

POPULATION & ENVIRONMENTAL PSYCHOLOGY BULLETIN

The Newsletter of Division 34 of the American Psychological Association

Vol. 25, No. 3, Autumn, 1999

HAPPY SILVER ANNIVERSARY, DIVISION 34 !!!

IN THIS ISSUE...

Retrospectives

>From APA Task Force to Division 34, <i>David</i>	1
On the Marriage..., <i>Altman</i>	3
Members' Memories, <i>Adler, Lowman, Severy</i>	4

Prospectives

Population Psychology... in under 300 words, <i>Agnew</i>	4
Personal Thoughts...Environmental Psychology, <i>Veitch</i> ..	5
>From the President...., <i>Sommer</i>	6
1999 Presidential Address, <i>Gifford</i>	7
Book Review: Advancing the Contextual Study of Abortion, <i>Wilmoth</i>	10
Announcements.....	12
Division Business Reports, 1999.....	13

Send submissions to Jennifer A. Veitch, Ph.D., Editor, at
jennifer.veitch@nrc.ca.

NEWSLETTER NEWS:

PEPB is an unrefereed forum for the sharing of news, ideas, and opinions in population and environmental psychology. Opinions are those of the authors, and do not reflect the official policy of Division 34 unless explicitly stated.

Call for Submissions

Winter, 2000

Health Research in Population & Environmental Psychology
Deadline: January 15, 2000.

Spring, 2000: *Imagine the Future: Utopia, Entopia, or Dystopia?* Deadline: May 1, 2000.

Autumn, 2000: *Families and Homes*. Deadline: October 1, 2000.

Submissions are invited for these forthcoming issues of PEPB. Submissions may be of the following types:

- commentaries on topical issues (max 1500 words)
- "Day in the Life" columns (max 1500 words)
- preprint abstracts (max 300 words)
- news announcements -- e.g., Calls for Papers, Upcoming Events, etc.
- teaching tips, laboratory assignments, etc. (max 750 words)

RETROSPECTIVES

From APA Task Force to Division 34

Henry P. David

Transnational Family Research Institute
Bethesda, MD

Division 34 is a child of the Task Force on Psychology, Family Planning, and Population Policy, established by APA Council in October 1969. The purpose of the Task Force was two-fold: (a) to prepare "a review of the current state of psychological research related to family planning and population policy and (b) to make recommendations for encouraging greater research and professional service participation by psychologists in this emerging area of social concern (McKeachie, 1970, 34). The initial members of the Task Force were James T. Fawcett, Deborah Matory, Sidney H. Newman, Edward T. Pohlman, and Vaida Thompson, with Miriam Kelty as APA staff liaison. I served as chair. Nancy Russo joined us later.

The Task Force emerged from an APA Council discussion of whether APA should take a stand on the legalization of abortion. As an APA Council member, I had joined with the Association for Women Psychologists to introduce a resolution declaring that termination of an unwanted pregnancy was a mental health and child welfare issue, and thus a legitimate concern of APA. The resolution resolved that termination of pregnancy be considered a civil right of the pregnant woman, to be handled as any other medical and surgical procedure in consultation with the woman's physician (McKeachie, 1970, 37). At the suggestion of some Council members, a second resolution was then moved by Division 18 (Public Service), which I represented, resolving that APA establish a Task Force on Psychology, Family Planning, and Population Policy. After only brief discussion, both the abortion and the task force resolutions passed by a substantial margin, thus placing APA firmly in support of women's reproductive rights well before the January 1973 Roe vs. Wade Supreme Court decision.

When the Task Force convened its organizational meeting on 17 December 1969, fewer than a dozen of the nation's then 31,000 psychologists were estimated to be working primarily in population-related endeavors. Not a single U.S. institution of higher learning had a psychology department with an undergraduate, graduate, or postdoctoral program explicitly dealing with population or reproductive behavior. Unhappily, that situation has changed little over the subsequent 30 years.

During its existence, the Task Force organized workshops and symposia, published resource information on family planning, encouraged the publication of several books, and disseminated a newsletter to over 750 individuals and organizations (APA Task Force, 1972). It also facilitated a special edition of the *Journal of Social Issues* (Back and Fawcett, 1974), largely devoted to population policies and psychological research. Jim Fawcett envisaged two types of studies to produce policy relevant knowledge: (a) studies related to policies, including the psychological mechanisms through which existing policies operate to bring about changes in

behavior, and (b) studies of the microlevel causes and consequences of demographic behavior with emphasis on linkages to external factors that are capable of being affected by policies. When population policy is viewed as a transaction between the individual and society, then psychological perspectives are believed to be of particular import.

In developing the 1974 issue of the *Journal of Social Issues*, the editors posed the question: What light can be shed on issues of population policy by viewing those issues from particular theoretical perspectives in psychology?. In the opening paper, Joe Stycos discussed diverse dimensions of the goals and means of population and family planning. Nearly all the subsequent contributions focused on fertility, fertility regulation, and fertility limitation policies, reporting studies that were largely social psychological while linked to a wider theoretical orientation. Judith Bardwick wrote about evolution and parenting, suggesting that people have both the ability and a need to parent. Vaida Thompson considered the ways in which the social system imposed boundaries on the latitude of individual behaviors through the emergence of family size norms. Paula Hollerbach (Hass) reviewed childbearing motivations, distinguishing between wanted and unwanted pregnancies and introducing further classifications of ambivalent, conflicted, and unmotivated pregnancies. She also recognized the importance of noting at what stage the classification was made, whether at preconception, postconception, or postbirth. Three other articles cited intervention strategies to facilitate change in fertility regulating behavior. Bill Wiest and Les Squier wrote about incentives and reinforcement, Tom Crawford recommended more effective persuasion strategies in population communication programs, and Joel Cooper suggested further exploration of forced compliance approaches. Attempting to integrate all the papers, Kurt Back concluded that "the most developed area in psychology relevant to population control; is the implementation of the use of birth control methods." However, "the large problems tying questions of population policy and its aims to general human characteristics have provided many intriguing ideas but few usable facts for the policymaker."

In reflecting on the field in 1972, the Task Force expressed its belief that the chief contribution of psychologists had been the identification of personal and attitudinal variables related to fertility. Some studies focused on fertility-regulating behavior and on couple decision-making processes. Others emphasized the normative rather than the pathological sequelae of contraception and pregnancy termination. Increasingly sophisticated, these studies promised to deepen understanding of the determinants of human fertility while extending the research parameters of motivation theory, decision making, and assessment. It was argued that there was a need for new measures of variables that were both theoretically and empirically relevant to family planning. Also needed were new methods of analysis that gave greater attention to the powerful interpersonal determinants of fertility-regulating behavior. Thought to be particularly desirable were measures that were relatively simple, brief, easily administered, and transnationally adaptable (APA Task Force, 1972, 1102). Much of this has come to pass .

Among the several recommendations of the Task Force was one encouraging the establishment of an APA Division of Population Psychology. Upon meeting the necessary requirements and approval by APA Council, the Division was duly organized in August 1974 with Vaida Thompson as first President. The four subsequently elected presidents - Fawcett, Russo, David, and Kelty - had all been members of the Task Force.

An important by-product of Task Force efforts was the convening of an interdisciplinary Abortion Research Workshop on the day before the 1973 meeting of the Population Association of America in New Orleans. Reflecting its expanding scope of interest, it was renamed the Psychosocial Workshop in 1982. Its annual sessions attract a coterie of anthropologists, demographers, economists, psychologists, psychiatrists, sociologists, and other health professionals. Happily informal, it has no bylaws or elected officers, and requires no dues. Annual program chairs organize the two day meeting, always leaving sufficient time for breaks and discussions (David, 1986, 1998).

The APA Task Force was a timely catalyst both within psychology and between psychology and other professions that shared the aim of attaining a better understanding of the complex psychosocial process of human fertility behavior. More than 25 years later the American Psychological Association published a volume on abortion (Beckman and Harvey, 1998). It echoes the resolutions of the 1994 United Nations Cairo International Conference on Population and Development (ICPD, 1995) by placing abortion, along with sexual and reproductive health, firmly within the context of women's rights. The APA book has wide interdisciplinary appeal and reflects well the diverse and complex aspects of the abortion issue.

Looking toward the future, I cannot help but reflect on my more than 30 years of cooperative interdisciplinary transnational research in reproductive behavior with colleagues on every continent. Much of our work in Central and Eastern Europe appears in a book just published (David, 1999). This endeavor leads me to hope that, with the celebration of its 25th anniversary, APA Division 34 will reaffirm its dedication to theory grounded research and to the effective utilization of research findings for enhancing public policy designed to improve public health, responsible reproductive and sexual behavior, and women's rights in the United States and other lands.

References

- APA Task Force (1972). Report of the Task Force on Psychology, Family Planning, and Population Policy. *American Psychologist*, 27, 1100-1105.
- Back, K.W. and Fawcett, J.T. (Eds.). (1974). Population policy and the person: congruence or conflict. *The Journal of Social Issues*, 30(4), 1-324.
- Beckman, L.J. and Harvey, S.M. (Eds.) (1998), The new civil war: The psychology, culture, and politics of abortion. Washington, DC. David, H.P. (1986). Reflections on the Psychosocial Workshop. *P.A.A. Affairs*, Fall, 2-3.
- David, H.P. (1998). Foreword. In L.J. Beckman and S. Marie Harvey (Eds.), *The new civil war: The psychology, culture,*

and politics of abortion (pp. xi-xv). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

David, H.P. (Ed.) (1999) *From abortion to contraception: A resource to public policies and reproductive behavior in Central and Eastern Europe from 1917 to the present*. Westport, CT: Greenwood.

International Conference on Population and Development. (1995). *The report of the International Conference on Population and Development, Cairo, September 15-19, 1994*. New York: United Nations.

McKeachie, W.J. (1970). Proceedings of the American Psychological Association of the year 1969: Minutes of the annual meeting of the Council of Representatives. *American Psychologist*, 25, 13-37

* Portions of this essay were previously presented in David (1998).

Henry David's e-mail address is hdavid@compuserve.com.

On the Marriage of Population and Environmental Psychology

Irwin Altman
University of Utah

Younger readers might not know, and older readers might have forgotten, that we are actually celebrating the Silver anniversary of the Division of *Population Psychology*, which was organized in 1974. The Division name was changed in 1976 to the Division of *Population and Environmental Psychology*, to reflect the joining of the Division by environmental psychologists who had been working as an *ad hoc* APA Task Force in the years preceding the merger. Here is one person's recollection of that era in respect to environmental psychology.

In the early 1970s the American Psychological Association's Board of Scientific Affairs sponsored a number of *ad hoc* Task Forces in so-called newly emerging areas of research. In 1973 I was invited to chair and organize a task force on environmental psychology, an area which had begun to be of interest to psychologists, other social scientists and environmental designers. The steering committee consisted of myself, Bob Helmreich, Ed Willems, and Jack Wohlwill. During the next two years the Task Force organized a variety of activities, including sessions at APA and regional meetings, convention and pre-convention workshops, a newsletter (which ran for 11 issues and had a mailing list of 1400 recipients), a survey of graduate programs, a curriculum network, an interprofessional consortium of social science and environmental design disciplines, a policy analysis group, and others.

Early research in the field focused on personal space (stimulated by the anthropologist Ned Hall), crowding (sparked by concerns about the worldwide population boom), and territoriality. Research in the psychological ecology tradition of Roger Barker was also popular, as were studies of spatial behaviors in mental hospitals, classrooms, libraries, etc. (reflected in the work of Bob Sommer and the CUNY group,

notably Hal Proshansky, Bill Ittelson, and Leanne Rivlin). Sociologists of the era were studying larger scale settings of streets, neighborhoods, communities and cities. Central to the field at the time, and continuing today, were creative studies of environmental cognition and perception, initiated by geographers but readily carried on by psychologists. There was also strong interest in special populations, including the elderly (exemplified by the studies of Powell Lawton, Tom Byerts, Paul Windley and others fondly known as the "gerontology mafia").

During this era there were ongoing and spirited discussions and debates between environmental designers, some public policy representatives, and social scientists on how to "bridge the gap" between the perspectives, goals and approaches of researchers, environmental designers, and public decision makers. That struggle seems to arise from time to time to this day, although there are now many cases of productive collaboration between researchers, practitioners, and policy analysts.

In advancing the work of the Task Force APA generously provided staff support in the person of Willo White. Willo later edited a book on the activities of the Task Force, "Resources in Environment and Behavior", published by APA in 1979. That volume contained chapters on the history of the field, graduate programs, teaching and curriculum, bibliography, career opportunities, federal and private funding sources, journals, organizations, and a personal interest inventory of members.

Those were heady and invigorating days, as members of the Task Force threw themselves into the work, saw a bright future for the field, and took on major and continuing responsibilities. In addition to the Steering Committee, some of the participants were senior and mid-career folks who offered considerable wisdom and support--Bob Bechtel, Ken Craik, Paul Gump, Bill Ittelson, Powell Lawton, Mac Parsons, Hal Proshansky, Leanne Rivlin, Jerry Singer, Bob Sommer, Seymour Wapner, and others. Many, if not most, participants were relative youngsters, who have gone on to become luminaries in environmental psychology and related fields--Jack Aiello, Andy Baum, Reuben Baron, Frank Becker, Paul Bell, Michael Edelstein, Julian Edney, Gary Evans, Scott Geller, Steve Kaplan, Rachel Kaplan, Eric Knowles, Bob Marans, Steve Margulis, Gary Moore, Rudy Moos, Stu Oskamp, Art Patterson, Miles Patterson, Ed Sadalla, Susan Saegert, Paul Stem, Dan Stokols, Peter Suedfeld, Eric Sundstrom, Jerome Tognoli, Sue Weidemann, Rich Wener, Alan Wicker, Gary Winkel, Maxine Wolfe, Craig Zimring, to name a few. And people came from other disciplines as well--Amos Rapoport, John Archea, Mike Brill, Tom Byerts, Jay Farbstein, Roger Hart, Walt Kleeman, Robin Moore, Wolfgang Preiser, Andrew Seidel, Ray Studer, John Zeisel, Erv Zube, and others. These are just a handful of those early visionaries.

Toward the end of the Task Force's charter there were discussions about where to go next. We were approached by the Division of Military Psychology (Division 19) to join with them. We were also approached by the then recently formed Division of Population Psychology (Division 34) to affiliate with them. Some in the Task Force wanted to go it alone, and to form a new and independent division in APA. My information at the time was that forming a new division would take a lengthy period of working through the APA bureaucracy, and I

was also led to believe that the organization was frowning on new divisions during that period, and that our best bet was to join up with an existing division. I opted to steer the group in the latter direction. We conducted a survey of the Task Force membership on the question of which division to affiliate with (and did not include the option of a new division--to the chagrin of some, I must admit). The survey results were clear: join with Division 34. As a result, negotiations proceeded quickly and smoothly with the divisional leadership and through APA, and in a very short time Division 34's name was changed to the Division of Population and Environmental Psychology. As one of those involved in those negotiations, I recall vividly the graciousness and good will of the then divisional leadership, especially Nancy Adler, Henry David, Toni Falbo, Vaida Thompson, Ernst Beier, and others. The door was completely open to the participation of environmental psychologists in the activities and governance of the Division from the outset. No contingencies, qualifications or barriers were set down. The welcome was unequivocal. That early spirit of openness and collegiality has served as a model over the years, with continued mutual support, respect and collegiality displayed by successive generations of population and environmental psychologists who have led the Division. I trust that we will preserve and nurture that atmosphere in the future.

So here we are, and that's what I recall about those early days. Isn't it fascinating that we are now talking with another group about the possibility of their joining the Division! Good luck to those deliberating on that possibility, and congratulations to all who have maintained an interest in the ever-important topics of population and environment. Our numbers may be small but our work is large and crucial to the field and to society.

Irwin Altman's e-mail address is irwin.altman@m.cc.utah.edu.

Members Reminisce about Division 34

Nancy Adler, PhD

University of California at San Francisco

Thanks for the invitation to send a memory about the establishment of Division 34. I don't have a specific event or memory to share, but would like to share my thoughts:

My memories of the early (and later days) of the division almost all involve Henry David. I had recently gotten my Ph.D. when the Division was first established and I wasn't sure just what I was, or what Population Psychology was. However, I knew that I was interested in topics relating to reproductive behavior and that a wonderful and lively group of people including Henry, Vaida Thompson, Nancy Russo, Miriam Kelty, Rennie Miller, Stuart Oskamp and James Fawcett were doing exciting work and were developing this division. Henry invited me to become involved in the Division not just in terms of my research, but also suggested that I attend a business meeting for the division. I went to the first business meeting and found myself signed up! The division exemplified the best

of a collegial organization, one in which there are strong personal and professional ties. These relationships are still important to me today. We are a small band (as reflected in difficulties in maintaining enough journal subscriptions!), but very dedicated and the link with Environmental Psychology has turned out to be a happy and long-lived marriage. Happy birthday, Division 34!

Nancy Adler's e-mail address is nadler@itsa.ucsf.edu.

Robert Lowman, PhD
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

My recollection is that Division 34 grew out of an APA task force on population psychology that was sponsored by the Board of Scientific Affairs beginning in 1969. Henry David chaired the task force. Mariam Kelyt was scientific affairs officer at the time, although in later years Willo P. White may have handled some of the staff duties. There was a second APA task force on environmental psychology with the same sponsorship that later approached Division 34 after it was established and asked the division to change its name and allow environmental folks to join. The division graciously agreed to do so. Both task forces were part of a series sponsored by the APA Board of Scientific Affairs on "emerging fields" in psychology. Health psychology was a third task force in that series that also became a division. In fact, there was quite a bit of concern expressed by some at the time that the BSA task forces were nothing more than excuses to proliferate divisions!

The report of the population task force is in the January 1972 American Psychologist. A book that grew out of the task force was the 1973 volume entitled "Psychological perspectives on population," edited by James T. Fawcett, who was a task force member. Vaida Thompson, now head of the social psychology program here at UNC-Chapel Hill, was also a task force member.

Robert Lowman's mail address is lowman@unc.edu.

Larry Severy, Ph.D.
University of Florida

In the summer of 1976, NICHD sponsored a summer workshop in Chapel Hill for social scientists interested in Population. Vaida Thompson led the charge, and Sid Newman had secured the funding. The five psychologists (also five economists, sociologists, political scientists, anthropologists) spent much of whatever free time there was discussing the beginnings of Division 34. Vaida, Sid and Henry David seem to have been the major players in first an APA Task Force, and then the beginnings of the division. I spent many a fine time with Sid at APA, and the PAA meetings, discussing NICHD, being a young psychologist in academic settings interested in population, having fine meals (Sid's favorite was the Windsor Room in New Orleans), talking about horses, etc. The Division 34 remembrance function at APA in Washington upon Sid's passing was a most touching and informative time. Gloria Kamenski was also a major player in those early years.

I also remember that we spent a great deal of time trying to tie population and environmental issues, and there are some early statements in the newsletter to this effect, especially by Stokols. I even gave a try. We also spent time worrying about whether being initially trained as a social/developmental/organizational, etc., psychologist would forever taint, diminish, or preclude success in the population and environmental fields. Given that we have evolved very few training programs in these areas (which department has more than two population psychologists?), that argument now seems moot - but what has our impact been, what might it have been?

One small bit of trivia: I probably own the record for the most elections lost in the division (at least four or five for the presidency alone)! Some day I shall learn to say no.

Larry Severy's e-mail address is severy@psych.ufl.edu.

PROSPECTIVES

Defining the Future of Population Psychology (in under 300 words!)

Christopher R. Agnew, Ph.D.
Purdue University

I've stopped counting the times that I've been asked by colleagues about the term "population psychology." What does it mean? What does one do? Where are all the others? Of course, it requires that I have a pithy response to such questions and therein lies the rub: I don't really have one, partly because the answer isn't as clear-cut today as it might have been at the advent of the field. Population psychology, to me, represents an amalgam of elements, unified by a core belief that human behavior is influenced by processes both at the psychological level and the population level. Although the majority of self-defined population psychologists have focused on human fertility issues, the field began in response to calls for a greater understanding of the psychological underpinnings of broad demographic patterns. Thus, the original focus was on psychological issues related to the "big three" of demography: fertility, mortality, and mobility. Today, as psychology and psychologists have become increasingly specialized, many early adherents to population psychology (and to these three issues) have found that their interests are more clearly aligned with other areas, including health psychology, psychology of women, social psychology, and the psychological study of social issues. Where does this leave population psychology? Given the increasing atomization and fragmentation of psychology and psychological research, I believe our future and our strength lies in our distinctive ability to draw together people working in these varied areas to examine important, interdisciplinary questions. By addressing the complexity of human population-relevant behavior with responses that transcend individual disciplines, I'm confident that population psychology will continue to hold its own.

Christopher Agnew's e-mail address is agnew@psych.purdue.edu.

**Personal Thoughts on the Once
and Future Promise of Environmental Psychology**

Jennifer A. Veitch, Ph.D.
National Research Council of Canada
Institute for Research in Construction

By rights, I should be pessimistic about the future of environmental psychology. In graduate school, in a department with one EP faculty member, it often seemed like an aberration to have an interest in the physical environment and its effects on people. Advisors told me to find another interest in order to market myself for jobs, and to keep EP as a personal research activity. Of the five environmental psychologists trained by my doctoral supervisor, only one (me) has found work directly in the area (others teach and research it, but were not hired specifically to work in EP). In my particular area of research, the workplace physical environment, it often seems as though no progress has occurred in the area since the publication of the *Handbook of Environmental Psychology* in 1987. I have recently looked back at many conference proceedings and publications from a decade or more ago, and have been struck by the fact that the eminent names in the field are the same today, and on this subject (despite the tremendous technological changes in workplaces) there has been little movement on either the theoretical or empirical fronts. Throughout my seven years on the Executive Committee, Division 34 has exhibited all the characteristics of an understaffed organization. The 'bright future' Altman and others envisioned in the early days doesn't gleam today as many hoped.

Nonetheless, this relative newcomer remains optimistic. Some changes occur more slowly than our Internet-excited expectations lead us to believe. The recognition that human experience and human needs are the *raison d'être* of the built environment, and that changing human behavior is the key to many environmental problems, shows signs of becoming entrenched in applied fields such as engineering and architecture. I have watched this development among my own colleagues, and have noted that our institute's brochures now describe EP as fundamental to understanding and developing guidelines for good indoor environmental conditions. When I interviewed for this position, many of my colleagues, wholly unfamiliar with the field, viewed psychology as a quasi-science, and its measures and methods highly suspect. Exposure to the activities of professional associations (including Division 34) has helped to change those attitudes.

One surprising discovery that I have made in recent years is how many people, in a wide variety of disciplines from planning to engineering to architecture, appear to have adopted this same strategy as my grad school advisors advocated. They also seem to toil in isolation, but fundamentally their interests are in environmental psychology. It is this discovery that provides my greatest hope for the future. Electronic advances make the distances between researchers smaller, and the difficulty of finding obscure journals in unusual databases has never been lower. With minimal effort it is possible to develop a richly

varied community — much as existed in the early Task Force on Environmental Psychology — and we have no excuse not to try. Good scholarship, the search for knowledge and wisdom wherever it is found, demands it. Happily, that effort might also allow us to recapture the enthusiasm of early days.

Jennifer Veitch's e-mail address is jennifer.veitch@nrc.ca.

**FROM THE PRESIDENT...
THOUGHTS ON PUBLIC POLICY,
RESEARCH, INTEGRITY, AND ACTION**

Robert Sommer, Ph.D.
University of California, Davis

Educational reform is high on the political radar screen. Controversies such as vouchers, social promotion, and bilingual education lie outside environment-behavior research (EBR) and we can leave research on them to other specialties. Issues such as school design, school size, and ambient environment are directly in our purview and have been the subject of published EBR research. So it was with keen interest that I found a front page article on school size in the regional newspaper (Kollars, 1999). There was a heated controversy in a nearby community experiencing population growth. The choice was between doubling the size of a new high school to 3,600 students, which would make it by far the largest high school in the region, or building two 1,800 student schools. The reporter had done her homework and mentioned EBR in her article. "Many recent academic studies," she wrote, "have concluded that smaller schools are better for students than big schools because large institutions can leave teenagers feeling invisible and unconnected. Having two schools would give twice as many students the chance to become quarterback, earn a lead in a play, edit the yearbook, or be elected class president."

This is right out of Barker and Gump (1964); there is no application gap here. Relevant research has been made available in understandable language to those in a position to make decisions. A spokesperson for the state Department of Education and an education consultant declared their opposition to the consolidated school. While acknowledging that larger schools can be more cost effective, the consultant pointed out that they can also yield lower achievement, alienation, and management problems.

If I stopped my account here, this could be considered an EBR success story. However, as many academics have ruefully learned, research may have limited value in policy debates. The city's mayor, Chamber of Commerce, the high school athletic director, and many parents support a single consolidated school. Their arguments are economies of scale, social cohesion in the community, and the athletic program. It would be less expensive to consolidate computer classrooms, a performing arts center, gym, and a library than to build duplicate facilities. Proponents maintain that a single school would be a unifying force in the community while two schools will promote rivalries. There is also a not-so-subtle argument regarding sports. According to the

high school athletics director, the school will move up from Division 2 to Division 1 in three years. A second school would bump it back to Division 2. There are also testimonials on the basis of personal experience. The mayor declared, "I went to a high school with 3600 students and wouldn't have traded it for anything," concluding that "Bigger is definitely better."

This is a fascinating case study on the applicability of EBR findings in the policy arena. We can put aside the political dynamics of the community and the agenda of those who want their city to become a sports powerhouse. These issues, while critical to the ultimate decision, are beyond the reach of EBR. Our role involves issues where there are research-based data. I am willing to assume that it is cheaper to expand an existing school than to build a comparable new one. There are demonstrable short-run savings in infrastructure costs in a single large facility relative to two smaller ones. Can these short-run savings of the single large school be countered by the social and educational benefits of two smaller schools?

I regard the data on the social benefits of smaller schools to be reasonably solid. Even from a purely statistical standpoint, there are more opportunities for involvement in two smaller than in one large school. I don't know of any research addressing the issue of divided loyalties in a community with two smaller high schools rather than one large school. Although the arguments for short-term economies of scale in a consolidated school are credible, I would like to see long-term cost data. Large institutions foster bureaucratic structures and policies that hamper innovation, increase inertia, and drive up costs. I am not familiar with the studies alluded to by the consultant showing higher student achievement in smaller schools. I do not know of any true experiments with random assignment to small and large schools, and I am doubtful that such research designs could pass ethical review. If his statement were based on meta analysis of quasi experiments with nonrandom assignment, I would consider this to be suggestive but not conclusive.

My recommendation for this type of policy issue is that environment-behavior researchers attempt to harden soft data on social benefits through the use of quantification, models, projections, and monetization. We can compile and analyze SES data, student test scores, college acceptance rates, teacher and administrative turnover, absenteeism figures, and administrative costs in large and small schools, none of which was done in Barker and Gump's Big School, Small School. Where appropriate, we should put dollar values on different options. This will require expertise from outside EBR that is not always available. We must actively seek out colleagues in other fields willing to engage in collaborative cross-disciplinary applied studies. Otherwise we cannot counter arguments based on short run cost savings and personal anecdote ("I went to a large school and it was great.").

Every research study needs an advocate. This goes beyond a strong defense of method and results, to diffusion and implementation. Our responsibilities as environment-behavior researchers do not end with publication in refereed journals. We should also write articles directed to practitioners and the public, testify at legislative hearings, and consult with community agencies, firms, and organizations able to apply our findings directly. We must also recognize the limits of research in any

field, not only in EBR, for influencing policy debates, over people's reliance on their own beliefs, perceptions, and goals.

References

- Barker, R. G. & Gump, P. V. (Eds.) (1964). *Big school, small school*. Stanford CA: Stanford University Press.
Kollars, D. (1999). One high school or two for fast-growing Folsom? *Sacramento Bee* (July 11), pp. A1, A11.

Robert Sommer's e-mail address is rosommer@ucdavis.edu.

1999 PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS

Environmental Numbness and the Secret Science

Robert Gifford
University of Victoria

I see the opportunity to deliver this Presidential address as a great honor. I also see it as a chance to reflect and even to pontificate without having to collect any new data, and I intend to take full advantage of this liberating license. That being said, I hope my ruminations will not amount to pointless lip-flapping; I hope they will spark a new thought or action or two. In fact, I intend to prod and provoke, and I will take some chances with these words.

The reason for this should become clear as I move along; it is part of the theme of this talk. Not incidentally, when Bob Sommer first heard my title, he thought that either its intent or its effect would be to repel potential audience members or to somnambulize anyone foolish enough to attend. I hope he was mistaken, for once in his life.

When I was a much younger pup, I had a flash, as we called ideas then, probably inspired indirectly by Bob--but please don't blame him--to see what would happen if people were placed in a physical setting that literally squeezed them, although not until any juices flowed! I was a graduate student who earned his meager keep as a teaching assistant in a research methods laboratory course. The lab room had a single door at the front. About a dozen two-person desks were usually arranged in fairly neat rows in this room, and students had to enter through the single door and move past the instructor's desk to their places.

In those days of furniture studies, my plan was to see what would happen if the front desks were placed only six inches apart before the lab began, seemingly by a previous class or the janitor. The desks were not very heavy, and they carefully placed so that a student could move them with a little shove, if she or he so chose. The notion under investigation was that "they" (whoever had placed or left the desks in their positions) were very powerful or, more accurately, were accepted as such, in public settings; that the omniscient and omnipotent "they" must have wanted the desks in this particular awkward arrangement for some good reason.

Over the course of several labs, I surreptitiously counted the number of times that students passively accepted the difficult furniture arrangement by squeezing through the six-inch gaps without "disturbing" the desks that squeezed them. At the time,

it seemed simultaneously hilarious and pathetic that the students contorted themselves time after time so as to avoid “disturbing” the furniture as they entered the lab, carried out their experiment, and left the room. I wished--at the time--that I had made a video to show how much respect the students paid these impersonal and inanimate objects.

I think that out of something like 650 times that students passed through the six-inch passage, about 6 or 7 students moved the desks to make the passage easier. About half of those, as I recall, were forced to move the desks because six inches simply was not enough room for their ample bodies.

In the report of this little study, I gave the name “environmental numbness” to this phenomenon. The students seemed to be completely unaware of the degree to which they let the physical setting dictate their movements. At the end of each lab, I even upped the ante by asking the students if they noticed anything odd, difficult, or amiss in the lab, and received almost no recognition of the furniture problem. I have a feeling that in the realm of furniture, this phenomenon has changed only a little, if at all, in the years since this study was done. That original form of environmental numbness probably still rules.

What has changed is my willingness to conduct such a study again. Like many a young pup, it seemed--or must have seemed, I don't really know anymore--that time was unlimited and that furniture studies were important. As an older pup, I can no longer envision spending my time on a study that now seems almost, dare I say it, frivolous. Don't misunderstand--I still believe it is unfortunate that people usually do not take charge of the furniture they must use in public places (or, I sometimes have noticed, even in their own primary territories) to make it serve their communication and comfort needs.

But why not pursue that line of research? Certainly millions, perhaps even billions, of humans still suffer from bad furniture and, by extension, bad buildings. If you add up all the discomfort and resultant absenteeism, turnover, and training costs, it undoubtedly sums to a lot of mild suffering and lost productivity.

But now I think there are even bigger problems. I hasten to preface these next remarks by saying that nature appears quite resilient and that I am not convinced that all life will end in the next decade or so. I do not believe nature is a sentient being who is hurt in a human-like manner. Still, it is now absolutely clear that humans are leaving permanent black marks and erasures on the planet.

In the old days, almost nothing we could do left a really permanent mark. We did erase mastodons, dodos, and carrier pigeons from the planet, but those seemed like isolated and flaky, if unfortunate, incidents from our late adolescence as a species.

I believe we used to think that our large building projects were either positive or transitory. Works that seemed permanent, such as the pyramids, the Trans Canada Highway, the Golden Gate Bridge, or the Empire State Building represented beauty or progress, or both. Permanent erasures, like extinction, usually were pre-historic phenomena caused by natural forces or plain bad luck that had nothing to do with us. Permanent, planet-level changes caused by people were

inconceivable even when millions of soldiers and civilians were killed in the 1940s.

If we are willing to discount the apocalyptic visions in the Book of Revelation, it took until August 6, 1945 for people seriously to contemplate the possible end of the world. Within the broad environmental community, a preferred date for the widespread consideration that humans were wrecking the place would be 1962, when Rachel Carson carefully documented and popularized the social trap of pesticides in *The Silent Spring*. In the 37 years since Carson's famous book, the evidence has steadily accumulated that we are seriously fouling our own nest.

As a crucial aside, our nest has not grown, but our numbers have. In 1900 there were 1.6 billion people on the planet. India alone just passed the one billion mark this month, and the planet is now home to six billion people. That's a fourfold increase in only 100 years, when the planet's human population remained at about one billion for at least 13,000 years! Even six billion who act responsibly may not be able to prevent disaster; this was Garrett Hardin's ghastly supposition in 1980.

I began to study commons dilemmas around that time. In a study reported in 1982, I found that among children aged 4 to 18, the best resource management occurred in 14 year-olds; both older and younger children showed more self-interest and less concern for the resource. Children apparently need 14 years to develop the cognitive capacity and sense of community required to minimize greed and maximize community interest.

Apparently, however, the world teaches young people over their next four years that self-interest is more valuable than community or environmental interests. For those familiar with the thoughts of Adam Smith in 1776 and William Lloyd in 1837, it appeared that 18-year olds went 61 years backwards in their thinking, from Lloyd back to Smith. I concluded my article by suggesting that we should turn over the management of our natural resources to 14 year-olds, but no one listened.

At the same time, my own realization of the problem's magnitude was incomplete in the 1980s. Although I included a chapter on resource management in my 1987 textbook, it said little (OK, nothing) about acid rain, global warming, biodiversity, population growth, or human-caused species extinction. Partly this was because a textbook author had little research of the sort to report at the time. Unfortunately, even by the time of the 1997 edition of the textbook there was little research in environmental psychology to report, with the notable exception of Paul Stern's work and a few others, although population growth is more dramatically described in the second edition and I squeezed out, with difficulty, a chapter on nature.

This was becoming an embarrassing conundrum for me. This may have been the first time the phrase “the secret science” welled up in my mind. Why? The name “environmental psychologist” implies to many or most laypeople I meet who hear it for the first time that I know something about those big problems of the planet. I'm not satisfied, nor are, I think, those who ask, when I can merely relate certain findings about attitudes, the attitude-behavior gap, or demographic variations in energy conservation, litter, and recycling.

If you read the papers, and I suppose this reflects the academic state of affairs, virtually all the environmental news comes from natural scientists and activists. In part, this is at it

must be: The natural scientists' job is to detect and report changes in global warming, acid rain, biodiversity, and the ozone layer. What has a psychologist to do with these things? I will return to this question a bit later.

First I feel compelled to report something I have noticed about natural scientists and the concept of the secret science. I am struck by the way that some natural scientists successfully promote themselves in public arenas. Cosmologists, for example, gain considerable respect, much funding and lots of TV exposure by simply claiming that they might find a trace of long-dead life on Mars! My reaction to this is a mixture of envy and admiration at the way in which the cosmologists have sold the public and the funding agencies on their goals.

Some natural scientists are not shy about the putative impact of their findings. Allow me to repeat some verbatim quotes from natural scientists in recent newspapers and magazines: "This experience changed my world view," said one. "But what we have done is move human thinking from the realm of mythology into real human achievement," says another. "This will go down as a landmark in the history of elementary particle physics," says a third.

Now have you ever heard an environmental psychologist utter such words? This seems like quite an odd reversal to me: natural scientists are supposed to be dispassionate and circumspect in their claims, and they have, in my mind, a cautious image that hardly calls hyperbole to mind. I cannot recall any reputable psychologist making a claim akin to those quoted above, passionate claims in the media about how our discoveries made us feel or changed our lives. Hence my revelation that our trade is the secret science, partly by choice: we do not speak out enough.

Could it be that we *have* nothing exciting to say? Is it possible that our discoveries truly are less valuable, less amazing? I think not. First, the natural scientists' discoveries are not always that exciting either, at least in my view. Let me relate the nature of the astounding discoveries that precipitated the remarks I just quoted by the natural scientists. The first, "this experience changed my world view," came after a biologist viewed some undersea hydrothermal vents and animals that live near them. He said, "Studying this area gives us some clue to what life was like on earth in its early history."

The second natural scientist, who spoke so immodestly about moving human thought from the realm of mythology to real achievement referred to his discovery that the universe is expanding faster than previously thought. His follow-up thought: "The fact that we can find out anything about what is happening so far away just seems to me really great." Now I do not begrudge either of these scientists their excitement; rather, I envy their willingness and ability to express it so publicly and so fulsomely.

Personally, I admit to wondering how they can be so excited about their findings when the main platform upon which we live is being degraded so rapidly, but maybe that's just me. Everyone's entitled to their own opinion, but compared to the real and present problems that environmental psychologists (of all stripes, even those who choose to work on architectural and built-environment problems) deal with, these are just not very

exciting to me...except in that I hear their discoverers *make* them *sound* exciting.

Are there any great discoveries by environmental psychologists? Well, at least as great as those just described? Given that it is my turn at the podium, let me share with you a small discovery I recently made. You can probably think of better examples in your own work, or that of your colleagues or heroes, so forgive me this self-serving indulgence. I am positive there are plenty of great and under-reported studies among us.

In a recent commons dilemma study that is not yet published, I found that participants drawn randomly from the Greater Victoria area--not students--who faced the problem of trying to manage a large pool of simulated resources did try to cooperate. They did not take as much from the pool (a fish population) as they might have. We interviewed the participants between trials (simulating fishing seasons), and they told us quite clearly that they were helping to preserve the fish population. They were well aware, without any explicit education or feedback, that they needed to restrain their harvests in order to preserve the fish population.

That, however and unfortunately, is not the news. The discovery was that the levels of restraint practiced by these participants as a whole was not sufficient to maintain the fish population. In essence, the participants were destroying the resource at the same time as they believed that their efforts to restrain themselves were sufficient. Now, with the usual caveats about replication and extension, this is really scary. It appears that the problem is not awareness of environmental problems, nor is it even the intention to be environmentally responsible. The problem, if you are willing to extrapolate, is that people are destroying the planet while trying to help it.

This conclusion is extreme and not (yet) well-founded--although I have seen two or three other studies that reach similar conclusions. But, to return to the secret science theme, often the conclusions of the natural scientists that are trumpeted in the papers are not rock-solid either. Very often they have much less to do with the survival of the planet. They do not seem to recognize that their discoveries would be impossible if their platform and source of all sustenance--this planet--were degraded to the point of no return. Often their conclusions are justified on what seems to me to be very flimsy claims on importance ("This molecule found on Mars suggests that life may once have existed there millions of years ago;" I actually read a story in Canada's national newspaper that trumpeted the fact that a certain archeologist had just discovered that a Paleolithic implement he had thought for 20 years was a spoon was actually a vomit stick).

What new, or newly recognized, challenges are we facing? I used to think the main problem was a shortage, or potential shortage, of natural resources. Some natural resources, such as fish stocks, truly are endangered. However, some resources--such as oil and natural gas--seem to be in greater supply than was envisioned a few decades ago. But even if the world's oil supplies, for example, are greater than thought earlier, the real problem lies with the by-products of energy use: global warming and damage to the ozone layer, neither of which are any longer questioned by reputable experts. The effects of these

changes are not in the future, they have already killed many people and animals.

For example, in July, officials in Canada's Prince Edward Island believe a heavy thunderstorm caused unusual pesticide runoff from potato fields into a local river. An activist noted that the seventh and largest fish kill of the summer did not occur because of any negligence; it happened with the normal and legal use of pesticides. A local biologist observed that not only were thousands of fish killed, but so were the aquatic insects and even the worms in the bottom of the stream. Some other recent developments:

1. Air pollution causes more deaths in Europe than car accidents.

2. High ozone levels in the U.S. are correlated with more domestic disputes serious enough to be reported to the police.

3. Many populated areas around the world may be flooded.

All these problems stem not from shortages of natural resources, but from byproducts of the USE of natural resources.

At the International Botanical Congress in St. Louis this month, presenters described 50 "dead zones" that have developed in coastal regions around the world. These are large stretches of water in which oxygen is so lacking that marine life dies. The largest zone in the western hemisphere is a patch, as large as New Jersey, in the Gulf of Mexico. The main cause is fertilizer runoff from the Mississippi River. Acid rain is an old issue, but has been downgraded in the media because there is an Acid Rain Program in place to reduce it. Trouble is, even with the full implementation of the program in 2010, an area about the size of France and the UK combined, which includes 95,000 lakes, will still receive acid rain in excess of critical loads.

If these sound like distant problems, let's consider a problem near to most of us here. Each of us who flew here traded speed for huge amounts of jet fuel. Jets account for about 3-5 percent of the gases that contribute to ozone layer deterioration and global warming, but that is expected to rise to 15 percent in the next fifty years.

Have I begun to bore anyone with this list? I think we all start to tune out after hearing these stories. This is environmental numbness of the ecological sort, as opposed to the furniture sort.

This talk is my own tentative attempt--you'll note all the qualifiers I still feel compelled to use--to try out a new trumpet. I am also in the midst of writing an article for *Psychology Today* on this theme, with the expressed goal of vanquishing environmental psychology as the secret science. It goes against my trained tendency to scientific modesty. It raises a huge red flag to the part of my brain that warns me, "What if you are totally wrong about this?"

More examples. A 1999 book by Dutch researcher Linda Steg reports that in the Netherlands, which is typical of the developed nations, consumers use 25 percent more energy than they did only 14 years ago. Much of this energy use reflects individual choices, *our* choices, to use energy. Thus, the important point is that much environmental damage begins not with governments or large companies, although some of it certainly does, but with the cumulative actions of many individual people. If there is a solution to this problem, it is to understand the choices of individual consumers of energy.

Environmental problems largely are problems for environmental psychology.

I wish to ride one more hobby-horse, this one related to my secret science theme. I have been calling for some years now for what I call sharper theories. A sharp theory is not only smart, as the phrase implies, but provocative and limited. A provocative theory proposes a fresh look at a phenomenon, but like all good theories, makes clear predictions and is testable. A limited theory? My view is that a very broad, inclusive theory or framework wins the diplomacy prize--everything that might influence behavior gets at least a mention--but verges close to untestability because studies would have to include so many variables and participants that only huge grants can be brought to bear.

We need legitimately challenging theories. Scientific psychology runs on proposals and disposals of controversial theories. Where are environmental psychology's challenging theories? Are we too timid to propose them? Have the few attempts that exist been so general or broad that they lacked punch or seemed impossible to test?

What has this to do with secret science? A sharp, provocative theory, assuming it is proposed in good faith and not merely to garner publicity, should stimulate debate. Debate creates interest, and interest in theory creates interest in a field, such as our own. Look what behaviorism did for the dull field of learning, and what Piaget did for child development. Where are our sharp, provocative theories? Perhaps I have missed them. Perhaps we confuse personal politeness with theoretical nicety. A field without sharp theories is a secret science by default. Then, environmental numbness of a third kind sets in: professional numbness of environmental psychologists ourselves.

We need some sharper and more focused theoretical statements, positions that will galvanize researchers into confirming, disconfirming, or refining them.

In the end, such theorizing is not done merely to gain attention and respect. Rather, it is the essence of science, to look up and to look ahead, to point out a plausible direction, and to excite researchers into genuine curiosity. It is time to think of good sharp, falsifiable theories, to promote them, to discuss our findings in local and national media outlets, and to place them in a personal and even emotional context. Testify!

In closing, let me exhort you, and me, to overcome environmental numbness as a professional disease, and to vanquish "the secret science" as an epithet that can be applied to our field. Thank you for listening. This talk has been a life-altering experience for me and its insights undoubtedly will change the very nature of human endeavor and help to ensure our continued existence on this planet.

Robert Gifford's e-mail address is rgifford@uvic.ca.

BOOK REVIEW

Advancing the Contextual Study of Abortion

A review of: Beckman, L. J., & Harvey, S. M. (1998). *The new civil war: The psychology, culture and politics of abortion*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association. ISBN: 1557985170 (hardcover, 406 pp.)

Reviewed by Gregory Wilmoth, Ph.D., Silver Springs, MD

A valuable addition to the literature on the psychology of abortion, this book provides a broad overview of public policy, research, and practice issues about abortion. It comprises four sections (plus a concluding chapter) covering the sociopolitical, cultural, intrapersonal and interpersonal contexts of abortion, and abortion in the context of clinical practice. The first section consists of four chapters that address: (1) U.S. federal abortion policies (legislation and regulatory actions) since 1973, (2) why abortion is a controversial issue in the U.S. as interpreted from a feminist perspective, (3) the reasons abortions are decreasing in the U.S., and (4) the effect of anti-abortion demonstrations on the psychological well-being of women seeking abortions. The second section is made up of three chapters, each focusing on a different racial/ethnic population (Blacks, Latinas, and Asian Pacific Islanders). The third section includes chapters on women's reactions to abortions induced by the drug RU-486; a feminist perspective on violence against women as a contributor to pregnancy and abortion; a discussion of men's lack of rights in the abortion decision as this impacts either their desire to be a father and/or obligations for child support imposed by the woman's decision; and the ability of adolescents to give informed consent to abortion. The fourth section has separate chapters on pre-abortion and post-abortion counseling issues and methods, as well as a chapter on lessons from other countries to increase and improve abortion services in the U.S.

The editors acknowledge that their feminist beliefs and feminist scholarship shaped the content included in this volume. With but a few exceptions, this orientation does not detract from the objectivity, tone or substance of the book. Although not all the chapter authors use an overtly feminist perspective, they are all pro-choice. I think it is unfortunate that the authors did not include a chapter presenting a pro-life feminist perspective. The editors and other authors note the existence of these pro-life feminists but exclude their voice from this book.

Throughout this book the issue of access to abortion is paramount. This theme is the glue of the first section. In particular, Henshaw details the declining number of abortion providers but neglects to place this decline into the context of the overall decline of medical providers in rural and poor areas. Arguing for increasing access to abortion in the U.S. is the goal of the chapter by Masho, et al (in section 4) who extract lessons for foreign practices. Beckman and Harvey (in section 3) conclude that misconceptions and lack of knowledge are the greatest obstacles to women using RU-486. Adler et al challenge the empirical basis for parental consent and notification laws that create barriers to abortion for adolescents. I wonder, however, what Adler et al would say about adolescent's ability to give informed consent to liposuction and breast implants. Rarely are questions about abortion examined for consistency with stances on other controversial issues such as gun control, TV violence, and pornography.

The book's breadth of coverage is one of its strengths. The discussion of the complexity of issues and their interactions demonstrate that the politics and psychological aspects of abortion cannot be reduced to a single act or experience called "abortion". Attitudes toward, actual use of, and psychological aftereffects of abortion vary between and within ethnic/racial groups, religious identification, age, gender, political philosophy and feminist/anti-feminist ideology. Although this fact is sometimes given insufficient emphasis by authors of chapters that are heavily feminist in persuasion, it is a valuable lesson for better understanding the social and political turmoil surrounding abortion. This is not a textbook but could be a useful starting point for a critical dialogue about the social, cultural, and psychological nexus of the abortion debate as well as how these authors and others frame various abortion issues. Another strength of the book is its inclusion of several empirical investigations such as the ones reporting on patients' reactions to abortions induced by the drug RU-486, the effect on women of getting abortions in centers being picketed, changes in the availability of abortions, and a test of competing models of the psychological effects of abortion.

Although this book has much to recommend it, like many edited books, it is uneven in the quality of the individual chapters. The chapters reporting original research appeal most to this reviewer whereas the literature synthesis chapters that advocate a particular "cause" or "perspective" (gender violence as an important cause of abortions) are less convincing or satisfying. Although these chapters qualify the arguments with "suggests" or "may", the tone is clearly "guilty until proven otherwise". And although the book may be of interest to general readers, it is not consistently written for general readers. The chapter describing a test of psychological models of psychological sequelae of abortion is highly technical. The chapter on federal legislation would have been more reader-friendly if actual dates as well as Congressional session numbers had been used throughout. Terms such as "medical" abortion are used inconsistently; vacuum aspiration is classified as medical abortion in one chapter but labeled as surgical abortion in another in which the term "medical" abortion is reserved for abortions induced by RU-486 exclusively. Both methods of abortion are "medical" in the sense they are performed by medical personnel using medical practices. Why not call abortions induced by RU-486 "pharmacological" or "pharmaceutical" abortions?

The chapters on abortion amongst Latina and Asian-Pacific Islanders are noteworthy because they document differences within these populations by ethnicity, by acculturation, by immigrants compared to non-immigrants, and socioeconomic status. Unfortunately, the chapter on Blacks and abortion fails to raise the possibility that abortion attitudes and practices might be different for the sizable Black U.S. immigrant communities from Ghana, the Caribbean and U.S. Blacks. The author does not even recommend research to clarify such important demarcations. This chapter also frequently confounds race with class and consequently makes attributions to race that should be made to class. Although Blacks are poor out of proportionate to their composition in the U.S. population, Whites are almost a majority of the poor (46.4% of the poor are White compared to

25.6% of the poor are Black in 1997). Any abortion policies that impact the poor, numerically impact almost twice as many poor Whites as poor Blacks.

The chapter describing the use of cognitive therapy in counseling clients at abortion clinics was the most disappointing. The authors' therapy example demonstrates several inconsistencies between what they preach and what they do. For example, one of the stated principles of cognitive therapy is examining distorted thinking such as rigid beliefs. But in the example, the counselor ignores the client's statement that "I don't have a choice". This rigid thinking is not explored at all. In another script, when the client asks "Do people die from abortion?" (meaning clients) the counselor "reframes" the question to answer that "suction curettage is one of the safest surgical procedures done..."(p. 316). The client is not treated as an adult and told that, although rare and the cause might be a fatal reaction to general anesthesia, women have died during legal suction curettage abortions in the U.S. performed by license medical providers. This chapter is also afflicted by numerous unsubstantiated factual assertions and doublespeak (calling twins a "double pregnancy").

Except for the chapter (9) by Russo and Denious on gender violence and pregnancy, there is a surprising absence of a chapter on causes of unintended pregnancy. Although Harvey et al's recommendations for increased and improved contraceptive education, more partner communication about contraception and decisions about unintended pregnancy, and better family planning services are sensible, they do not address other major factors such as the role of alcohol use and unintended pregnancy.

The best parts of this book are the chapters dedicated to empirical studies including the chapters on Latina and Asian-Pacific Islander abortion attitudes and behavior. The most annoying aspects of the book are unsubstantiated generalizations about Victorian morals and religious beliefs being the source of anti-abortion attitudes. Although this might be true for some people, it implies that atheists with nonwestern, not to mention non-Victorian morals, would automatically have pro-choice attitudes.

Unfortunately, there are a number of errors that were not caught during editing. The abortion rate is erroneously reported as 29,000 and 26,000 per 1,000 women (p. 7) instead of the correct rates of 29 and 26 per 1,000 women (p. 136). On page 26, the authors refer to the "passage" of Roe v. Wade; the Supreme Court does not pass decisions, but legislatures do pass laws. The editors state that "nearly one half of American women have had at least one abortion" (p. xix) while on page 29 an "estimated one in five adult women has had an abortion".

Finally, APA, which does the author indexing, needs to do a better job. Some authors (such as Zabin, L. and Zabin, L. S.) are listed twice in the index. Also, an author (Wyatt, G.) is indexed as appearing on pages 374 and 382 but is on neither page. In addition, not all pages where an author is mentioned are indexed (e.g., Wilmoth, p. 340). These raise concerns about what other indexing mistakes exist.

Despite some uneven qualities, this volume is a valuable addition to the field of the psychology of abortion. In some cases (Chapters 4, 6, 7, 8, 10) but not all, the book contains

some of the best information available in the mainstream psychological literature on abortion. This broad overview of public policy, research, and practice issues brought together into one source provides a good starting point for further reading into this extensive and growing literature.

Greg Wilmoth's e-mail address is wilmoth-cohen@prodigy.net.

ANNOUNCEMENTS

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS Division 34 Fellowship

The Division 34 Fellowship Committee invites nominations of Division members for potential election to Fellow status in the American Psychological Association.

The deadline for nominations is December 1, 1999.

The deadline for receipt of application materials is January 15, 2000.

Late applications will not be considered in the current review cycle, but they can be held and considered during the next review cycle. Nominations may be made by any member or Fellow of the Division; self-nominations are acceptable.

Under the Bylaws of the American Psychological Association, Fellowship is an honor bestowed upon members who have made an "unusual and outstanding contribution or performance in the field of psychology." Division 34 wishes to recognize its members who have had a significant impact on the specialty of population and environmental psychology within the areas of science, teaching and training, service delivery, administration, policy development, and/or advocacy. Seniority or professional competence alone is insufficient to achieve Fellowship. Fellows' contributions are seen as having enriched or advanced population and environmental psychology beyond that normally expected of a professional psychologist.

In order to be considered for Division 34 Fellow status, the candidate must meet the APA requirements. APA requirements include: (a) the receipt of a doctoral degree based in part upon a psychological dissertation, or from a program primarily psychological in nature, and conferred by a graduate school of recognized standing; (b) prior membership as an APA member for at least one year and membership in the Division through which the nomination is made; (c) active engagement at the time of nomination in the advancement of psychology in any of its aspects; and (d) five years of acceptable professional experience subsequent to the granting of the doctoral degree.

Nominees for Fellow status will be asked to complete the APA's Uniform Fellow Application and related materials, and to solicit evaluations from three or more APA Fellows, at least two of whom must be fellows in Division 34. Completed applications are reviewed by the Fellowship Committee, which submits its recommendations to the Division's Executive Board; nominations are sent forward to APA's Membership Committee for final approval. Members of the Fellowship Committee or Executive Board who submit evaluations of a nominee do not vote on that nominee. New Fellows are announced at the

Division's annual business meeting during the APA Convention, which will next be held in August, 2000, in Washington, DC.

Letters of nominations should be sent to the Fellowship Committee Chair, who in turn will supply packets containing applications and forms for letters of recommendation to the nominee. For questions or to make nominations, please contact Krista Stewart, Fellows Committee Chair, 1801 N. Quinn Street, #301, Arlington, VA 22209. Telephone, 202-712-0808 or 703-243-4694; e-mail, Kstewart@usaid.gov.

NEW BOOKS

From Abortion to Contraception: A Resource to Public Policies and Reproductive Behavior in Central and Eastern Europe from 1917 to the Present.

Edited by Henry P David, with the assistance of Joanna Skilogianis. Greenwood Press, 1999 ISBN 0-313-30587-0. 408 pages. PRICE \$95.

"Thoroughly researched and meticulously documented, this impressive volume is an invaluable resource for understanding interrelationships among public policy, reproductive health and behavior, and women's roles and status. Its breadth of coverage--encompassing seven decades of socialist rule and a decade of postsocialist transition in 28 countries--make it a must for the historian's library." Nancy Felipe Russo, Ph.D., Regents Professor, Arizona State University.

Lives in Time and Place: The Problems and Promises of Developmental Science.

by Richard A. Settersten, Jr. (1999). Amityville, NY: Baywood Publishing Company. (Society and Aging Series, Jon Hendricks, Editor). ISBN: 0-89503-200-7, 310 pp., \$48.95. Time and place are of the greatest significance for scientific inquiry about human lives. As we seek to better understand the nature and rhythm of the life course in modern societies, its effective analysis and explanation simultaneously becomes more pressing and more complicated. This information is crucial for developing and reforming social policies, services, and interventions aimed at improving human development and welfare. Yet as our scientific treatments have become more elaborate, they have also become more fragmented within and between academic disciplines, across the study of specific life periods, and by method. This book is about the challenges of bridging these gaps, and sets an agenda for the future of developmental science, as we strive to understand human lives in whole and as wholes, through time and in place.

Advances in Population: Psychosocial Perspectives (Volume 3)

Edited by Lawrence J. Severy and Warren B. Miller. Jessica Kingsley Publishers, Philadelphia, 1999, ISBN: 1 85302 569 0. There are both constants and changes in our approach to the third volume in this series. We remain steadfast to our commitment to go beyond simply recording 'population-related phenomena' and to search scientifically for theories and methods that will allow humans 'to prevail, not merely endure'. To this end, we again present chapters representing theory, a few describing new analytical approaches, and a number based on

the most recent empirical findings, all of which challenge the way we think about population phenomena.

Directions in Person-Environment Research and Practice: Ethnoscapes

Edited by Jack L. Nasar and Wolfgang F. E. Preiser. Ashgate, Brookfield, VT, 1999, ISBN: 1-84014-178-6, 416 pp, \$78.95.

This book presents a fresh and diverse set of perspectives representing key directions of research and practice in the field of environmental design research. Leading researchers in various areas of person-environment research, such a privacy, children's environments, post-occupancy evaluation, environmental cognition, environmental aesthetics, crime prevention, housing and environmental protection and environmental design present what they consider their best work.

Call for Comments

Handbook of Environmental Psychology (2nd Ed.)

Bob Bechtel has been asked by John Wiley and Sons to edit a new *Handbook of Environmental Psychology*. He is interested in hearing from Division 34 members and others who have thoughts on what should go into such a handbook. His e-mail address is: bechtel@u.arizona.edu.

FUNDING OPPORTUNITIES Social Science Research Council

The Social Science Research Council is offering fellowships and a summer minority workshop in 1) International Migration to the US and 2) Religion & Migration to the United States. For more information, contact: Sue Mark, Program Assistant, International Migration Program, Social Science Research Council, 810 Seventh Ave., New York, NY 10019, Tel.: 212-377-2700 (x453), Fax: 212-377-2727, E-mail: mark@ssrc.org.

The Collaborative HIV Prevention Research in Minority Communities Program

The UCSF Center for AIDS Prevention Studies provides mentoring and funding for investigators doing HIV prevention research with minority communities. In the summer of 2000, four scientists will develop their ethnic minority focused HIV prevention research projects. Scientists will be funded to spend six weeks during each of three summers at UCSF's Center for AIDS Prevention Studies working with other researchers; they will receive additional funding for their research project. The program was designed for scientists in tenure track positions or investigators in research institutes who are committed to HIV and minority research. Application deadline: January 31, 2000. Contact: Romy Benard-Rodríguez, Tel: (415) 597-9366; Fax: (415) 597-9213; e-mail: rbenard@psg.ucsf.edu; Download an

application at:
<http://www.caps.ucsf.edu/projects/minorityindex.html>

Members interested in working with Andre on this should contact him at fiedeld@libarts.up.ac.za.

CALL FOR PAPERS

Intelligent Buildings: The International Journal for Researchers and Practitioners

Intelligent Buildings is a new quarterly journal, publishing papers of a philosophical, research or professional case study nature for the benefit of practitioners as well as academics who are involved in the design, production, operation and research of intelligent buildings. It will be aimed at a wide variety of disciplines, offering perspectives from technology, economics, architecture, engineering and psychology.

Topics to be included in the journal include: building systems: architecture & people; integrated building design I & II, project planning and strategy; briefing; facilities management; design management; financial analysis & investment appraisal; information technology & communications systems; sustainable design, construction & operation; culture of living & working and life learning. For more information, contact Prof. D. J. Clements-Croome, The University of Reading, Department of Construction Management & Engineering, Whiteknights, PO Box 219, Reading, RG6 6AW, UK. Tel: +44 (0)118 931 8197 Fax: +44 (0)118 931 3856 E-mail: D.J.Clements-Croome@reading.ac.uk.

DIVISION 34 BUSINESS REPORTS, 1999

Highlights of the Executive Committee and Business Meetings, Boston, August 1999

Margaret Topf, Ph.D., Secretary

The President's Report for 1998-1999 was approved. An important accomplishment was the new Division 34 membership e-mail list: Div34@lists.apa.org. The Secretary's and Treasurer's Reports were also approved. The Treasurer's Report is provided in this edition of the Bulletin.

Krista Stewart, Ph.D. was appointed as Fellows' Chair for 1999-2000.

Mary Lou Randour, Ph.D. spoke to the Executive Committee on the possibility of psychologists with an interest in human-animal relations becoming a part of Division 34. This group of about 200 psychologists evidently has been unsuccessful in forming their own division. Dr. Randour was asked to submit a petition statement for inclusion in Division 34 to the Division Executive Committee. The position statement will be published in a future issue of the Bulletin. Pro and Con arguments will accompany the position statement. A mail ballot is likely to be undertaken on whether to include this group in Division 34.

Andre Fiedeldej spoke on increasing Division 34 international affiliates via electronic means, such as developing a website.

1999 Treasurer's Report

Peter R. Walker, Ph.D.

Balance Sheet

The balance sheet (Table 1) shows the Division's account as of December 31. The Division ended 1997, with a balance of \$5,444.80, and ended 1998 with a balance of \$5,799.44, an increase of \$354.64. In the first month of each year, the available funds increase due to the release of dues collected the previous autumn by APA (October, November, December) on behalf of the Division. This year they amounted to \$1,894 00, bringing the funds available in January 1999 to \$7,693,44.

Table 1. Division 34 Balance Sheet

	1997 Final	1998 Final
ASSETS		
Cash on deposit at APA	7377.80	7693.44
Investments	0.00	0.00
Accounts receivable	0.00	0.00
Advances/prepaid expenses	0.00	0.00
Accounts not held by APA	0.00	0.00
Total Assets	7377.80	7693.44
LIABILITIES & FUND BALANCE		
Liabilities		
Dues collected in advance of service year	1933.00	1894.00
Other revenue collected in advance	0.00	0.00
Accounts payable	0.00	0.00
Other liabilities		0.00
Total Liabilities	1933.00	1894.00
Fund Balance		
Beginning of year	3844.17	5444.80
Net current year-to-date income or (loss)	1600.63	354.64
Current Fund Balance	5444.80	5799.44
TOTAL LIABILITIES & FUND BALANCE	7377.80	7693.44

Note. "Current Fund Balance" represents the Division's accrued savings.

Statement of Revenues, Expenses and Net Income/Loss

The statement (Table 2) shows income from dues and interest in 1998, which amounted to \$3,450.29, and expenses which amounted to \$3095.65. With respect to cash flow, the income in the Spring tapers off after the large deposit in January, while bills for activities draw down the balance in the account until the end of the year. The costs of our current 16-page Newsletter are about \$800 per issue. No awards or grants were given during 1998. The Division paid for a Social Hour in San Francisco and will split the costs of a Social Hour in Boston. Payment for the President-elect's travel to the CODAPAR meeting in Washington D.C., \$390,65, fell in the 1998 accounting period. For the first time, foreign affiliates were permitted to pay by credit card. Four individuals took advantage of this opportunity, for which we were assessed a modest processing fee by APA. The total fees amounted to less than one dollar and were charged to Division in 1999.

Table 2. Division 34 Statement of Revenues, Expenses, & Net Income(Loss)

TITLE	1997 FINAL	1998 FINAL	1999 (EST.)
ASSOCIATE ASSESSMENTS	55.00	44.00	50.00
MEMBER ASSESSMENTS	1859.00	1562.00	1580.00
FELLOW ASSESSMENTS	781.00	759.00	750.00
EXEMPT DUES		245.00	260.00
NON-APA MEMBERS DUES	351.00	355.17	380.00
CONTRIBUTIONS	144.00	54.00	50.00
OPERATING INTEREST (APA)	299.50	354.12	360.00
OTHER INCOME			
TOTAL INCOME	3489.50	3450.29	3430.00
PRINTING/PUBLICATIONS	936.32 ¹	2136.37	2400.00
POSTAGE/MAILING	254.46	405.88	350.00
CONVENTION/MEETINGS	0.00	162.75	220.24
TRAVEL EXPENSE	395.09 ²	390.65 ⁴	0.00
TOTAL EXPENSES	1888.87	3095.65	2970.24
NET INCOME (LOSS)	1600.63	354.64	459.76

Note. Values drawn from APA-supplied statements. For comparison purposes, this statement is based on previous reporting categories. Rows with two entries reflect that subcategories were added in the 1998 APA accounting change.

1. Newsletter expenses were unusually low in 1997 because of a credit from APA for errors in the printing and mailing of the Fall 1996 newsletter.
2. Actual expense for President-elect to attend CODAPAR meeting in Washington, DC.
3. No Student Paper Award given in 1998.

Membership

During the period June 1998 to June 1999, there was a modest increase in overall membership. As of June 30, 1999, the number of members whose dues are collected through APA totaled 238, 65 of whom are senior members, exempt from paying full Division dues. Forty nine of these members volunteered to pay a \$5.00 fee to the Division. The Treasurer collected dues from an additional 30 affiliates and others. The total current membership is 268.

DIVISION 34 EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE, 1999-2000

President: Robert Sommer, PhD
Psychology Dept.
University of California at Davis
Davis, CA 95616-8686
Tel.: 916-752-1875 / Fax: 916-752-2087
Email: rosommer@ucdavis.edu
Term: August 1999-August 2000
Past-President term: August 2000-August 2001

President-elect: S. Marie Harvey, PhD
340 Hendricks Hall
The Center for the Study of Women
University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403-1201
Tel.: 541-346-4120 / Fax 541-346-5096
Email: mharvey@OREGON.UOREGON.EDU
Term: Aug. 1999-Aug. 2000
President Term: Aug. 2000 - Aug. 2001
Past-President Term: Aug. 2001 - Aug. 2002

Past-President: Robert Gifford, PhD
Dept. of Psychology
University of Victoria
Victoria, British Columbia
V8W 3P5 Canada
Tel.: 604-721-7532 / Fax: 604-721-8929
Email: rgifford@uvic.ca
Term: Aug. 1999-Aug. 2000
Treasurer: Peter Walker, PhD
5 Bayside Terrace
Riverside, CT 06878
Tel.: 203-637-1281
Email: nucprw@ibm.net
Term: Aug. 1998-Aug. 2001

Secretary: Margaret Topf, PhD
4800 Hale Parkway #602
Denver, CO 80220
Office tel.: 303-315-4245 / Fax: 303-315-5666
Email: Margaret.Topf@UCHSC.edu
Term: Aug. 1999 - Aug. 2002

APA Council Representative: Greg Wilmoth, PhD
14804 Eastway Drive
Silver Spring, MD 20905
Office tel.: 202-512-5629 / Fax: 202-512-3774
Email: wilmoth-cohen@prodigy.net

Members-at-Large:
Gary Gottfredson, PhD
Gottfredson Associates, Inc.
3239 B Corporate Court
Ellicott City, MD 21042
Tel.: 410-461-5530 / Fax: 410-461-5529
Email: gainc@clark.net
Term: Aug. 1997 - Aug. 2000

Christopher Agnew, PhD
Dept. of Psychological Sciences
Purdue University
1364 Psychological Sciences Building
West Lafayette, IN
Tel.: 765-494-6254 / Fax: 765-494-1264
Email: agnew@psych.purdue.edu
Term: Aug. 1998-Aug. 2001

Krista Stewart, PhD
USAID
RRB, 3rd Floor 3-06-045
Washington, DC 20523-3600
Tel.: 202-712-0808 / Fax: 202-216-3046
Email: kstewart@usaid.gov
Term: Aug. 1999-Aug. 2002

Chairs of Standing Committees:

Fellows: Krista Stewart, PhD

Membership: inactive.

Program: Robert Sommer, PhD, & S. Marie Harvey, PhD

Election: Presidential officers, Secretary, & Treasurer

Chairs of Ad hoc Committees:

International Relations Co-Chairs:

Population: Henry David, PhD
Transnational Family Research Institute
8307 Whitman Drive
Bethesda, MD 20817
Tel.: 301-469-6313 / Fax: 301-469-0461
Email: hdavid@compuserve.com
Term: Indefinite

Environmental: Seymour Wapner, PhD

Dept. of Psychology
Clark University
Worcester, MD 01610
Tel.: 508-793-8839 / Fax: 508-793-7780
Email: swapner@jack.clarku.edu
Term: Indefinite

Student Paper Competition: S. Marie Harvey

Term: Indefinite

Environmental Problems: inactive

Division History & Archives: James M. Richards, Jr., PhD

573 West Rio Teras
Green Valley, AZ 85614
Tel.: 520-625-9039
Email: jmbmrchards@compuserve.com
Term: Indefinite

Bulletin Editor: Jennifer A. Veitch, PhD

National Research Council of Canada
Institute for Research in Construction
Bldg M-24 1500 Montreal Road
Ottawa, ON K1A 0R6 Canada
Tel. 613-993-9671 / Fax 613-954-3733
E-mail: jennifer.veitch@nrc.ca
Term: August 1998-August 2001

Printed on recycled paper made from 100% post-consumer fiber