem or situation, HIV/AIDS is immersed in a particular social context surrounded by par-

ticular concepts of social categories. These included among others our constructions of health and illness, of youth, of homosexuality, of gender relationships, of death, of drug addiction, of friendship, of help and support, and of the role of government and community in providing services. I will discuss only some of these categories trying to demonstrate the positive contributions of HIV/AIDS to each.

**Youth.** Psychology conceptualizes adolescence as a specific stage of development that we surpass on our way to adulthood (Rosario, 1990; Serrano-Garcia & Rosario, 1992; Toro-Alfonso, 1990b). Puberty, which mainly has biological bases, is confused with youth, which is socially constructed. The dominant construction of youth presents young people as a homogenous group characterized by immaturity, innocence, naiveté, impulsivity, the inability to decide and the need for supervision. These characteristics are attributed to their age, without considering their socio-economic or historical context. Thus, psychology has generated approaches that focus on youth's formation and control (Rosario, 1990).

Alternatively, Guillén (undated) states that the youth "is a social product, determined by the place it occupies in the hierarchical structure of society and by the kind of relationships it establishes with other social groups." "Youth is not a homogenous reality. There are urban youth and rural youth, there is youth in developed and underdeveloped countries, there are youths that work and youths that study, there are youths that take life seriously and youths that take life jokingly" (Ander-Egg, 1980). This view requires that we look at young people with respect, trust, and acceptance of their process, contradictions and sexuality. This last factor gains prominence with the emergence of HIV/AIDS.

Recent studies show that high school and university students are sexually active from a very early age but do not protect themselves against HIV/AIDS, nor against any other sexually transmitted diseases (Cunningham & Rodriguez, 1991; López, 1993). We could, of course, assume that this is due to their immaturity and impulsivity. We could, on the other hand, assume

that because their construction of reality is different, they have decided to experiment with their bodies, to get to know them better, to express their feelings physically. We could assume that they do not believe in hiding or being ashamed of their sexual behaviors but rather believe in sharing and enjoying them. We could assume that increasing their awareness of the risk of HIV infection will lead them to use safer sex behaviors. We could try to understand and share their construction of reality and emphasize their strengths and not their weaknesses, challenging them and ourselves in the process.

This change is required by HIV/AIDS. Denying youth's sexual reality, or characterizing it as naive and impetuous, only increases the possibility of infection. We know that people require a social context that supports their change (Finebert, 1988). We can provide this context not in the interest of protecting and controlling but in the interest of sharing.

**Gender Relationships.** Many are tired of research that informs us that women are oppressed, that we have little control over the power relationships in which we participate, and that we have fewer options than men (Cantera, 1992; Patton, 1990; Santos-Ortiz, 1991). We have heard that women are taught to be obedient, compliant, sweet, shy, studious, and pretty and that men learn to be aggressive, controlling, harsh, daring and strong (Colón, 1977; De la Torre & Oliveras, 1984). Some are tired of this message because they believe this has changed, that there has been much progress that has been fostered by the feminist movement, by scientific research, and by community activism (Santos-Ortiz, 1991). Some even think that women are in charge.

<sup>1</sup> Translated and revised version of Invited Address presented at the Puerto Rican Psychological Association, February, 1993, San Juan, Puerto Rico.

and a description of the PACT (Program of Assertive Community Treatment) model. This multimodal rehabilitation approach includes crisis intervention, community resource management, skills training, educational initiatives, and employment assistance. The benefits have been demonstrated to notably outweigh program costs, with lower rates of hospitalization for clients, increased independent living and employment, greater levels of social interaction, and higher self-reported life satisfaction for program participants. The PACT program has been implemented on a statewide basis in Delaware, Rhode Island, Ohio, Michigan, and Wisconsin, and has been partially implemented in another 20 states. Given the well-established pattern of need for multiple services among severely mentally ill persons with chronic conditions (Morrissey, 1990), this model may have important implications for the design of comprehensive service programs.

Cost-benefit evaluation (CBE) is becoming a well-established methodology in mental health services research. An influential paper by Richard Frank from the health policy program at Johns Hopkins University reviews the path-breaking work by Burton Weisbrod and colleagues in the early 1980's, and considers the panoply of factors that may lead a public agency to not adopt or expand a socially efficient community-based program (Frank, 1993; Frank & Kamlet, 1986; Weisbrod, 1983). Frank also reviews more recent analyses of pharmacologic interventions (e.g., evaluating the effectiveness of expensive antipsychotic drugs such as clozapine), as well as studies on psychotherapy research, partial hospitalization programs, and integrated packages of community-based services (Dickey et al., 1989; Kamlet et al., 1992; Meltzer et al., 1992; Olfson, 1990).

While CBE has a legitimate role in decision making regarding mental health programs, there are important cautions to keep in mind in when interpreting these studies. As Frank and others discuss, there is good reason to believe that cost-benefit analysis findings differ across treatment sub-groups. Further, the compounding effects of small sample sizes and measurement error can lead to inappropriately rejecting the null hypothesis (i.e., concluding that a treatment approach is not cost-effective when in fact it may just not have been demonstrated). Variants of the "reimburse only if cost-effective" rule proposed by the California Public Employee Retirement System present substantial risks for decision-making based on Type II error. Deci-

sion rules such as these could result in the withdrawal of insurance coverage from treatments that are clinically effective but do not presently meet the standards of cost-benefit analysis.

In brief, more and better information is needed for the evaluation and rational planning of mental health treatment programs. It is important that legislators and policymakers be apprised of technical research considerations such as those relating to cost benefit analyses. But the effectiveness of interventions remains a critical issue, and process and outcomes measurement systems may well become part of the everyday world in treatment settings within the decade (Fogel, 1993). Assessment instruments may range from the brief mental health subscales of the SF-36 (Wells et al., 1989) to comprehensive tracking systems such as COMPASS (Integra, Inc., in Winslow, 1992), which measure patient well-being, symptom severity, and functioning over time, as well as the match of a particular therapist with an individual client.

One topic that has not been discussed much in the recent mental health care deliberations has been prevention research. Given the well-established biological perspective on severe mental illness, this is not surprising. But evidence continues to accumulate indicating that social and environmental factors are important as both causes and moderators of many types of mental disorders (cf., Hooley & Teasdale, 1989). These factors are important in the design of primary and secondary prevention programs and for the planning of mental health promotive interventions.

The Prevention Research Branch of NIMH has in place a five stage classification system for their sponsored research, extending from Hypothesis and Methods Development, through Controlled Intervention Trials and Defined Population Studies, to Demonstration and Implementation Studies. A total of 70 grants make up the current NIMH portfolio in this area. These range from the prevention of social and emotional problems in high risk infants, to the prevention of conduct disorders in school age children, to the prevention of anxiety and depression resulting from stressful life conditions, to the prevention of youth suicide.

The current edition of *Prevention Report* reviews a number of mental health initiatives (USPHS, 1993). The article classifies programs as being either proactive, in reducing the likelihood that stressful life events will occur, or reactive, in helping people cope with stressful situations or

circumstances. A proactive model of prevention developed by George Albee (1988) considers risk factors (such as organic vulnerabilities and stressors) as well as protective factors (such as coping skills, self-esteem, and social support). Examples of proactive programs include the Social Competence Promotion Program for Young Adolescents in Greensboro, North Carolina, and the Interpersonal Cognitive Problem Solving approach being taught to younger children in Alabama, Georgia, and Illinois. Both of these demonstration programs have been funded by the National Mental Health Association and are in progress.

Examples of coping-based prevention programs include the Children of Divorce Intervention Project developed at the Arizona State University (Wolchik et al., 1993) and the JOBS program for unemployed persons developed at the University of Michigan (Vinokur et al., 1991). Both of these controlled randomized trials have demonstrated significant benefits. The Children of Divorce intervention found higher quality mother-child relationships, fewer negative divorce events, and better mental health outcomes for program participants, with the largest effects for families with the poorest initial levels of functioning. The JOBS program participants received training in job-seeking strategies and in coping skills in a socially supportive program environment. These participants showed fewer depressive symptoms relative to controls and were more likely to be reemployed at higher paying jobs after completing the program. The beneficial effects continued for more than 30 months after the program ended.

Women report psychic distress more often than do men, and they are also more frequent users of mental health services. Looking forward, do these facts argue in favor of an NIMH-sponsored 'Womens Mental Health Initiative' that would focus resources on somatic diseases and biological processes that affect women? Or do these phenomena reflect a pattern of underutilization of needed and appropriate mental health services by men? Given that many people in our society are reporting high levels of stress, would mental health promotion initiatives addressing the needs of both genders be a better investment of resources? Your comments are invited and your thoughts on these issues will be of great interest.

While the inclusion of a universal set of mental health services in the core benefits package is by no means certain, the inclu-

# Student Practicum: An Orientation to Community Psychology

Paula Julian-Daws  
University of Missouri-Kansas City

After several years of working in business, I returned to school to seek a Ph.D. in community psychology to pursue a career that was more human service-oriented. I was interested in organizational development, particularly in linkages that occur between the business sector and the community as a whole. The systems-orientation and ecological perspectives addressed in the field of community psychology seemed like a "fit" for my career goals. Presently, I am finishing my third year of study in a community psychology doctoral program at the University of Missouri-Kansas City, and feel that I made an excellent choice. What follows is an account of my first practicum experience—a unique experience that I developed with my advisor, Dr. Leah Gensheimer.

The purpose of the practicum experience at UMKC is to provide students with an opportunity to apply their training and education in community oriented methods and procedures, and ultimately, to develop potential sites for future research. In returning to school, I felt that I had developed skills in working with business organizations but still needed to gain experience in working with academic or psychology-related organizations. The goal of my first practicum, therefore, was to gain knowledge of and experience in the organizational structure of the field of psychology at local, state, and national levels, and to find a personal leadership role for

myself within that organizational structure. Dr. Gensheimer supported my idea and helped me to explore and identify several meaningful projects. I kept a logbook of my activities, recording thoughts and ideas about each project. I also met with Dr. Gensheimer periodically to discuss the status of the projects.

First, I joined APA and Division 27 and began receiving copies of the publications of these organizations. Through reading them I became more familiar with current topics and issues in the field as well as with the names of individuals associated with them.

One topic especially interesting to me was that of licensing in psychology because the state of Missouri was in the process of revising their state licensing law to one that was more generic and much more stringent. Many of the members of our department were concerned that the new law would mean that our activities would no longer be exempted from licensure. Therefore, I undertook an active study of the licensure of psychologists during the practicum, particularly the issue related to the Missouri Licensure Law under revision. Dr. Gensheimer and I began to monitor the quarterly meetings of the State Committee of Psychologists (SCOP), a regulatory board appointed to deal with issues of licensure, and to interpret the new law. After monitoring only a few meetings, we could see that our position toward exemption from licensure was not supported by SCOP. Clearly,

## Student Issues

Melody G. Embree

*To provide an experiential summary of a practicum, Paula Julian-Daws has written about her experience at UMKC. This article expands upon a single practicum, contributing a personal facet to the more general article on practica in the Training Issues column. Melody G. Embree and Susan Li, National Student Representatives.*

we needed support from other sources.

This realization led to the next part of the practicum—identifying and enlisting a possible constituency for our concerns. We compiled a mailing list of university and college psychology professors in the state, as well as other psychologists in the state who might have similar concerns. We mailed these individuals a packet of information on the issue. Of the 323 packets mailed, we received 73 responses from individuals who were interested in receiving more information or in becoming involved in the licensure debate.

The practicum was a positive experience for me. I learned a great deal about the field of psychology. As a result of the practicum, I became the local student representative to Division 27. I was also enlightened to the process of working in the area of public policy-making. The process is slow, requiring a high level of interest and a concentration of energy—more than I ever imagined! This experience helped me to define objectives, interests, and goals that I have continued to pursue throughout my career as a doctoral student. In fact, it resulted in the research topic for my masters's thesis.

## Call For Papers: Feature on the Home-Work Interface

Over the past two decades, a number of social scientists have investigated the interface between work and family life—two major adult life domains. However, the particular values and perspectives of community psychology, which focus on person-setting transactions and other ecological issues, is notably absent from this body of literature. To facilitate thinking and dialogue among community psychologists and interested others, we are developing a Feature in *The Community Psychologist* that focuses on aspects of the interface between work and home life.

We are seeking submissions of papers describing research results, programs and policies that are relevant to the home-work interface. Topics can include: effects of work on family outcomes and/or family on work outcomes, work-family role conflict, family-friendly organizational programs or policies, community-based support programs for working families, child care or any other relevant area.

Papers should be approximately eight to ten double-spaced pages in length and typed using an IBM-compatible or Macintosh pro-

gram. Include the file name and your return address on the disk label. Individuals planning to submit a paper should send a letter to that effect to the address below by September 1, 1993. The deadline for papers is October 15, 1993. If you have any questions, please call Diane Hughes at (212) 998-7906. Papers should be sent to:

Diane Hughes (Editor)  
Department of Psychology  
New York University  
6 Washington Pl., Room 280  
New York, NY 10003

# The Practicum Experience: Defining Community Psychology Education

Melody G. Embree, Michigan State University

Eden Avery, Georgia State University

Renee Dabrowski, Georgia State University

Susan Carpenter, University of Illinois, Urbana-Champaign

Dale R. Fryxell, University of Hawaii

Paula Julian-Daws, University of Missouri, Kansas City

Juliette Mackin, Michigan State University

Joan Valery, Sage Graduate School

A majority of community psychology training programs incorporate a practicum experience into students' development. Indeed, students expect real-life "community" experience from their programs. It adds invaluable knowledge and complements classroom learning. For many students, practicum is a defining feature of community psychology training.

Even non-community students who incorporate a community emphasis into their education desire "community" involvement. At Michigan State University, for example, clinical graduate students take part in a community psychology seminar. One of those students expressed surprise and regret that class content and assignments were exclusively theory-based. She had anticipated the opportunity to gain "community" experience which was impossible to obtain in her own degree program. Her regret, it seemed, spoke to her expectation that community psychologists are trained in their "communities."

## Practicum Goals

Practicum, in its various forms, is often the vehicle for students' community entree. Training programs have a number of goals and expectations. Some simply expect students to become acquainted with various aspects of the community in which they live. To that end, students may work in an agency or organization for a semester, often completing a task that benefits the worksite. Others anticipate that a research experience will be the practicum outcome. When research is the goal, students may enter a setting in which the possibility of research has been explicitly negotiated with setting personnel. Still others hope students will gain insight into the lives of the disenfran-

chised groups with whom community psychologists often work. These are perhaps the most difficult and rare practica. Access requires gaining the trust of individuals in whom many of us are most interested, but to whom we actually have little to offer. Successful students are invited into these individuals' lives.

Sage Graduate School, Georgia State University, and the University of Hawaii express similar practica goals. Essentially, students are expected to integrate formal course work skills into their areas of specialization, apply what they have learned, and gain practical experience in varied settings.

Likewise, Michigan State University's practicum is intended to familiarize students with the local community and its resources and to immerse them in the arena of a problem they have chosen to address. Ideally, this investigation leads to a setting in which to do research or helps them gain access to a population of interest.

The University of Missouri at Kansas City practicum experience combines the goals of practical experience and research. Students gain practice working in various community agencies and organizations, while applying *community-oriented* methods and procedures (e.g., advocacy; community consultation; community organizing; institutional- or system-level analyses; program assessment, development and evaluation; dissemination and outreach, etc.) and/or evaluation and research skills. At the same time, students are accessing potential sites for future research and opportunities for community networking, and gaining insight into career options and a competitive edge when seeking employment.

## Training Issues

Kenneth Maton

*The Council of Community Psychology Program Directors (CCPPD) column this issue is written by students from a number of different community psychology programs. It focuses on their experiences concerning an extremely important facet of training about which little has been written: practica. The column presents a spectrum of views and experiences in different types of practica, and should contribute to our thinking about and our development of maximally useful practica.*

## Practicum Requirements and Structure

Just as there are varied goals, practicum requirements and structure vary across programs. The Michigan State University practicum is a required part of the first year graduate curriculum, and includes weekly discussion meetings with a faculty member and the other first year students. Students are encouraged to seek out a role in a community agency or organization. Most students make many contacts and feel out many situations, spending about six hours per week searching for, and eventually working at, one practicum location.

A total of 12 semester credit hours of practicum are required for University of Missouri-Kansas City doctoral students. Students begin practica after completing their first semester of coursework. During their first semester of practicum, students enroll in a formal course. This practicum experience is highly structured and closely monitored. It includes four to five weeks of "academic training" while students investigate potential sites that have established administrative agreements with the Department of Psychology to sponsor UMKC students. Once students begin their fieldwork, class time is devoted to group supervision, in which the student and instructor form a "supervising team." In the remaining three semesters, students develop their own practicum experiences to explore/fulfill personal research and applied interests. For these practica, students enlist a member of the program faculty with compatible interests to act as their Department supervisor. Students negotiate a "contract" for the course, which includes spending a minimum of 10 hours per week at their site, keeping a detailed logbook of activities,

students acknowledge the benefits of the highly structured first semester of practica, they consistently cite the flexibility of the remaining three semesters as a "plus." This flexibility is a key element in the learning process and necessary for developing skills and expertise in diverse areas of interest and specialization.

Similarly, most students at Sage Graduate School feel that the externship is an invaluable learning experience. Joan Valery says it allows them to put into action the

many skills they have learned in the program. They experience, first hand, the frustrations of working with different stakeholders and the politics involved within agencies. Students are able to provide the agency with some form of feedback concerning the issues that were explored. Most agencies are very appreciative of the work students do for them, making the overall experience very worthwhile.

Juliette Mackin concludes that the direct issue-specific benefits and the indirect

enrichment from working within the community far outweigh the unreturned phone calls and dull jobs. The practicum is an important vehicle for us to learn about the problem area we have identified and begin to understand the possibilities and limitations of research on the issue. It is a critical time for building relationships and exchanging needed skills and knowledge; we make a commitment to an organization and provide it with services, while we, in turn, acquire information and expertise.

## Congressional Fellowship: Psychology's Chance to Influence Health Policy

*Public Policy*

Annette Rickel

As an APA Congressional Fellow, I have had the good fortune to be in Washington at a most exciting time in our nation's history. Because I work on health policy for Senator Donald W. Riegle, Jr. (D-MI), who chairs the Senate Finance Subcommittee on Health for Families and the Uninsured, I was designated to serve on the President's Task Force for National Health Care Reform, chaired by Hillary Rodham Clinton. This assignment is a dream come true for a Community Psychologist--the chance to integrate practical experience with public policy.

Working with health care experts, officials from various agencies, Congressional staff and White House personnel, I have been involved in the drafting of a comprehensive plan for delivery of mental health services as part of national health care reform. Specifically, I have participated in the Mental Health Working Group for Children's Services as well as the Working Group for Prevention, two of the Clusters established to design a benefit structure in these health policy areas.

Outreach to children at risk for emotional and substance abuse problems is a critical challenge for the new system. Tipper Gore, who spearheads the mental health initiative, has been advocating to ensure that children and adolescents with mental disorders receive equitable treatment under the health care reform plan. In the past decade, research has demonstrated that a comprehensive array of services, managed in an organized system of care, is the most effective and efficient approach to serving children and adolescents with emotional

and substance abuse problems. Therefore, the plan that has emerged recognizes the viability of alternative home and community based services, the importance of involving families as partners in the treatment of children's disorders, and the necessity of outreach efforts to identify children at risk.

The policy development and evaluation effort of the Task Force, coordinated by the President's Senior Advisor for Policy Development, Ira Magaziner, is based on the "Tollgate" system. This investigative and evaluation process is commonly used in the business world for large scale projects that need to be completed quickly. Under this process, the working groups, which are divided into health policy areas, are guided in their research and proposal development through a series of tests, or tollgates. During the first series of tollgates--the broadening phase--each working group is asked to put all options "on the table"--to guarantee that all issues are considered and correct mechanisms employed. In the next phase, the broad group of options is narrowed after which a comprehensive set of proposals is presented. Like the "Tollgate" on an expressway, these stopping points interrupt the flow of work so that courses of action can be checked at various points along the way.

The Health Care Reform Task Force has based many of its policy options on the significant foundation of work that many members of Congress have laid in the last 20 years. As legislation is drafted and the President's proposal is presented to Congress, the work of the Task Force will turn to an outreach effort, to build strong bipar-

tisan support. Task Force members will be charged with briefing House and Senate leadership, as well as committees that have primary legislative jurisdiction over health care.

Support for fundamental change must be built from the grass roots up not the top down. Consequently, the White House is also actively reaching out to the American people, to representatives from small and large businesses, to state and local officials, and to organized health care interest groups in an attempt to make health care reform respond to the concerns of those who receive health care and those who provide it.

We community psychologists have much we can contribute to the formulation of public policy. My experience in Washington has taught me that we each have a responsibility to make our knowledge and expertise available to policymakers as often as possible. If they are ignorant of our areas of expertise, we have only ourselves to blame.

*Annette Rickel is a former President of the Society for Community Research and Action. During her Fellowship year, she is on leave from Wayne State University where she is a Professor of Clinical-Community Psychology. Dr. Rickel's research involves preventive interventions with high risk children and adolescents and their families. Not only has she had the opportunity to contribute to the formulation of landmark health policy, but recently she has been able to thank the President and Mrs. Clinton personally for their efforts at a White House reception.*

**Jeni Jerrell, Santa Clara County (CA) (Fall 1991)**

My two federally-funded grants investigating case management and substance abuse interventions for severely mentally ill adults have moved into various stages of completion, with a flurry of activities for final data collection, analysis and reporting. I am still actively collaborating with Teh-wei Hu, a UC Berkeley economist, and promoting the use of cost-effectiveness study methods to improve mental health services delivery. My newest cost-effectiveness project involves examining mental health services to minority adolescents who are in the juvenile justice system with primary mental health problems. I intend to extend my mental health services research to evaluate programs for other target populations in mental health, and I am finding it to be an exciting and challenging endeavor. On a more somber note, the county in which I work has had, like many others, to drastically curtail its operations and make severe fiscal cuts. I have advocated for service delivery changes using the cost-effectiveness data from my current studies. I have also gained invaluable first-hand experience with how political considerations can

override scientific knowledge in the policy-making process and with the shortcomings of traditional cost-effectiveness studies in addressing fundamental policy issues. The researcher/manager experience continues to be "fun" but is also very stressful at times. I have learned a lot from the process which I intend to incorporate into future cost-effectiveness studies. My greatest hope is that I have used my position and knowledge to promote the best use of scientific results, to encourage the development of cost-effective services, and to increase these services to persons who need them most.

**Roger Weissberg, University of Illinois, Chicago (Summer 1992)**

When the column was published, I was in the process of moving from Yale University (after 10 years) to the University of Illinois at Chicago (UIC). I completed a 16-hour drive from the East Coast to Chicago on July 4 just as a beautiful display of fireworks began, a nice introduction to the City! I feel very welcome by my new colleagues who have taken me to terrific ethnic restaurants, diverse community sites, innovative school settings, and the Cubs, White Sox, Bears, and Bulls. My wife,

Stephanie Wright, a longtime Division 27 member, and children (Elizabeth and Teddy) are enjoying our new home.

I am very excited about working with the committed group of community psychologists I've joined at UIC. Currently, I am collaborating with a talented group of Division 27 members (e.g., Jim Kelly, Chris Keys, Olga Reyes, Stephanie Riger, Joe Stokes, and Pat Tolan) to help establish a freestanding Community Psychology Program in the UIC Psychology Department as well as a strong set of prevention offerings within UIC's Clinical Psychology program. I am also collaborating with a multi-disciplinary, multi-cultural group of investigators (including Brian Flay of UIC's Prevention Research Center) on a five-year project to design and evaluate comprehensive school- and community-based programs to prevent drug use, high-risk sexual behavior, and aggression with a sample of young, African-American adolescents. At the same time, I travel back to New Haven each month to continue my collaborative program development and research efforts with the New Haven Schools' kindergarten-through-high-school Social Development Project.

---

## Continuing Call for Course Materials for Education Connection

In the Spring 1993 issue of our column, we unintentionally set a very short period for responses to our request for your submission of course materials (May 1). As a result, we are extending the period during which you may help instructors looking for new ideas for teaching (a group that may someday include you). We have had requests regarding courses in community psychology, preventive psychology, commu-

nity mental health, and related areas. Please send course syllabi, reading lists, project requirements, or other materials to one of us at the addresses below. As before, you will receive a number of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards for your helpfulness, including recognition in a future column of the Education Connection. Take just a few minutes and send us your materials today!

### *Education Connection*

James Dalton &  
Maurice Elias

James Dalton  
Department of Psychology  
Bloomsburg University  
Bloomsburg, PA 17815

Maurice Elias  
Department of Psychology  
Tillett Hall, Livingston Campus  
Rutgers University  
New Brunswick, NJ 08903

attendance rates at blood drives. These researchers trained 10 female volunteers to request a blood donation from peers the day before a drive. The volunteers were instructed to use one of two strategies: (1) inform individuals about the upcoming drive and state humanitarian reasons for donating; or (2) in addition to the humanitarian appeal, mention that incentives (free or reduced price merchandise [McDonald hamburger coupons, ice cream coupons] and participation in a raffle [college football tickets for two]) would be provided for donors. Results indicated that these incentive were effective in increasing participation in the drive.

Jason, Jackson, and Obradovic (1986) attempted to increase the number of blood donations at several community and business settings. These researchers compared the rates of blood donations in organizations that employed incentives, competitions, and raffles to those in organizations that did not use extrinsic rewards. Results indicated that across settings, organizations that used incentives had higher levels of blood donations than organizations without incentive programs.

It should be noted that the use of incentives for blood donating is somewhat controversial. For example, Oswalt (1990) raised a concern that people "may falsify their medical history so they will not be disqualified from contributing blood" (p. 373) to obtain these rewards. However, he notes that "mugs, pins, and the like could be used, if in the eye of the recruiting organization, the value (worth) of the incentive would be seen as a token of appreciation and not be of sufficient value to cause people to hide medically disqualifying facts" (p. 374).

### Altruistic/Humanitarian Appeals

Altruism continues to be given as the main reason for donation by most donors. Piliavin (1990), however, points out that the evidence on the importance of altruistic, humanitarian, or moral reasons for donation is equivocal. Paulus, Schaffer, and Downing (1977) examined whether listening to altruistic or personal benefit persuasive communications influenced participants' commitment to donate blood. Results showed that "veteran" but not first-time donors were more likely to donate in the future and claimed a weaker belief that donating was aversive.

More recently, Ferrari and Leippe (1992) extended the study of Paulus et al. (1977) by examining the separate effects of specific message contents, employing multiple measures of intention and measuring

blood drive attendance. College students heard either no message or one of three types of messages advocating a donation. These messages were taken from American Red Cross literature and from studies on donor and nondonor differences (e.g., Pomazal & Jaccard, 1976). The moral message highlighted humanitarian and altruistic reasons for blood-giving, whereas the fear message diminished the aversive aspects of donating blood. In the last condition, aspects of the moral and fear messages were combined. Participants who received the moral message reported significantly more favorable attitudes toward the consequences of giving and a stronger sense of moral obligation compared with participants in the no message and fear message groups. Participants who received the combined message reported the most positive attitudes toward the consequences of giving and a stronger sense of moral obligation than participants in the other groups. The combined message participants also reported more favorable attitudes toward donating and higher levels of intent to donate than participants in the other groups. However, there were no significant differences across conditions on actual attendance rates. Only 14% of the participants attended the drive.

In a second experiment, Ferrari and Leippe (1992) examined whether persuasive messages were differentially effective given individual differences on *responsibility denial* and different levels of *attitude accessibility*. Responsibility denial (RD) is a process whereby a person rejects or denies responsibility for prosocial behavior if the act is perceived costly or demanding, regardless of personal moral obligations (Schwartz, 1977). Attitude accessibility was manipulated by requiring half the participants to list all relevant thoughts on blood donating. No significant differences in response to the type of message were found for high vs low RD types nor for accessibility conditions. Based on these studies, it appears that altruistic persuasive appeals (like media techniques of posters and fliers) do not increase attendance rates at campus drives. Although some believe altruism should be the primary motive to solicit donations (Oswalt, 1977, 1990), these studies suggest that just heightening moral obligations is insufficient to increase blood donations.

### Summary and Future Directions

Several strategies reported in this paper were effective in increasing blood donations. Specifically, peer pressure, prompting, and incentives appear to facilitate do-

nations. It is important to note that these strategies can be relatively inexpensive to use. For example, training volunteers to remind possible donors of their commitment by phone took about an hour. The coupons for the incentive programs were solicited from local merchants who, in turn, received opportunities for free advertisements on campus. The low cost of these techniques makes them feasible for community psychologists and other workers to use in blood donor recruitment associations. Applied behavioral researchers must examine other recruitment methods, and extend existing interventions to other types of samples of potential donors. For example, it is possible that humanitarian appeals for blood donors would be more effective at increasing attendance rates if drives were designed for specific types of patients than for more general community blood banks (see Newman, Burak, McKay-Peters, & Pothiwala, 1988). Because the American Red Cross obtains only 15% of its blood supply from drives at colleges and universities (Oswalt & Napoliello, 1975), there appears to be a wealth of "untapped" resources still available for recruitment.

### References

- Bowen, (1976). Cognitive and attributive processes in a real help giving situation. *Dissertation Abstracts International*, 37, 3566-3577B.
- Burnett, J.J. (1981). Psychographic and demographic characteristics of blood donors. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 8, 62-66.
- Burnett, J.J. (1982). Examining the profile of the donor and nondonor through a multiple discriminant approach. *Transfusion*, 22, 138-142.
- Condie, S.J., Warner, W.K., & Gillman, D.C. (1976). Getting blood from collective turnips: Volunteer donation in mass blood drives. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 61, 290-294.
- Drake, A.W., Finkelstein, S.N., & Sapolsky, H.M. (1982). *The American blood supply*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Edwards, P.W., & Zeichner, A. (1985). Blood donor development: Effects of personality, motivational and situational variables. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 6, 743-751.
- Ferrari, J.R., & Baldwin, C.H. (1989a). From cars to carts: Increasing safety belt usage in shopping carts. *Behavior Modification*, 13, 51-64.
- Ferrari, J.R., & Baldwin, C.H. (1989b). Promoting safety belt usage in shop-



# The Varying Faces of Graduate Education in Community Psychology: Comparisons by Program Type and Program Level

Kenneth I. Maton, University of Maryland Baltimore County  
 Gregory Meissen, Wichita State University  
 Patricia O'Connor, The Sage Colleges

*In 1990, we undertook a survey of graduate programs in community psychology, resulting in a listing of various features of 59 programs (Maton, Meissen, & O'Connor, 1991). The purpose of the current article is to more systematically examine the information provided in the survey, with an eye to discerning the varying ecologies of training in community psychology, depending on program type (clinical-community vs. community) and program level (doctoral vs. masters). The findings may be of interest to students considering graduate study in community psychology, and more generally to those interested in the current nature of graduate training in community psychology.*

## Method

Coordinators of 59 programs in community psychology and related areas responded to our 1990 survey, representing a 76% response rate. The current report examines survey items focused on faculty composition, student applicant qualities, field training sites, training area emphases, and representative job positions or career paths of program graduates. All programs were coded as either

clinical-community or community, and as doctoral or masters. Included in the clinical-community grouping were a number of masters programs in counseling-community psychology. Included in the community category were free-standing community programs, combined community programs (e.g., community-social), and some programs without community in their program title (e.g., applied social). The interested reader is referred to Maton, Meissen, and O'Connor (1991) for additional details about the survey sample and methodology.

## Results

**Faculty Composition.** Table 1 presents the average number of faculty for all programs and by program type and level. Across all programs, there were on average 4.2 core faculty, 5.4 affiliated faculty, 0.8 minority faculty, and 2.6 female faculty. A 2-way Type (clinical-community vs. community) by Level (doctoral vs. masters) MANOVA indicated no significant interactions and no significant effects for Program Level. The only significant univariate effect for Program Type concerned the number of minority faculty; doctoral programs reported significantly more minority faculty than masters programs.

**Desired Attributes of Student Applicants.** Respondents were provided a list of 15 student attributes, and asked to indicate up to five that were "most important" and up to five

that were "least important" in student applicants. For the current analyses, a +1 was assigned to a survey response if the student attribute was marked as one of the five most important by a program, 0 if the attribute was not marked, and -1 if the attribute was marked as one of the five least important. Table 2 presents means and frequencies (number of programs indicating one of five most important/neither most nor least important/one of five least important) for all programs and by program type and level. Next to the mean in the last column, statistically significant results of 2-way Type (clinical-community vs. community) by Level (doctoral vs. masters) ANOVAs are presented: <sup>T</sup> indicates an effect for Type, <sup>L</sup> for Level, and <sup>TXL</sup> a significant Type X Level interaction. Also, as an aide to quicker visual identification of the most and the least important attributes for a given program type/level, the highest and lowest means (operationalized as means  $\pm .50$ ) within each column in Table 2 are indicated by placing the frequencies that contributed to the mean in bold type.

Across all programs, Evidence of Intellectual Ability was the most consistently endorsed student attribute. ANOVA analyses indicated that *clinical-community* programs placed significantly greater emphasis on evidence of intellectual ability, writing skills, and interest/potential for clinical, direct service; *community* programs, in turn, placed greater emphasis on commitment to action or applied research, and social change orientation.

Concerning program level, *doctoral* programs placed significantly greater emphasis on fit/match with faculty interest, previous research experience, and interest/potential for an academic career; *masters* programs, in turn, placed significantly greater emphasis on commitment to action or applied research.

Significant Type X Level interactions were obtained for interest in underserved populations (especially important for community masters programs) and interest/potential for clinical, direct service (especially important for clinical-community masters programs).

**Student Field Site Placements.** Respondents were provided a list of 20 field place-

Table 1

Number of Faculty Across All Programs and by Program Type and Level

	All Programs	Doctoral		Masters	
		Cl/Co	Comm	Cl/Co	Comm
Core Faculty	4.2	3.9	4.3	4.5	4.4
Affiliated Faculty	5.4	6.4	6.1	4.0	4.6
Minority Faculty	0.8	1.1	1.1	0.5	0.3 <sup>†</sup>
Female Faculty	2.6	2.7	2.7	2.1	3.0

Note: Cl/Co=Clinical Community Comm=Community  
<sup>†</sup> indicates significant effect for Program Type.

**Table 4**  
**Training Area Emphases: Means, (Frequencies), and ANOVA Results**

	All Programs	Doctoral		Masters	
		Cl/Co	Comm	Cl/Co	Comm
Prevention Programming	.59 (35/24/0)	.56 (10/8/0)	.44 (8/10/0)	.63 (10/6/0)	1.00 <sup>L</sup> (7/0/0)
Program Evaluation	.49 (32/24/3)	.61 (11/7/0)	.61 (11/7/0)	.19 (6/7/3)	.57 (4/3/0)
Systems-centered Consultation	.25 (20/34/5)	.22 (6/10/2)	.33 (6/12/0)	.00 (3/10/3)	.71 <sup>T</sup> (5/2/0)
Basic Research	.24 (23/27/9)	.61 (11/7/0)	.44 (10/6/2)	-.31 (2/7/7)	.00 <sup>L</sup> (0/7/0)
Action Research	.12 (16/34/9)	.22 (6/10/2)	.56 (10/8/0)	-.44 (0/9/7)	.00 <sup>T,L</sup> (0/7/0)
Other (written in)	.02 (3/54/2)	.00 (2/14/2)	.06 (1/17/0)	.00 (0/16/0)	.00 (0/7/0)
Community Organization	.00 (8/43/8)	-.17 (1/13/4)	.11 (4/12/2)	-.06 (1/13/2)	.29 <sup>F</sup> (2/5/0)
Clinical Practice	-.17 (18/13/28)	-.06 (4/9/5)	-1.00 (0/0/18)	.88 (14/2/0)	-.71 <sup>T,L,TXL</sup> (0/2/5)
Administration	-.22 (3/40/16)	-.22 (0/14/4)	-.17 (0/15/3)	-.38 (1/8/7)	.00 (2/3/2)
Policy Analysis	-.27 (6/31/22)	-.33 (1/10/7)	.11 (4/12/2)	-.69 (1/3/12)	-.14 <sup>F</sup> (0/6/1)
Individual-centered Consultation	-.31 (9/23/27)	-.28 (1/11/6)	-.83 (0/3/15)	.44 (7/9/0)	-.71 <sup>T,L,TXL</sup> (1/0/6)

Note: Cl/Co=Clinical Community, Comm=Community. See text for description of means, frequencies and ANOVA effects.

masters programs).

**Job Positions or Career Paths of Program Graduates.** Respondents were asked to indicate the three most typical positions, or career paths, of graduates of their program. The responses were then coded by the research team. Table 5 presents the percentage and ratios of programs indicating a given job position/career path as representative, for all programs and for each program type and level. Percentages greater than or equal to 50% are indicated in bold.

For graduates of *clinical-community doctoral* programs, academic jobs were listed most often (72.2% of programs), followed by community-based human services (50.0%). For *community doctoral* programs, academic jobs were listed most often (81.3%), followed closely by applied research/evaluation jobs (75.0%). For *clinical-community masters* program graduates, community mental health center jobs were listed most often (81.3%), followed by community-based human service jobs (50.0%). For graduates of *community masters* programs, administrative positions were listed most often (83.3%), followed by community-based human services (66.7%).

### Conclusion

Consistent with previous surveys of graduate training in community psychology (Feis, Mavis, Weth, & Davidson, 1990; Godin, Elias, Dalton, & Goldstein, 1988; Meyer & Gerard, 1977; Sandler & Keller, 1984), the present results portray substantial differences across the training ecologies of community psychology graduate programs. In the current survey, a number of differences across program types and program levels were re-

vealed. Looking at the resulting patterns of difference, *clinical-community doctoral* programs appear distinctive in their **breadth of focus**, encompassing traditional clinical field sites and program training in both basic and program evaluation research and prevention. *Community doctoral* programs are distinctive in their focus on **applied or action research** (as reflected in student attributes, field sites, training emphases, student job positions). *Clinical-community masters* programs appear distinctive in encompassing a strong **direct service/clinical focus** (student attributes, field

training emphases), strong **community mental health center ties** (field sites, student job positions), and a focus on **preventive programming** (training emphasis). Finally, *community masters* programs, while small in number, are distinctive in combining a **strong community ideology** (students with social change orientation, advocacy organization field sites) with a focus on **community-based service systems** (students interested in underserved populations, training in prevention and systems consultation, administrative job positions for graduates).

### References

- Feis, C.L., Mavis, B.E., Weth, J.E., & Davidson II., W.S. (1990). Graduate training and employment experiences of community psychologists. *Professional Psychology: Research and Practice*, 21, 94-98.
- Godin, S., Elias, M., Dalton, J., & Goldstein, S. (1988). Masters and doctoral-level programs in clinical-community and community psychology: An empirical comparison. *The Community Psychologist*, (summer issue), 16-20.
- Maton, K.I., Meissen, G., & O'Connor, P. (1991). A survey of graduate education in community psychology. *The Community Psychologist*, (summer issue), 15-35.
- Meyer, M.L., & Gerard, M. (1977). Graduate training in community psychology. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 5, 155-164.
- Sandler, I.N., & Keller, P.A. (1984). Trends observed in community psychology training descriptions. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 12, 157-164.

**Table 5**  
**Job Positions or Career Paths of Program Graduates: Percentages (and Ratios)<sup>1</sup>**

	All Programs	Doctoral		Masters	
		Cl/Co	Comm	Cl/Co	Comm
Academic Setting	46.4% (26/56)	<b>72.2%</b> (13/18)	<b>81.3%</b> (13/16)	0.0% (0/16)	0.0% (0/6)
Community-Based Human Services	44.6% (25/56)	<b>50.0%</b> (9/18)	25.0% (4/16)	<b>50.0%</b> (8/16)	<b>66.7%</b> (4/6)
Community Mental Health Center	39.3% (22/56)	44.4% (8/18)	6.3% (1/16)	<b>81.3%</b> (13/16)	0.0% (0/6)
Applied Research/Evaluation	32.1% (18/56)	22.2% (4/18)	<b>75.0%</b> (12/16)	6.3% (1/16)	16.7% (1/6)
Administrator	32.1% (18/56)	16.7% (3/18)	18.8% (3/16)	43.8% (7/16)	<b>83.3%</b> (5/6)
Government	23.2% (13/56)	33.3% (6/18)	37.5% (6/16)	0.0% (0/16)	16.7% (1/6)
Doctoral or Post-Doctoral Study	14.3% (8/56)	11.1% (2/18)	6.3% (1/16)	25.0% (4/16)	16.7% (1/6)
Program Development or Org. Consultant	10.7% (6/56)	0.0% (0/18)	25.0% (4/16)	12.5% (2/16)	0.0% (0/6)
Private Clinical Practice	7.1% (4/56)	0.0% (0/18)	0.0% (0/16)	25.0% (4/16)	0.0% (0/6)

Note: Cl/Co=Clinical Community, Comm=Community. Two of the Doctoral Community and one of the Masters Community programs did not respond to this question.

# Reflections on Rappaport's Contributions as *AJCP* Editor

Leonard A. Jason, Past President, 1989-1990, DePaul University  
Paula A. Dvorchak, DePaul University  
Robynn Bushner Kobayashi, Rehabilitation Institute of Chicago

In 1988, Julian Rappaport was selected to replace John C. Glidewell who had previously served as the distinguished editor of *AJCP*. As Julian Rappaport's term as editor has now ended, we will review his accomplishments over the past five years. The three authors of this essay represent a diverse group with different levels of knowledge and experience in the field of community psychology. Leonard Jason has been an active member of the discipline since the mid 1970's, whereas Paula Dvorchak and Robynn Bushner Kobayashi are more recent student members. We feel that the diversity of our combined backgrounds and interests will contribute to our reflections and assessment of Julian Rappaport's editorship.

At the outset of his term as editor, Julian Rappaport stated that he hoped that the "tensions created by a diversity of interests and purposes will be represented in future issues" (Rappaport, 1988, p. 153). Rappaport's challenges included appealing to an audience of both applied professionals as well as scientists and scholars, fostering a passion for reform within the field while still serving as a mode for the erudite discourse of an established discipline, and strengthening the infrastructure of community psychology without prematurely limiting its scope (Rappaport, 1988). We believe that Rappaport successfully accomplished these goals by: 1) actively encouraging a diverse group of authors to submit papers to the journal, 2) selecting more representative members for his Editorial Board, 3) appointing topical associate editors, 4) encouraging the publication of several special issues and sections, and 5) experimenting with new formats for the exchange of ideas.

We believe the appointment of topical associate editors was a significant influence in facilitating the development of theory, research and practice in several underdeveloped domains (i.e., environmental/ecological psychology, legal issues, underrepresented populations, social policy, methodology and innovative programs). It is beyond the scope of this brief essay to comment on all the valuable work contributed in these different areas.

However, we would like to illustrate how Rappaport realized his vision of increasing the participation of previously under-represented populations.

As has been suggested, a specific goal of Rappaport's was to increase the number of manuscripts submitted by underrepresented populations. He facilitated this endeavor by publishing announcement requests in *AJCP*, by adding topical associate editors, and by making the Editorial Board more representative.

We decided to investigate the representation of one underrepresented group, women, on the Editorial Boards and as authors of articles during the terms of the three *AJCP* editors: Charles D. Spielberger, John C. Glidewell and Julian Rappaport. We first reviewed the number of women appointed as associate editors and elected to the Editorial Board in the last issue of *AJCP* that each editor published. The percentage of female editors increased from 5% to 22% to 40% during the respective terms of Spielberger, Glidewell and Rappaport. In addition, when we examined the percentage of female authors included in the last volume for each editor, the rates increased from 14% to 33% to 50% respectively. We find it interesting that as the number of women on the Editorial Board has increased, so has the number of women publishing articles. These findings are particularly encouraging and support our thesis about the increase in underrepresented groups in policy and decision-making positions within our field. Rappaport surely deserves credit for fostering this healthy change.

Rappaport approached his editorship as a collaborator with reviewers, associate editors, authors, and readers. He balanced this collaborative effort with his goals for the journal and vision for community psychology. The culmination of his efforts is well illustrated in the five special issues and sections produced during his term.

The topical areas of these special sections were community psychology in Asia, substantive theorizing, empowerment through research, preventative interventions, and self-help groups. In each of these sections, authors

with a variety of perspectives explored crucial issues such as methodology, efficacy, implications for social policy and program applications. This exploration was in the context of the specific topic but held significance for the direction and development of community psychology as a whole.

The first special section, community psychology in Asia, provided an opportunity to view community psychology research and practice from the unusual vantage of differing cultural contexts. In the introduction to the section, Levine (1989) states "that every problem is more complex than it first appears, and that we imperil our projects when we neglect to pay attention to local dynamics" (Levine, 1989, p.71). The contributing authors report on a variety of community focused activities such as building competence in school children, development of a Women's Center, and development of community mental health programs. The five authors show that the field has much to gain by attending to how community psychology concepts apply or must be adapted to cultural contexts.

The second special section featured an article by Allan Wicker (1989) on substantive theorizing and research followed by commentaries focusing on the strengths and limitations of the approach as well as examples illustrating its application. Community psychology can only be strengthened through the development of research strategies to study more effectively complex events. A substantive approach to theory and research emphasizes the process rather than the product; yet, the goal to identify, describe and understand a phenomena remains. The section on substantive theorizing does not present a solution to the problems of research in the realms of social science and community psychology in particular. Rather, it sets the stage for continued exploration, discussion and debate to provide alternative strategies for research.

The third special section focused on empowerment. Rappaport (1981), at one point, had provocatively suggested that "empowerment was promising as both a plan of action and as a symbolic ideology for a social movement called community psychology"

# A Tribute to Julian Rappaport as Editor of *ACJP*

Lonnie R. Snowden  
Past President, 1991-1992  
University of California, Berkeley

Throughout his term of service, Julian was deeply concerned with issues of diversity. He conveyed his commitment in inviting me to become associate editor and in encouraging me to develop underrepresented populations as an area. Indeed, the very term "underrepresented populations" came about at Julian's suggestion, to emphasize the marginal political status of groups about which we were concerned.

Julian was open to innovative ideas and willing to take risks. He delegated responsibility and permitted a necessary degree of autonomy, but was always willing to provide direction and guidance when necessary. For example, Julian conferred and assisted in efforts to encourage ethnic minority authors. My extra effort at explaining the process and attempting to humanize it were recognized by Julian and welcomed.

In *ACJP* and elsewhere, there continued to be fewer submissions and published articles on underrepresented populations than any of us would like. Under Julian's leadership, however, *ACJP* made significant inroads in recognizing and enlarging the literature on underrepresented populations.

---

## Divergence Within Convergence: The Rappaport Years

Irma Serrano-Garcia  
President, 1992-93  
University of Puerto Rico

The *American Journal of Community Psychology* was founded in 1973 under the editorship of Charles D. Spielberger and from 1976-1989 was edited by John Glidewell. Born within a epoch of change, the journal was geared toward fostering research, theory, intervention, scholarship and innovation for a newly rising and developing discipline (Rappaport, 1988).

Throughout its lifetime, *AJCP* has been entangled in a web of convergence and divergence. Convergent processes are the steps of normal science. Divergence relies on questioning underlying assumptions of phenomena and examines problems from different perspectives that contribute to significant disciplinary changes (Seidman, 1987).

The first manifestations of this struggle are summarized in Glidewell's reflections of his editorship (Glidewell, 1988). During the journal's initial years, he states that his selection criteria for publications were guided by two main thrusts; manuscripts that moved the discipline toward greater

understanding of the phenomena in which its members were interested, and innovation, creation, reorganization, reconceptualization. At the end of 13 years, the journal had published a growing number of articles, included publications by new contributors and timidly fostered diversity. Its emphasis, however, was on establishing community psychology as a scientific discipline, because without this, community psychology was not expected to survive within psychology. Glidewell states that upon concluding his editorship, *AJCP* was "a better and better journal, because I received better and better, noncontroversial manuscripts well within our paradigm of respectability" (Glidewell, 1988, p. 767). Community psychology's origin had stemmed from divergence, requiring that *AJCP* successfully devote its efforts during the discipline's initial years to solidifying its definition, its scope, its methods, its interventions and its purpose.

*AJCP*, or perhaps the discipline, was ready for, and in need of, change. The

Society searched for a leader, someone who in the past had contributed significantly to its development, who could move it further, who could entangle him/herself in the web of convergence and divergence. Rappaport was selected and immediately met the challenge placed before him by stating that *AJCP*'s function was to serve as a vehicle for "the more dispassionate discourse of an established discipline" while fostering the discipline's passion and its diversity of interests and purposes (Rappaport, 1988).

Rappaport also recognized that the content and method of a field are directed by the preferences of its members. Up to that point, these had been characterized by empiricism. In fact, Glidewell (1988) had stated "Most of us community psychologists, . . . , are empiricists, not radical empiricists, but, if we worship anything, it is empirical data" (1988, p. 761). The journal would be initially, and principally, what its contributors made it, after assuring that manuscripts met the standards and criteria of normal science. Convergence was

# The Julianizing of the Journal

John C. Glidewell  
 Editor Emeritus, *AJCP*  
 Peabody College of Vanderbilt University

Julian has for quite some time made a point of the distinction between an exemplar and the phenomenon of interest for a field of study and a field of practice. Some twenty years ago I sat on a committee charged with discovering the proper organization of the psychologists on the campus of the University of Chicago. As I listened to distinguished psychologists explain their ideas before the committee, a similar distinction emerged. Some psychologists focus on studying the phenomenon into which professional psychologists intervene; some focus on the process of intervention itself. As I later heard Julian make his distinction, it seemed to me that the phenomenon of interest was some state of human affairs (e.g., low empowerment) into which psychologists believe they can intervene and do some good. An exemplar is a specified process of intervention, as, for example, an intervention to prevent ill-being and to enhance well-being (and empowerment) in a particular population of people.

The distinctions made by the Chicago psychologists didn't help me discover the proper organization of psychologists on the Chicago campus because the relationship between the professional schools on the campus (all of whom had psychologists on their faculty) and the graduate divisions (more traditionally the graduate arts and sciences organization, containing a Department of Psychology) had to maintain a myth and work with a reality. In a like manner, I thought that community psychology had to maintain the same myth and work with the same reality. The myth was that psychologists, as scientists-practitioners, ought to have joint appointments—one in a research arm of the university and one in a relevant professional school. In the same way, community psychologists who publish in *AJCP* ought to have joint foci—one in practice and one in the science (the discovery of the nature) of the phenomena into which that practice intervenes. Often psychologists do hold joint appointments, and the myth has lived a vibrant life.

The reality was that each unit of university organization needed carefully to con-

trol the appointment and promotions of their faculty, and in joint appointments, one part of the joint usually prevailed in such matters. A more important and more editor-relevant reality was that most psychologists were either practitioners or scientists. Their primary loyalties were to a professional school or a research unit of the university, in either an extra-university practice or an extra-university research unit. Editors, as well as university administrators, must deal with that reality. Their authors tend to be either practitioners or scientists. Although many staunchly maintain that they are hyphenated, only few actually are.

One of Julian's contributions to *AJCP* has been the reinforcement of the myth and a deft coping with the reality. Table 1 contains my quick count of the articles in

two classes: The Phenomena of Interest (Phenomena into which Community Psychologists Intervene) and Exemplars (The Processes of Intervention by Community Psychologists). Each has several sub-classes to reflect more specifically the content of the articles. I did not deem it necessary to get somebody else to classify and count the articles, so I'm sure that my count has some mistakes. I'm equally sure that my classification would differ from that of someone equally competent. However, the errors are not so severe as to invalidate my point.

Julian has given attention to both the phenomena of interest and to the exemplars of practice. Of 298 articles, 78 are devoted to exemplars of the processes by which community psychologists intervene into the phenomena of interest.

Table 1

## The Duality of Community Psychology Publications During the Editorship of Julian Rappaport

Class of Article	Number of Articles
<b>Phenomena of Interest</b> (Into which community psychologists intervene)	
Description of the phenomena .....	4
Unassisted changes in psychological well-being	
Stress, personality, social support, illness, and psychological well-being .....	50
Other unassisted changes .....	31
Theory about the nature of the phenomenon .....	8
Descriptions and analyses of discrimination, oppression, neglect, diminution .....	5
Research reviews .....	1
Essays and comments .....	21
Total .....	120
<b>Exemplars</b> (The Processes of Intervention by Community Psychologists)	
Analyses and descriptions of programs .....	14
Experimental preventive interventions .....	27
Experimental plus natural interventions .....	2
Theories of interventions into communities .....	14
The social psychology of the profession .....	2
Psychotherapy .....	1
Ethics of community intervention .....	7
Research methodology and epistemology .....	10
Research reviews .....	1
Comments and essays .....	15
Total .....	78

## In Remembrance: J.S. Tanaka

J. S. Tanaka, Associate Professor of Educational Psychology and Psychology at the University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana, died in a tragic car accident on November 3, 1992. He was 34 years old. Jeff was a fellow of the American Psychological Society and of the American Psychological Association (APA), with active memberships in Divisions 5 (Evaluation, Measurement and Statistics), 8 (Personality and Social Psychology), and 45 (Society for the Psychological Study of Ethnic Minority Issues). He published over 30 journal articles and five chapters in edited volumes during his brief career, making important contributions in structural equation modeling, psychometrics, and multivariate analysis. He is survived by his parents, Shoji and Margaret, of Los Angeles, California and his younger sister, Stacy, a physics doctoral candidate at the University of California, Berkeley.

Jeff was not a community psychologist, but nonetheless had important impacts on the field. He played an important role in training graduate students in two community psychology programs. He was a critical methodological and statistical consultant to his colleagues in community psychology on a number of large research projects. He was a frequent guest reviewer and later panel member on important federal grant review committees. He had a strong commitment to minority issues, serving as a member of APA's Committee on Ethnic Minority Affairs. Many of his formal and more subtle contributions to community psychology are best represented in the words of some of his colleagues, presented in italics in the paragraphs below.

In an introduction of the great statistician John Tukey, a colleague once noted that there are two types of statisticians: those that are interested in statistics and those that are interested in data. Tukey's brilliance was attributed to his passionate interest in data, an observation that is equally apropos of Jeff. Much of Jeff's statistical work focused on finding solutions to problems that commonly arise in the analysis of data collected in real world settings. The complex, socially relevant, yet messy data sets that he encountered in areas like community psychology provided a fertile ground for his genius. But, Jeff also passionately cared about communicating his insights about methodology and data analysis to researchers who were not experts in the arcana of statistical theory. He did this in

his day to day work with students and colleagues. And resisting the unfortunate practice that has developed among some quantitative psychologists of only communicating with other specialists, he also did this in publications such as a special issue of *Child Development* on structural equation modeling (Connell & Tanaka, 1987), a chapter on the same topic in *Review of Personality and Social Psychology* (Tanaka, Panter, Winborne, & Huba, 1990), a chapter on statistical models of change in the *Handbook of Community Psychology* (Tanaka, in press), and a chapter on research methods in the *Handbook of Asian American Psychology* (Tanaka, Ebreo, Linn, & Morera, in press). At the time of his death he was under contract writing a major new graduate level introductory statistics text, "Statistical literacy: How to make sense of your data," that promised to communicate many of his insights about the application of statistical models to real data. These writings have served and will continue to serve diverse areas of psychology as readable introductions to many of the newest developments in statistics and research methodology.

Jeff graduated *cum laude* with an A.B. degree from the University of California at Los Angeles in 1979. He continued on at UCLA to complete his M.A. (1980) and Ph.D (1984) in the Quantitative Program under the supervision of Dr. Peter M. Bentler. During that time, he studied properties of different estimation procedures in structural equation modeling, the topic of his doctoral work. In addition, he was already beginning to show the first indications of being an outstanding teacher and colleague, as is revealed by the comments of one of his fellow graduate students at UCLA.

*Jeff was two years ahead of me in the graduate program at UCLA. We all knew of Jeff's genius then, but only now appreciate its magnitude. I want to mention one aspect of Jeff's genius that had a large impact on me. Anyone could enter Jeff's office with even weak or strange ideas and be treated with a pleasant and thorough discussion. If there was a pearl to be found, Jeff would find it. I believe this was due to his mastery and enjoyment of quantitative psychology combined with a fair and gentle approach to others. Jeff is alive in his scientific work and he is alive in those of us who strive for Jeff's style of interaction with colleagues and students.*

David MacKinnon, Arizona State University

In 1984, Jeff joined the Psychology faculty at New York University (NYU). He was promoted to Associate Professor in 1989 and continued his collaborations and mentoring of former students as Research Associate Professor even after he left in 1990. While at NYU, Jeff continued to develop his quantitative interests. Many of his contributions during this period addressed questions stimulated by the questions of researchers using structural equation models who confronted the limitations of real data: How to assess fit? How to get the best solution from small samples? What approach should be used when the data are collected across instruments, time points, or informants? Jeff also developed interests in promoting the education of minority students. Each year, he sponsored several students from a local science high school and directed their psychology research projects as part of the Westinghouse Talent Program. He also began to take interest in undergraduate minority students who were pursuing research across the natural and social sciences. In 1988, he was asked to direct NYU's College of Arts and Sciences Minority Opportunity Scholar's Training Program. His excellence as an undergraduate professor was recognized in 1988 by the Psi Chi Faculty Award for Excellence in Teaching.

Jeff's contributions at NYU are remembered by Beth Shinn, one of his colleagues in community psychology.

*Jeff Tanaka was formally part of the Social/Personality program at NYU, and had a joint appointment with community for only half his stay with us. Indeed, his interests in psychology were so broad that he could have fit easily into any of the programs in the department, and each program drew of his talents as though he "belonged" solely to them. Community students particularly valued his courses in data analysis, multivariate analysis, and structural equation modeling, although they sometimes rebelled when he wanted them to think through the strengths and weaknesses of different approaches rather than simply relying on his expert advice. Jeff probably served on more dissertation committees (over 70) than any other faculty member in the department, and both students and faculty additionally sought him out for informal advice. He was wonderful at tailoring his advice to the sometime modest talents of his interlocutors, and had a very pragmatic sense of when a sophisticated technique*

# 1993 APA Convention Society for Community Research and Action

August 20-23, 1993

Friday, August 20

9:00-11:50 (VIP Room)

Executive Committee Meeting

Chairs: Irma Serrano-Garcia, University of Puerto Rico  
Christopher B. Keys, University of Illinois at Chicago

12:00-12:50 (Wentworth)

Conversation Hour: NIMH Preventive Intervention Research Branch

Intervention Research Funding Opportunities  
Host: Peter Muehrer, NIMH

1:00-1:50 (Dominion North)

Symposium: Natural Disasters and Mental Health: Implications of Research for Prevention

Chair: David N. Sattler, College of Charleston  
Psychological adjustment: An epidemiological approach  
John R. Freedy, Medical University of South Carolina  
Components of a conceptually based strategy for children and adolescents experiencing trauma  
Russel T. Jones, Virginia Polytechnic Institute  
Understanding adolescents' adjustment to disaster: Laying the groundwork for intervention  
Daniel W. Smith, Medical University of South Carolina  
Natural disaster and psychological utilization of mental health programs  
David N. Sattler, College of Charleston  
Discussant: Charles S. Carver, University of Miami  
Co-sponsors: 9, 42

2:00-2:50 (Dominion North)

Invited Address: Distinguished Contribution to Theory in Community Psychology

Many cooks, brave men, apples and oranges:  
How people think about equality  
William Ryan, Boston College  
Chair: George Albee, University of Vermont

3:00-3:50 (Civic)

Invited Address by Recipient of the Seymour B. Sarason Award for Community Research and Action  
Chairs: Kenneth I. Maton, University of Maryland, Baltimore  
Seymour B. Sarason, Yale University

How to make early intervention a more effective weapon against poverty  
Edward Zigler, Yale University

Saturday, August 21

8:00-8:50 (City Hall)

Symposium: Moving Beyond the Classroom: Training Opportunities in Multicultural Settings

Chairs: Linda Silka & Kathy Hubert, University of Massachusetts, Lowell

From ropes courses to program evaluation: Multicultural opportunities for students

Linda Hart, Northeastern University

Student facilitation of a grass-roots multicultural peer leadership conference

Carol McCall, University of Massachusetts, Lowell

Sambath Chey Fennell, Community-University Partnership

Healthcare: Applying community psychology

Athena Michaels & Vannaroit Lamm, University of Massachusetts, Lowell

Facilitating a women's resource center: A community-university partnership

Jan Goodwill, Community-University Partnership

Angela Guarino, University of Massachusetts, Lowell

Multicultural youth sports program: Lessons for involving students

Jon Hellstedt, Dana Skinner, & Veronica Fortune, University of Massachusetts, Lowell

Environmental racism: Innovative perspectives on community, environmental, and occupational problems

Charles Levenstein & Linda Silka, University of Massachusetts, Lowell

Co-Sponsors: 7, 16, 42, 45

8:00-8:50 (TBA)

Interest Group Meeting: Rural Psychology

Chairs: David S. Hargrove, University of Mississippi  
Peter Keller

9:00-10:50 (Dominion South)

Symposium: Community-Based Interventions for Homeless with Substance Use and Mental Health Disorders

Chair: Harold I. Perl, NIAAA

Case management models for homeless persons with substance disorders

Peggy M. Murray & Harold I. Perl, NIAAA

Comprehensive substance abuse services for homeless persons with alcohol or other drug problems

Michael Kirby, Arapahoe House Alcohol and Drug Treatment Center

Recovery-conducive housing for treating homeless with substance use problems

Fried Wittman, CLEW Associates

Vocational training and employment

Gerald Bennett, Medical College of Georgia

Discussant: Paul Koegel, RAND Corporation

Co-sponsors: Divisions 9, 18

- Drug training program for front line youth workers  
*Albert E. Wener, Wener Consulting*  
*Roch Tremblay, Centre De Readaptation Alternatives*
- Predictors of psychological distress among mothers of persons suffering from psychotic disorders  
*Myreille St-Onge & Francine Lavoie, Université Laval*
- Receptivity of community residents to tenants of mental health residences  
*Tim D. Aubrey, University of Ottawa*  
*Bruce Tefft & Raymond Currie, University of Manitoba*
- Assessing reading level of drug users for HIV/AIDS prevention purposes  
*Mark E. Johnson, Dennis G. Fisher, Dawn C. Davis, & Henry H. Cagle, University of Alaska*
- Feminist research methods: Analysis of psychology and criminal justice textbooks  
*Rebecca Campbell & Pamela J. Schram, Michigan State University*
- Assertiveness training: To promote adaptive behavior in adolescent mothers  
*Edith R. Montgomery & Annette U. Rickel, Wayne State University*
- Role play as a method for teaching university  
*John A. Boyd, Marie Bracki, & Jame Ellor, National-Louis University*
- An agency/university partnership in treatment research: Views from both sides  
*Sara J. Corse & Nancy B. Hirschinger, University of Pennsylvania*
- Effects of police activities on community reactions to serial murder  
*Michael J. Herkov, University of Florida*  
*Monica Biernat, University of Kansas*

### 3:00-3:50 (City Hall)

#### Invited Address:

#### Leadership and Community in Higher Education:

#### Perspectives of a Feminist University President

*Judith Albino, University of Colorado*

*Chair: Pierre Ritchie, Canadian Psychological Association*

### 4:00-5:50 (Windsor)

#### Symposium: Preventive Intervention Design: Translating Qualitative and Quantitative Risk Analyses

*Chair: Raymond P. Lorion, University of Maryland*

Basing preventive intervention design on risk analysis--A programmatic approach

*Raymond P. Lorion, University of Maryland at College Park*

Resilience among single mothers: Raising young children in risky neighborhoods

*Anne Brodsky, University of Maryland at College Park*

Adolescent pregnancy as an adaptive and maladaptive coping response

*Carol Bartels, University of Maryland at College Park*

Parenting as a buffer against pervasive community violence

*Tracy Myers, University of Maryland at College Park*

Psychosocial status of HIV children: Coping with personal and social fear

*Sharmistha Bose, University of Maryland at College Park*

Latchkey status and children's psychosocial adjustment: Risk factor or not?

*Cheryl Cole, University of Maryland at College Park*  
*Cosponsor: 18*

## Sunday, August 22

### 8:00-8:50

#### Regional Coordinators and Executive Committee Breakfast

*Chairs: James G. Emshoff, Georgia State University*  
*Christopher Keys, University of Illinois at Chicago*

### 9:00-9:50 (Grand Ballroom West)

#### Roundtable Presentations: Society for Community Research and Action

#### Roundtable 1: Overcoming Stressful Events

*Chair: Anne Kazak, Children's Hospital of Philadelphia*

Community bereavement after traumatic loss

*Carol S. Fullerton, Robert J. Ursana, Tzu-Cheg Kao, & Vivek P. Bharitya, Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences*

Hurricane Andrew: Psychological effects of tent city inhabitants

*David N. Sattler, Charles Kaiser, Beverly Hamby, Jaci Winkler, Claudia Abu-Ukkaz, Mary G. Adams, Ann Beatty, Lavra Love, & Barrett Watts, College of Charleston*  
*Jerome M. Sattler, San Diego State University*

Children's future expectations and resilience to stress: A prospective study

*Peter A. Wyman, William C. Work, Emory L. Cowen, & Judy H. Kerly, University of Rochester*

Life events and depression in homeless and low-income housed mothers

*Elaine A. Anderson & Sally A. Koblinsky, University of Maryland*

#### Roundtable 2: Reactions to Violence

*Chair: Myrna B. Shure, Hahnemann University*

Asian American's reactions to racially-motivated violence

*David Rollock, David Wei Chih, & Teresa A. Mok, Purdue University*

*Jan Trang Hoang, California State University*

Evaluation of a primary prevention program for dating violence

*Francine LaVoie, Christince Piche, & Lucie Vezina Michel Boivin, Université Laval*

The effects of urban violence exposure on children's psychological adjustment

*Melanie P. Duckworth & The Miriam Hospital/Brown University*  
*Henry E. Adams, University of Georgia*

#### Roundtable 3: Working with Ethnic Minorities in Context

*Chairs: LaVome Robinson, DePaul University*

*Isaiah Crawford, Loyola University*

Self-help groups serving African Americans

*Kathryn D. Kramer & Kermit B. Nash, University of North Carolina*



**11:00-11:50 (Simoe/Dufferir)**  
**Invited Address: Distinguished Contribution to Practice in Community Psychology**

**Capturing Excellence in Applied Settings: Lessons from Kermit the Frog, Leonard Bernstein, and Community Psychology**  
*Maurice Elias, Rutgers University*  
*Chair: James Kelly, University of Illinois at Chicago*

**1:00-1:50 (Dominion South)**  
**Invited Address:**

**Putting Community Back into Community Psychology**  
*Stephanie Riger, University of Illinois at Chicago*  
*Chair: Christopher Keys, University of Illinois at Chicago*

**2:00-2:50 (Essex)**

**Symposium: Sexual Harassment in Context: Explorations of Multiple Settings**

*Chair: Meg A. Bond, University of Massachusetts, Lowell*  
Sexual harassment and departmental climate on campus  
*Meg A. Bond, Anne Mulvey, & Charlotte Mandell, University of Massachusetts, Lowell*  
Walking through walls: The sexual harassment of high school girls  
*June Ann Larkin, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education*  
Sexual harassment of female family physicians by patients  
*Margaret Schneider, The Ontario Institute for Studies in Education*  
*Cosponsors: 9, 35, 42*

**4:00-4:50 (Dominion South)**  
**Presidential Address:**

**The Ethics of the Powerful and the Power of Ethics**  
*Irma Serrano-Garcia, University of Puerto Rico*  
*Chairs: Meg A. Bond, University of Massachusetts, Lowell*  
*Guillermo Bernal, University of Puerto Rico*  
*Co-Sponsors: 29, 38*

**5:00-5:50 (Dominion South)**  
**Business Meeting:**

**Society For Community Research and Action**  
*Chairs: Irma Serrano-Garcia, University of Puerto Rico*  
*Christopher B. Keys, University of Illinois at Chicago*

**6:00-6:50 (Dominion North)**  
**Social Hour**  
**Honoring New Members, Fellows, and Award Recipients**

*Chairs: Ana Mari Cauce, University of Washington*  
*Brian Wilcox, APA Public Policy Office*  
*Thom Moore, University of Illinois, Champaign Urbana*

**Monday, August 23**  
**9:00-10:50 (Dominion South)**

**Symposium: Conceptual and Methodological Innovations in Research on Homelessness**

*Chair: Paul A. Toro, Wayne State University*  
Maternal characteristics and the socioemotional functioning of homeless children

*Julie Passero, University of Buffalo*  
A systematic, three-step methodology for representative sampling of homeless

*Paul A. Toro, Wayne State University*  
Mental illness among homeless and poor people: Some methodological issues

*Charles W. Bellavia, University of Buffalo*  
Cross-sectional and longitudinal analyses of social support among the homeless

*Debbie Bates, University of Buffalo*  
Structural equation modeling among homeless adults: Stress, support, and self-esteem

*Susan M. Wolfe, Wayne State University*  
*Discussant: Carol T. Mowbray, Wayne State University*  
*Co-sponsors: 9, 18, 29*

**12:00-1:50 (Dominion South)**

**Symposium: Methodological Problems in Conducting Research on Support Networks**

*Chair: Kenneth Heller, Indiana University*  
Methodological problems in interviewing older adults and their network

*Ana M. Arroyo & Kenneth Heller, Indiana University*  
Advantages and disadvantages of targeting one category of network relationship

*Victoria H. Bedford, University of Indianapolis*  
How do I support thee: Let me count the ways

*Carolyn E. Cutrona, Iowa State University*  
*Discussants: Bruce Rapkin, New York University*  
*Ana Mari Cauce, University of Washington*  
*Co-Sponsors: 29, 38*

**2:00-3:50 (Dominion South)**

**Symposium: HIV Risk Reduction Interventions Targeting Vulnerable Youth**

*Chair: Ellen Stover, NIMH*  
Interventions to reduce HIV risk related sexual behavior among adolescents

*John B. Jemmott, III, Princeton University*  
*Loretta Sween Jemmott, Rutgers University*  
*Geoffrey T. Fong, University of Waterloo*

Peer-led HIV risk reduction intervention for junior high students  
*Maria L. Ekstrand, David Siegel, Flora Krasnozsky, & Katherine Haynes-Sanstadt, University of California, San Francisco*

AIDS education and skills training for persons with developmental disabilities

*Joseph R. Scotti, James T. Ellis, Kimberly J. Ugcich, Karen S. Kirk, Carrie Masia, Deborah Olchec, Karen Weigle, & Kimberly Weaver, West Virginia University*

HIV risk reduction program for African-American adolescents  
*Janet S. St. Lawrence, Ted L. Brasfield, Kennis W. Jefferson, Edna Alleyne, Yolanda Diaz, & Pamela G. Banks, Jackson State University*

*Juanita Davis & Aaron Shirley, Jackson-Hinds Comprehensive Health Center*

*Discussant: Peter Muehrer, NIMH*  
*Co-Sponsors: 7, 16, 18, 37, 38, 42, 45*

# Thank You!

Much work goes on behind the scenes when putting together a program for APA. Our official committee consisted of Ana Mari Cauce (Chair), Brian Wilcox, and Thom Moore. However, we received help from many others over the past year. Linda Massey from the University of Washington was absolutely invaluable. The reviewers play a critical role in determining the quality of the program. The following people served as reviewers and, when called upon, came through with helpful and timely comments to guide our planning. THANK YOU ALL!

Larry Aber  
Jeffrey Anderson  
Joseph Aponte  
Manuel Barrera, Jr.  
Bill Berkowitz  
Frank Baker  
Oscar Barbarin  
Ellen G. Benswager  
Guillermo Bernal  
Anne Bogat  
Vivian Brown  
David Canales-Portlatin  
Brenna Bry  
Helena Carlson  
David Chavis  
Fern Chertok  
Lillian Comas-Dias  
Ann D'Ercole  
Cary Cherniss  
Jim Dalton  
William S. Davidson II  
Jim Emshoff  
Stephen Fawcett  
Joseph Durlak  
Maurice Elias  
Margaret Gatz  
Ellis Gesten  
Linda Garnets  
Meg Gerrard  
Jan Gillespie  
Mark Ginsburg  
David Glenwick  
Katherine Grady  
Christine Iijima Hall  
David S. Hargrove  
Diane Hughes  
Dirk Hightower  
Barton Hirsch

May G. Kennedy  
Christopher Keys  
Anne Kazak  
Margaret Kiely  
Michael Knox  
Brian Lakey  
Gloria Levin  
Jean Ann Linney  
Ray Lorion  
Damian McShane  
Ken Maton  
Gary Melton  
John Morgan  
John Moritsugu  
Carol Mowbray  
Anne Mulvey  
Donna Nagata  
Judy Primavera  
Ken Pargament  
Mary Procidano  
Bruce Rapkin  
LaVome Robinson  
Mary Jane Rotheram  
Irwin Sandler  
Dick Reppucci  
Annette Rickel  
Craig Schweon  
David Snow  
Myrna Shure  
Carolyn Swift  
David Stenmark  
Ralph Swindle  
Jack Tebes  
Betty Tableman  
Paul Toro  
Alex Vaux  
Rod Watts

## Psychological Empowerment Theory, Research and Policy

Co-editors Doug Perkins and Marc Zimmerman are soliciting ideas for contributions to a planned issue of the *Journal of Social Issues*. The topic is Psychological Empowerment Theory, Research and Policy. This issue will evaluate past, present and future directions for the research and application of empowerment-related theories in community, industrial-organizational, social, personality, and developmental psychology. Sections will focus on (1) the development of empowerment theory and measurement, (2) the implications of empowerment research for clarifying the meaning, process and applications of empowerment theory, (3) collaborative methods and making the conduct of psychological research more empowering, and (4) the proliferation of "empowerment"-related social programs and directions for clearer and more specific use of empowerment theory and research by policy-makers. Contact:

Douglas D. Perkins  
Environment and Behavior Area  
FCS Dept./AEB  
University of Utah  
Salt Lake City, UT 84112  
(801) 581-6548 or (212) 758-9291  
FAX (801) 581-5156  
E-mail: PERKINS@  
ALFRED.FCS.UTAH.EDU

## APA Congressional Fellowship Program

APA invites applications for its 1994-95 Congressional Fellowship Program. The program will sponsor three psychologists, including a Senior Fellow, to serve as special legislative assistants on the staff of a Member of Congress or Congressional Committee. Activities may include conducting legislative or oversight work, assisting in Congressional hearings and debates, and preparing speeches and briefing materials. Prospective Fellows must demonstrate competence in scientific and/or professional psychology and display sensitivity toward policy issues and a strong interest in applying psychological knowledge to national issues.

**Qualifications:** APA Member (or applicant for membership) and doctorate in psychology, with a minimum of two years post-doctoral experience preferred. A minimum of ten years of post-doctoral experience required for the Senior Fellowship.

**Terms:** One-year appointment beginning September 1, 1994. Stipend of \$36,000 (\$46,000 for Senior Fellow) plus \$2,500 for relocation to Washington, D.C. area and travel expenses.

**Application Procedure:** Interested psychologists should submit a curriculum vitae and a personal statement of 500-1000 words addressing the applicant's interest in the fellowship and career goals, potential contributions to the legislative process and desired learning from the experience, along with three letters of reference specifically addressing abilities related to the Fellowship.

**Send application materials to:**  
Congressional Fellowship Program  
Public Policy Office  
American Psychological Association  
750 First Street, NE  
Washington, D.C. 20002-4242  
(202) 336-6062

The deadline for receipt of applications is  
November 15, 1993

APA is an Equal Opportunity Employer

## Call for Papers, Symposia and Posters

APA will sponsor an national conference on *Psychology and Women's Health: Creating a Psychosocial Agenda for the 21st Century*, May 12-14, 1994, at the Hyatt Regency Hotel, Capitol Hill, Washington, DC. The conference goal is to highlight the importance of psychosocial and behavioral factors in women's health research, and the implications for treatment, prevention, and health policy.

Major foci will include theoretical models/frameworks for conceptualizing women's health; issues in research methodology, measurement and evaluation; new research on psychosocial and behavioral factors in women's health; implications of psychological factors in treatment, health policy, and interventions; and special issues of underserved populations (e.g., ethnic minorities, the poor, women with disabilities).

Deadline for receipt of abstracts (800-1000 words) is October 4, 1993. Send abstracts to:

Gwendolyn Puryear Keita, Ph.D.  
American Psychological Association  
750 First Street, N.E.  
Washington, DC 20002-4242  
(202) 336-6044 or (202) 336-6040 (FAX)

# Jobline

## *Opportunities for Opportunists*

*Please PRINT or TYPE the following information. We will place your job listing in the next issue.*

Circle the category below that best classifies the position:

ACADEMIC/FACULTY

DIRECT CARE PROVIDER

RESEARCH

OTHER: \_\_\_\_\_

TITLE OF POSITION: \_\_\_\_\_

BEGINS: \_\_\_\_\_ APPLICATION DEADLINE: \_\_\_\_\_

RESPONSIBILITIES: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

QUALIFICATIONS: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

SALARY: \_\_\_\_\_ BENEFITS: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

APPLICANTS SHOULD SUBMIT: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

FOR ADDITIONAL INFORMATION CONTACT:

NAME: \_\_\_\_\_

ADDRESS: \_\_\_\_\_

PHONE: \_\_\_\_\_

*Return this form to Joseph Ferrari, Ph.D., Center for Life Studies, Cazenovia College, Cazenovia, New York 13035*

# CONVENTION NOTES