



# PSYCHOPHARMACOLOGY NEWSLETTER

(Division 28 - The American Psychological Association)

Issue Number 1

February 1986

## CONGRESS CONVENED JANUARY 21 AND FACED BUDGET REALITIES

The first session of the 99th Congress finally adjourned on December 20. The second session began at noon on Tuesday, January 21. When members of Congress returned to town, they faced not only holiday bills and cold weather but the realities of the Gramm-Rudman-Hollings (GRH) balanced budget amendment as well.

Deficit goals under GRH are:

FY 1986	\$171.9 billion
FY 1987	144 billion
FY 1988	108 billion
FY 1989	72 billion
FY 1990	36 billion
FY 1991	\$0

There will only be seven months in which to effect the savings for FY 1986 (which began on October 1, 1985). On January 10 the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) and the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) prepared a joint projection of the FY 1986 deficit, which they reported to the General Accounting Office (GAO) on January 15. On January 20 the GAO reported the findings to the President, who issued an order on February 1 to reduce the FY 1986 budget based on the report. Since the deficit goal of \$171.9 billion has certainly been exceeded, the order for reductions of \$11.7 billion in FY 1986 outlays will be issued and will take effect March 1. The cuts will be spread throughout the government in the programs not exempt by law.

Meanwhile back at the FY 1987 budget ranch, the President released his FY 1987 budget on Monday, February 3. If Congress and the President can agree on a budget which meets the deficit reduction goal, the automatic process of across-the-board cuts can be avoided. That's a big IF!

The plot thickens! In early February, a 3 judge panel declared as unconstitutional the provision in the GRH bill that gives the U.S. Comptroller General the assignment of determining the budget items to be cut. However, the bill stands as is until the Supreme Court has ruled on the appeal. In addition, even if the judiciary panel decision is upheld, the bill contains a fall-back

provision which delegates a joint House-Senate committee with the responsibility for deciding on cuts. So the impact will be felt.

Read the following article for one knowledgeable person's assessment of the impact.

## WHILE YOU'RE UP, GET ME A GRANT; OR AT LEAST PART OF ONE Fast Funding, Half Fast Funding, Or No Funs At All

(to be read rapidly and with feeling)

A retrospective appraisal suggests that the growth surge in funding for Division 28 members occurred during the late 60's and the 70's. This was concurrent with rapid advances and major promises in behavioral and psychopharmacology. (One may ponder the direction of the causal relation). The study of drug effects on behavior and the complex interactions and mechanism thereof constituted what is presumably meant by the new wave term of "hot areas". The disciplines involved have now become mature and sophisticated. Furthermore, contrary to some views, but very much in accord with those expressed by Thompson (annual APA Meeting, Los Angeles, 1985), they have fulfilled promises in a variety of areas (I refer the interested reader to Thompson himself). If behavioral principles, to say nothing of truth, light and beauty exist, the behavior of those behavioral and psychopharmacologists and those of other labels in Division 28 who have emitted the appropriate responses should be reinforced. Why is their behavior being ignored? Or is it? Where has all the money gone?

Several possible explanations have been proposed for the seeming paucity of funds. Briefly stated they include the following: (i) behavioral and psychopharmacologists are not good at the Sci Biz (e.g. Thompson 1985); (ii) they are being chameleonic and obtaining their funds under other visages (Smith, 1986); (iii) the funds are being usurped by new "hot areas"; (iv) some are suffering (not necessarily willingly) that others might prosper many-fold; (v) overseers of the funds may arbitrarily (from their perspective wisely but

arbitrarily) begin redistribution based on their vision of the future and future needs; (vi) there has been an increase in available funds and the doomsayers are wrong for one reason or another; (vii) alternatively, recent events have finally caught up with the doomsayers predictions.

First, Thompson is probably correct that, most, but certainly not all, b & p pharmacologists have not been particularly adept at marketing themselves or their science. There is of course, the viewpoint that aside from the clearly defined activities of scientific endeavor, most basic and applied scientists were not trained for, and are not interested in, "selling" their science except by the traditionally accepted routes. Frankly, I applaud them, agree with the view, think it is correct and think the evidence of the potential adverse consequences of press release science are already evident.

However, in the current era there does now exist a need to sell your science in the best Wheaties tradition. The NIDA has picked up this cry. This may be reversible but the forces against reversal are considerable. Even the vocabulary of science, or at least its administration, has drifted substantially in the direction of business. After all, there is talk of product rather than scientific data, indirect cost rates are taking on greater importance than the data generated by the direct costs, and perhaps the best indicant of all, institute grant programs are now "portfolios". The bulls have it. To change the current situation would require effort by those who are disinclined to be involved.

Perhaps most important to stabilization of the current "political science" is the need for a lower profile in the study of drug effects and drug abuse. This is unlikely to occur but it is evident that the high profile has presented problems for the development of rational funding schemes. The fevered cries of a minority has probably dramatically enhanced public misperceptions about drug effects and has certainly altered the behavior of some administrators and scientists alike. In both groups, some change is driven by punishment and avoidance of perceived threats while it may also be driven by the heat of the kleig lights. Nevertheless, funding of some grants and contracts is dominantly dependent on the noise quotient rather than programmatic need or evidence of clear merit. Clearly, being in an administrator's position has difficulties.

Scientists too, have been concerned with both the negatives and positives of public image. Some have reported, or implicitly indicated, being verbally threatened by government officials thought to have power over the purse. Susceptibility to environmental contingencies and consequences is not a trait of rodents, avians, nonhuman primates and administrators alone. Some scientists may gently, or not so gently, alter public statements about data due to concern that their views will result in inanition for research animals, staff and their own children. Fear of loss of funds is no doubt about to surpass fear of flying, or fear of manuscript rejection as the dominant phobic disorder in our scientific community.

As implied above, there is more than punishment and negative reinforcement at work. It is easier these days to "publish" in the lay press than it is to receive favorable reviews from JPET, JABA, JEAB, PB&B, Science or Psychopharmacology. There is a public appetite for "science news" even though the publications are not archival on Medline. Perhaps we are all falling prey to shortcircuiting of reinforcer systems described by Skinner (APA Annual Meeting, Los Angeles 1985). There are many reinforcers following your appearance on television, in the Times (be it the Shreveport or the New York version), and, of course your kids think that you are terrific when you appear in Superteen magazine. These points may seem remote from the funding business. They are not. It is my observation, and experience, that these shifts have been, and are occurring. One can go on about Sci Biz and funding, but the next point is overdue.

The second categorical explanation of appearance of funding changes is that many b & p pharmacologists are moving onward and that the discipline is evolving with fractionation of the base. There is, we would all agree, a dramatic spread of the methods and technology of these disciplines, providing data on their utility and merit. Are these people leaving the fold or are they simply taking positions in departments less clearly affiliated with psychology, pharmacology or even psychiatry? Perhaps both are true. In any case, it appears there is substantial overlap with interdisciplinary types being polygamous in terms of their affiliations. That is, they may belong to ACNP, BPS, ASBC, SN, FASEB, ASN, and ASPET, but they retain membership and continue to participate in APA.

It is not surprising if some of our colleagues who obtain funds from diverse sources, are found increasingly in other than traditional departments, and thus give the illusion of being geese (Henningfield notes—in good Minnesota tradition—that no matter what you call it, if it walks like a duck, swims like a duck, quacks like a duck, and water roles off is back, it must be a duck—or a psychologist.) However, many, but certainly not all (and certainly not as many as wished to) have received their funding from stereotypically Division 28 sources. For example, the overlap of lists of Division members and those who obtained their funds from the Clinical and Behavioral Pharmacology Branch of NIDA is considerable. And in the last few years the amount of money available to scientists from this source has increased, not decreased although a hooker (discussed below) resides in there somewhere (Walsh, 1986). Finally, consider that the number of members of Division 28 has remained relatively constant during the last decade. There is a substantial core group and then there are those who have come and gone. It is difficult to make a case that people have left for new or fertile grounds due to loss of funds. Similarly, although it is true that NIDA does periodically undergo upheavals and reorganizations which give the illusion that major changes have taken place, like the chameleon or the stylish dresser, we may all occasionally change our

colors but the fundamental reptilian or naked structure remains.

The sensitivity of the issues now increases. The question has been raised whether some investigators receive disproportionate amounts of the available resources. To quote the range of equivocal comments, perhaps, maybe and sort of. There is no question that there are entities identifiable as individuals, groups of individuals, departments, or combinations of departments which receive a significant proportion of available NIDA funds. Furthermore, the prevailing philosophy of the appropriateness of this situation shifts only slightly less frequently than the Sahara sands. During a period of great concern in 1982, an argument was made for the absolute need to maintain the integrity of major research facilities, necessarily at the cost of individual grants. The rationale was that there would be, in the long run, no new investigators to maintain the discipline if the major centers providing training succumbed to the Stockman ax. Subsequently, the case was made that there was a need to set aside a certain portion of the budget for investigators defined as young, or new, single, or simply lonely (i.e. not working with a large group). Certainly the two views are not incompatible. There is a need to achieve both ends. A base for b & p pharmacology by the broadest definitions should exist in centers and there should be a protected source for the singleminded independent investigators (old, middle and young) whose creativity often fosters whole new areas of research or new approaches to problems.

Who determines where the available funds should go, who should make the determinations, and how are the determinations made are questions often asked? The answer depends in part on the level at which one poses the question. Clearly, determination of major conceptual focus (e.g. treatment, prevention, biomedical, behavioral, pharmacological) results from complex interactions between congressional mandates, cultural pressures, pressures from scientists themselves, NIDA's Directors' Offices, and occasionally even due to advances in science itself. Acute and chronic conditions can alter or enhance emphasis. For example, increased prevalence of cocaine abuse led to a flurry of activity, special emphasis and a specific program announcement. Similarly, AIDS has generated a special announcement and specific funds set aside for AIDS related complexities. These are all necessary responses to the health environment although the institutional response is at times unduly strident. However, investigators should be aware that under claims of budget crises, individual administrators may force drastic changes in investigator initiated research. Others will, of course, make every effort to help.

Determinations about funding of specific projects also result from interacting factors. There is considerable discussion about the level of importance to be attached to priority scores; some would dispense with them entirely while others would adhere to them rigidly. The middle ground entails some consideration of

combinations of priority and "programmatic importance". Clearly, in the face of a flexible view of priority scores, who makes acute decisions about programmatic importance becomes critical to the individual investigator.

The current directions of NIDA are not clear but one might expect that the good old persons network is probably prospering. For those who have strongly encouraged and benefitted from g.o.p networks in the past, it must be recalled that the network in power may change and when it does the cradle (and the funding) may fall. The peer review system, unless unduly interfered with by administrators, legislators or special interest groups, is perhaps the best protection scientists have available despite the occasional peculiar results. (Everyone should be aware that there are substantial pressures on the review system and resolution of observed problems will begin when you speak up, not if you hunker down.) The point then, and there is one, is that balance of funds is precarious and the policy issue is one that should be determined by a combination of Institute staff members and scientists of all persuasions pertinent to a particular funding unit. Any one of these groups or individuals alone will not serve well the future of science since their immediate reinforcers will cloud judgement of long term issues. Or so at least, it has been my privilege to observe.

The questions which brought us to this series of observations on factors effecting funding was based in recent legislation and interest in where the money has gone. Those who have been the recipients of budget cuts clearly interpret the problem as being one of reduction of overall funds. Consider the following: NIDA's extramural research budget over the last five years was as follows: 1981, \$41,367,000; 1982, 37,225,000 (beaujolais was bad that year too); 1983, \$43,023,000; 1984, \$49,885,000; 1985, \$58,362,000. One need not be astute to observe budget increases in the last several years. Then why the cuts? Indirect costs charged by universities and other institutions (their cost for graciously overseeing your grant) are not insignificant. They range from about 20% of the total for some off-campus efforts to over 100%. Thus, of last years \$58,000,000 extramural research budget, less than 40,000,000 went to direct costs of research. What other drains are there on the budget? Many investigators build in 10% increases in budget in all categories including personnel. How many universities permitted 10% increases in salary in each of the last five years?

The fact that directors of programs and institutes may use some discretion in funding the occasional odd costly program further draws on available money. Further complicating the problem is that congress (and other interested parties), in an effort to assure funding of new grants and to avoid gradual elimination of funded research programs, stipulated a specific number of new and competing renewal grants to be funded each year. As you have read elsewhere and as is evident here, the end result is that grants must be cut. In brief, it should be evident that there have been multiple factors

contributing to the cuts to date. Thus, the doomsayers were only partially correct. There was more money but it was spent in advance.

These thoughts bring us to the final question; has the day of the doomsayer arrived? Who are Gramm, Rudman, & Hollings (never heard of them—where have you been) and where goes NIDA funding "policy" now? In the effort to balance the national budget by 1991, GR&H sponsored a bill. It has been passed and requires annual limits on spending or reductions will ensue. In addition, there will be, as noted both in *Science* (January 31, 1986), and by the administration itself, efforts to achieve larger cuts (they clearly are not aware of the toxic consequences that occur at the distal end of the dose response curve). One other point of note is that an effort will be made to maintain a 6% increase in the Department of Defense budget.

The consequences are of course clear and have been most eloquently stated by Dr. Brown (chief of the Neuroscience Branch at NIDA): "The funding climate is austere although we will be able to fund some grants during 1986"; Dr. Walsh of the Clinical and Behavioral Pharmacology Branch uttered a similar comment and then something unprintable, and Dr. Tims the new branch chief (since my departure) of the Treatment Research Branch was equally optimistic. These comments were, in the main, translatable as minimum 20% reductions for the remainder of the year.

Faced with a modest increase in budget, reductions would have been necessary to meet the various contingencies. Confronted with a flat budget (the \$58,000,000 of 1985), reductions in budgets would be even more necessary. The determinants are, as noted above, general increases in indirect costs, the principal investigators budgeted increases in direct costs, and the congressionally dictated mandate to fund a specified number of new and competing renewal grants (in the NIDA's case, 131). Concurrently, there is a general reworking of the program ongoing. The final, and potentially crippling blow will revolve around the AIDS funds. The Institute was directed to set aside \$6-7 million dollars for research and "information dissemination" related to AIDS. This was to have been provided as a supplement. If the additional money is not provided, it will be necessary to absorb the costs in the regular budget. Clever and creative financing by the NIDA administrators at all levels will reduce the effect to some extent, but there are limits on the level of creativity that can be achieved.

What strategy should the administrators use? Certainly succumbing to every political whim, whimper, and sound of fury is not the solution although it commonly occurs. The current view at the highest levels is that all staff members should be good soldiers and "team players". If an ADAMHA administrator or congressperson says provide my colleague or constituent with a modest (or immodest) fund to evaluate program x, the prevailing view is; "circumvent the grants system, write a contract and take the position that we have wasted more money in other places and this will gain us

good will." It also means that some grantee who has gone through the entire review process will not get funded. Similar perspectives that grantees should be informed as little as possible about the funding process (a new phenomenon at NIDA) is likewise likely to lead to misdirection of funds without review. One clear benefit of the peer review process is to avoid these occurrences. Finally, there is a substantial need to preclude the problems of omniscient science administration. Scientists and clinicians, not just those of the g.o.p. network, should contribute ideas and views on the specifics. Administrators, who do have the major advantage of overview, should put the pieces together, always checking with the community at large to determine whether the integration and translation are correct. The greatest criticism of the scientific community contributions at present is that they tend to be unduly narrow and self serving. The latter comment assumes intent in the narrowness and it has been evident. Alternatively narrowness may be described as "focused" and is often a hallmark of fastidious science, an obviously desirable condition. Overall, the need to avoid programmatic funding decisions being made in vacuo is apparent. The decisions required of administrators in the best of times are difficult and now they will be subject to remarkable pressures.

Aside from the possibility of arbitrary, or even well planned programmatic shifts, a major pragmatic question now arises for both the scientists and the administrators. Should the policy be to provide everyone up to some reasonable priority score (thereby meeting the "numbers requirement" - i.e. 131), 20% to 80% of their requested funds, or should a lesser number of grants be funded in their entirety or with much less severe cuts? Presumably, if you have a terrific priority score you have answered this question quickly and in one direction. If you have what has become a more modest score, e.g. 135, you have responded differently. Your response probably reflected whether your salary is "hard" or "soft". Perhaps most important is that you responded with the thought that this is a short term problem. The current "official" position is that many investigators will be given very modest amounts (e.g. \$1.50) so that they can be maintained in the NIDA fold in the event that funding improves. And what is the time course? Given current legislation, this is a problem of continuing importance and will effect programs across the board, with the exception of social security, defense, and a few other items for the next five years.

One would hope that we are all aware of the origins of the current fiscal problems. The problem is real. What are we going to do? There is a need for more creative proposal than the one which is stereotypic; i.e. "Our program is most important". As it stands, the program which effects us the most will be reduced in scope. Can we do anything in the short or long run to alter the overall effects. Immediate economies may attenuate some of the effects. Should unneeded funds be refused or turned back so that others may eat, or a least feed their rabbits? How you choose to approach this is a rather

personal decision. There is of course a public side to all of this. First, there is a need for clear statements and openness in the Institute's consideration of programmatic funding priority areas. Certainly, special programs of administrators should wait. Reviewed programs should take precedence. And then there are the letters. Perhaps all of those computers and word processors which churn out scientific papers could be used for other purposes for a day or two. Some have suggested there exists a need for the following items: increased, or at least level, domestic funding; decreased defense spending and a meaningful tax increase. All of these things would hurt someone some of the time. In the name of equity everyone should presumably share the experience. What do you think? Have you thought about it? The question is whether those of us who are scientists and administrators are going to address our not inconsiderable talents to the problem. I noted at the outset that Thompson strongly urges us to become more involved in the Sci Biz. I would further suggest that we become more heavily invested in the life biz; if you can't find out what is going on in your neck of the desert or woods, get the Washington Post Weekly Edition (and read it). Believe that there will be repercussions of the Graham-Rudman-Hollings bill whether or not you are aware of its existence. Write a letter. Write two letters. Short ones are better (you would have been happier if this had been shorter; congress people do not have time to deal with long letters; and as the number of staff members at NIDA diminishes, the remaining few will likewise be hard pressed for time). And that, my friends is the first report from the bayou. To quote Ian Shoales, "I gotta go".

*John Grabowski, Ph.D., Department of Psychiatry  
LSU, 1501 Kings Highway, Shreveport, LA 71130  
(intermittently with NIDA)*

*Acknowledgements:* I wish to thank my colleagues, Drs. Dworkin and Smith for thoughts and comments on this diatribe; may their funding not be adversely effected. Thanks as well to Drs. Walsh, Brown, Snyder, and Tims.

#### **ADAMHA ANNOUNCES RESEARCH PROGRAM ON AIDS**

The Alcohol, Drug Abuse and Mental Health Administration issued a program announcement for research on the alcohol, drug abuse and mental health aspects of Acquired Immunodeficiency Syndrome (AIDS). This announcement is to encourage research directed toward the psychological and neuropsychiatric problems, which are important consequences of AIDS and may also represent risk factors for it. Among the concerns are drug abusers who represent an avenue of AIDS infection to the general public. Concern over AIDS also reemphasizes the importance of research on the effects of alcohol consumption on immunologic functioning. Support may be requested for up to five years. Applications will be accepted and reviewed according to usual Public Health Service schedule and procedures. For further information contact: Ellen

Simon Stove, Ph.D. Deputy Director, Division of Basic Sciences, National Institute of Mental Health, Room 10-104, Parklawn Building, 5600 Fishers Lane, Rockville, MD 20857 (Tel: 301 443-4337).

#### **MEETING ANNOUNCEMENTS**

##### **European Behavioural Pharmacology Society**

A group of European behavioural pharmacologists has undertaken to establish the European Behavioural Pharmacology Society (EBPS). The inaugural meeting of this society will take place in Belgium on July 2-7, 1986. It will consist of a main scientific meeting (July 3-5), a business meeting (July 6), and a satellite workshop (July 5 and 7) on Transduction Mechanisms of Drug Stimuli.

The EBPS meeting will feature theoretical lectures on fundamental aspects of behaviour analysis and pharmacology, and will cover several important areas of behavioural pharmacology. The latter will include:

- Drugs and reinforcement
- Neurotransmitters and behaviour
- Neuropeptides and behaviour
- Environmental determinants of drug action
- Behavioural and neuropharmacological models of anxiety

Recent research on human and social behaviour Research papers on these aspects of behavioural pharmacology will be grouped together in proximity to the invited contributions; work in other areas will also be welcomed and accommodated in the meeting.

The satellite workshop will in effect be the continuation of the International Drug Discrimination meetings held previously in Beerse, Belgium in 1978 and 1982. It will cover research on discriminative stimulus properties of drugs and drug state dependency. The focus of the 1986 drug discrimination meeting will be on those mechanisms by which drug molecules are transduced so as to become stimuli to behaviour. Research findings relating to receptor mechanisms and sensory pharmacology/physiology will thus be emphasized.

Both the main EBPS meeting and the satellite workshop are open to scientists from any nation, including non-European countries. It will also be possible to become a member of the EBPS from the time of the meeting onward. Abstracts for the meetings are due April 20. For more information, contact Dr. F.C. Colpaert, Dept. of Psychopharmacology, Janssen Pharmaceutica, B-2340 Beerse, Belgium.

##### **Joint Meeting of ISGIDAR and SSPD**

The International Study Group Investigating Drugs as Reinforcers (ISGIDAR) and the Society for the Stimulus Properties of Drugs (SSPD) will co-sponsor a scientific meeting on June 15, 1986 in Lake Tahoe, Calif. Papers on drug self-administration or stimulus control of behavior by drugs are invited. Registration will be at 8:30 a.m. ISGIDAR will hold its annual business meeting following the paper session. To present a paper,

send a 300 word abstract by April 1, 1986, to William L. Woolverton, Department of Pharmacology-Physiology, University of Chicago, 947 E. 58th Street, Chicago, IL 60637, or to Debra Bennett, Neuroscience Research, CIBA-GEIGY Pharmaceuticals, 505 Morris Avenue, Summit, New Jersey 07901 (SSPD). There will be a \$15 registration fee. ISGIDAR is also sponsoring an award for travel expenses (up to \$500) for a new investigator to present a paper on drug self-administration research. Full papers for this competition should be sent to Dr. Woolverton and are due March 1, 1986. Submission guidelines will appear in the ISGIDAR Newsletter or can be obtained from Dr. Woolverton.

#### **Behavioral Pharmacology Society**

The 1986 meeting of the Behavioral Pharmacology Society will be held in Atlanta, Georgia, at the Colony Square Hotel on May 16-17. If you are not a member and you have an interest in attending the meeting in 1986, you will need a special invitation to attend as a guest. To receive an invitation, please ask a member of the Society to send a letter to the President requesting that you be permitted to attend as that person's guest. Once that letter is received, your name will be placed on the mailing list, and you will receive a letter of invitation and future announcements about the meeting.

If you are a non-member who has attended a meeting, you are eligible to be nominated for membership in the Society. If you are interested in seeking membership, you must ask a member to send the President a letter of nomination. The nomination for membership and the request to attend as a guest can be addressed in the same letter. Members will vote by mail ballot on those nominated for membership, and the results will be announced at the May, 1986, meeting. For additional information regarding the Society, contact the President, Larry D. Byrd, at the Yerkes Regional Primate Research Center, Emory University, Atlanta, Georgia 30322 (phone: 404/727-7730).

#### **Division 28 Informal Paper Session**

Division 28's program for the 1986 APA annual meeting will again include an informal paper session to be held during the hospitality suite hours. Please submit any suggestions for this session or brief descriptions of presentations you would consider presenting during the Informal Paper Session to: Steven L. Dworkin, Ph.D., LSU School of Medicine, Department of Psychiatry, P.O. Box 33932, Shreveport, LA 71130.

#### **NEW JOURNAL: DRUGS AND SOCIETY**

The Haworth Press, Inc., announces the forthcoming publication of the new quarterly journal **DRUGS & SOCIETY: A Journal of Contemporary Issues**. The journal will pursue the publication of articles that will critically review issues and provide reports of innovative contemporary research that will have direct implications for practitioners and researchers, and which will help to provide direction for research and

treatment. It will break away from traditional formats and procedures and will seek to present creative, exciting, stimulating, and provocative articles by allowing a significant degree of freedom for authors to communicate their ideas. Each issue of the journal will be devoted to a specific topic of interest. Contributors to **DRUGS & SOCIETY** will be obtained by direct solicitation, or by a "Call for Papers." The charter issue of **DRUGS & SOCIETY**-Volume 1, Number 1-is scheduled for publication in Fall 1986. For more information contact Bernard Segal, PhD, Center for Alcohol & Addiction Studies, Univ. of Alaska, 3211 Providence Drive, Anchorage, AK 99508 (907) 786-1802.

#### **NOMINATIONS SOUGHT**

##### **Edwin B. Newman Graduate Research Award**

The eight annual Edwin B. Newman Award for Excellence in Graduate Research, established jointly by Psi Chi and APA, will be given at the 1986 APA National Convention in Washington, D.C. The award will be presented for the best graduate student paper accepted for presentation at the APA or Psi Chi convention, any of the six regional psychological association conventions, any of the state psychological association conventions, or the Canadian counterparts to these conventions, held between July 1, 1985 and June 30, 1986. For purposes of the award, "research" is broadly defined to include all forms of scholarly endeavor relevant to psychology, such as experiments, correlational studies, historical papers, case histories, and evaluation studies. The deadline for submissions is March 23, 1986. For more information write to the Edwin B. Newman Award, Scientific Affairs office, American Psychological Association, 1200 17th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 or call (202) 955-7755.

##### **Leadership Citation of the Committee on Women in Psychology.**

The APA Committee on Women in Psychology (CWP) invites nominations for CWP's Second Annual Leadership Citation. CWP will accept nominations in two categories:

*Emerging Leaders*-Persons who have worked less than 10 years after the Ph.D. degree, who have made a substantial contribution to women in psychology, and who show promise of an extensive career influence.

*Established Leaders*-Persons who have worked for 10 or more years after the Ph.D. degree, who have had a longstanding, continued, and cumulative influence on women's issues and women's status, and who are recognized leaders in their area of expertise.

All nominations must include a brief statement of support for the nominee (500-word maximum), a curriculum vitae, and the names of three individuals who have been asked to send reference letters. Nominations should be forwarded to the Women's Programs Office, American Psychological Association, 1200 Seventeenth Street, N.W., Washington, DC 20036. The deadline for nominations is April 1, 1986.

### APPRECIATION

The members of Division 28 are very appreciative of the financial support given during the past year by the following corporate affiliates.

<i>American Cyanamide</i>	<i>Bristol Myers</i>
<i>Ciba-Geigy</i>	<i>Hoechst Roussel</i>
<i>Hoffman LaRoche</i>	<i>McNeil</i>
<i>Merrill-Dow</i>	<i>Pfizer</i>
<i>Sandoz</i>	<i>Schering</i>
<i>Squibb</i>	<i>Upjohn</i>
<i>Wyeth</i>	

In addition, thanks to G.D. Searle for providing the typesetting, printing and mailing of the November 1985 issue of the newsletter.

A very special thank you goes to Burroughs-Wellcome, Research Triangle Park, NC for their continued generous support of the Young Psychopharmacologist Award.

### A STAMP COMMEMORATING WILLIAM JAMES

The Public Information committee of APA is asking members to write the Postmaster General urging that a stamp be issued in honor of William James to commemorate a hundred years of psychology as a science, discipline and profession. Letters should be addressed to the Stamp Committee, c/o The Postmaster General, U.S. Postal Service, 475 L'Enfant Plaza, S.W., Washington, DC 20260. The Stamp Committee seems to respond best to short presentations that emphasize the significance of the person or theme suggested and the timeliness of the idea. The James theme is likely to gain acceptance because of his eminence and because the upcoming 100th anniversary of the publication of his "Principles of Psychology" and his involvement in founding the American Psychological Association give a certain timeliness to the proposal.

### POSITIONS AVAILABLE

**RESEARCH ASSISTANTSHIP:** Beginning July 1, 1986, a position is available in an ongoing project studying the effects of ethyl alcohol on animal behavior. Applicant must be interested in pursuing a Ph.D. in Motor Control and/or Biopsychology, focussing on the effects of chronic alcohol on fast movement reactions to sensory stimuli in rats. Contact Dr. Waneen Spirduso, Belmont 222 (512/471-4168) or Dr. Timothy Schallert (512/471-5175), The University of Texas, Austin, TX, 78712.

**POSTDOCTORAL RESEARCH FELLOWSHIP:** This position in alcohol research is a two year appointment, beginning in July or September 1986, with the Addictive Behaviors Research Center in the Department of Psychology at the University of Washington, and is funded by the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism. The overall purpose is to provide postdoctoral training for individuals who wish to pursue a career in alcohol research, with an emphasis

on the etiology and prevention of problem drinking and alcoholism. As this topic will be approached from both psychosocial and biobehavioral perspectives, individuals with background training in any relevant areas of psychology (clinical, health psychology, physiological, social, cognitive, behavioral pharmacology, etc.) are encouraged to apply. Stipends range from \$16,000 to \$30,000, depending on years of postdoctoral experience. Applicants should submit a cover letter indicating areas of research interest, a vita, and three letters of recommendation, by March 1, 1986, to Alan Marlatt, Ph.D., Director, Addictive Behaviors Research Center, Department of Psychology (NI-25), University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195.

### POSTDOCTORAL RESEARCH FELLOWSHIPS:

Several positions in human behavioral pharmacology and substance abuse are available between now and Fall 1986 at the Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine. Studies of (1) drug effects on psychomotor, cognitive, and social behavior, mood and affect; (2) opioid physical dependence and stimulus effects; (3) analysis of cigarette smoking behavior; (4) substance abuse treatment (methadone, polydrug) are possible in a productive laboratory with excellent resources and support. USPHS stipends: \$16,000-22,000 approx. Send letter of interest, vita, and names of 3 references to: George E. Bigelow, Ph.D.; D-5-West, Psychiatry; Johns Hopkins/Key Medical Center; Baltimore, Maryland 21224; (301) 955-0035.

### IT'S YOUR NEWSLETTER

This newsletter can provide a valuable service for Division 28 members if you choose to utilize it. It is circulated to approximately 1200 people who have a direct involvement and/or interest in the area of psychopharmacology. As such, publishing in the newsletter provides you with direct and free access to the audience you'd most like to reach. Have a position available? Send an announcement giving the details. Would you like to inform others about graduate education in your department? Send a description of the program, participating faculty and research opportunities. Have you recently written or edited a book you'd like to promote? Send a brief description. Or how about an article you've just published and would like to bring to the attention of others? Don't be modest - send an abstract. It's your newsletter - please feel free to use it!

Deadline for the next issue is April 11. Send materials to Nancy J. Leith, Ph.D., G.D. Searle & Co., 4901 Searle Parkway, Skokie, IL 60077.

