

COMMITTEE HIGHLIGHTS

- **DOES PSYCHOLOGY HAVE A FUTURE?**

To California Psychologists interested in the future of Psychology: A Request for your Input

--Deane Shapiro, Jr., Ph.D., Chair, Committee on Future Directions in Psychology, CSPA

In preparation for the upcoming CSPA Convention in March, the Committee on Future Directions in Psychology is proposing two symposia: 1) Psychology and the Future: The Role of the Professional School; and 2) Psychology and the Future: Health, Education, Politics.

In a very real sense, California is setting models and standards with regard to the training of professional psychologists. Professional schools, which are involved in the training of future psychologists, are in a pivotal position to both assess the needs of psychology in the future, and ensure that their students are trained to meet those needs. A primary function of the first symposium will be to have representatives from different professional schools discuss the directions and goals towards which they would like to see psychology evolve in the future. Obviously, however, there are an inordinate amount of crucial issues facing professional psychologists in the future. Therefore, to narrow the scope of the symposium, and to provide topics of general interest to professional psychologists, I would like to request your input:

PLEASE WRITE ME, AND

let me know which types of questions you would like to see addressed by this symposium: topics may range from the nature of community/clinical training needed for the future; the predicted job market; ways of augmenting psychologist's role in the community; balancing the practitioner/scientist model,

etc.

The second symposium proposed intends to draw from distinguished speakers in the field of health, education, and politics; the intent of this symposium is to discuss ways in which different groups of professionals can work together cooperatively for an expanded vision of human potential, and the means to obtain that vision. Again, please write if there are specific questions that you would like to see addressed by this second symposium.

Please send mail care of
Post Office Box 2084
Stanford, California 94305

Deane Shapiro, Jr., Ph.D.
Clinical Faculty, Dept. of
Psychiatry & Behavioral
Sciences, Stanford University
Medical School

Dean of Academic Affairs
Pacific Graduate School of
Psychology



Symposium One

Psychology and the Future: Health, Education, Politics

This symposium represents part of a continuing effort to look into the future to see where the practice of professional psychology might be heading, and to help define, in so far as that is possible, where we would like to see it heading.

As part of that effort, it seemed important to view psychology and its interaction with allied professions--educators, politicians--and in innovative areas--e.g., biofeedback and the health sciences.

This panel brings together three speakers representing each of the above areas. Regarding the area of health sciences, increasingly physicians are turning to psychologists for information on the role of the "mind" in the healing of psychosomatic disease. This includes not only such phenomena as the "will to live" and placebo effects, but also the development of more appropriate, health giving "life styles."

Regarding both politics and education, psychologists are increasingly realizing the need to alter human environments and social interactions to make them more healthy and supportive. Education provides an ideal social environment in which to teach students not only academic behavior, but also emotional and interpersonal skills. Similarly, psychology needs to work with legislators to develop more humane laws, laws which give people more control over their own lives, as well as teach people the means to be responsible for their own actions. Ultimately, educators, psychologists, politicians have the same goal: that of serving human welfare. The means by which they can work together, cooperatively, for a future vision of the human potential is a necessary and crucial issue for discussion in the present.

Group Presentation Proposal

Title: Psychology and the Future: Health, Education, Politics

Chair: Deane Shapiro, Jr., Ph.D. Chairperson, CSPA Committee, Future Directions in Psychology; Clinical Faculty, Department of Psychiatry and Behavioral Sciences, Stanford University Medical School; Dean of Academic Affairs, Pacific Graduate School of Psychology

Participants:

Ken Pelletier, Gladman Memorial Hospital; 2510 Walnut Street; Berkeley, CA., 94075 ; 415-548-1115

Psychology, psychosomatic medicine, and holistic health

Willis Harman, Stanford Research Institute, Menlo Park, CA., 94025
415-326-6200

Psychology and Education: Towards a New Paradigm of the Human Potential

John Vasconcellos, State Capital Building, Sacramento, CA.,

Psychology and Politics: Towards Cooperative Problem Solving

Relevant topics: 19, 36, 37

Abstract: This symposium represents part of a continuing effort to look into the future and see where the practice of professional psychology might be heading, and to help define, in so far as that is possible, where we would like to see it heading. As part of that effort, this symposium will draw from speakers from politics, education, and the area of health psychology, to discuss ways in which different groups of professionals can work together cooperatively for an expanded vision of the human potential, and means to obtain that vision.

Symposium Two

Chair: DEANE SHAPIRO, JR. Pacific Graduate School of Psychology

GROUP PRESENTATION; There are fundamental questions which psychologists are facing about the nature and extent of services which they provide to the community at large. These questions may influence the nature and type of training emphasized in professional schools. This symposium intends to provide a dialogue between representatives of various professional schools, the psychological community, and other interested parties. Topics may range from the nature of clinical/community training needed for the future; the predicted job market; ways of augmenting psychologist's role in the community; balancing the practitioner/scientist model.

Participants:

DEAN DIXON, California School of Professional Psychology
MARVIN FREEDMAN, Wright Institute
DEAN NARRAMORE, Rosemead Graduate School of Psychology
PAUL CLEMENT, Fuller Graduate School of Psychology
ROBERT KANTOR, Pacific Graduate School of Psychology

In a very real sense, California is setting models, and standards with regard to the training of professional psychologists. A primary function of this symposium will be to have representatives from different professional schools discuss the directions and goals towards which they would like to see psychology evolve in the future. In this way, the practice of professional psychology, rather than reacting against legislative and social forces; can work to set a master plan for its own

direction, and then proceed in an orderly, constructive way to educate the public and legislators regarding its purpose.

Professional schools, which are involved in the training of future psychologists, are in a pivotal position to both assess the needs of psychology in the future; and ensure that their students are trained to meet those needs.

Obviously there are an inordinate amount of crucial issues facing professional psychologists in the future. To narrow the scope of the symposium, and to provide topics of general interest to professional psychologists, the following procedure will be followed:

- 1) The members of the panel will be asked to submit a list of questions which they would like to see addressed.
- 2) A notice will be written up in the California State Psychologist asking professionals in the community which types of questions they would like to see addressed.

3) These responses will be collated made into list form, and copies sent to the symposium panel. A revised agenda will then be selected by the panel, and precirculated prior to the symposium

After the formal symposium there will be an informal no-host cocktail party co-hosted with Division 11 of CSPA so that members of professional schools and other professionals in the community may further discuss some of the issues raised by the symposium.

SIDE I

I guess I'd like to say as a word of welcome that the Committee on Future Directions in Psychology sort of fancies itself as the west coast branch of Psychology Today. We're calling ourselves Psychology Tommorrow. What we're doing is were taping the symposium, and we're going to edit it later for some kind of publication. So, if you have questions, since we don't have a very good tape recorder, we'd appreciate it if you'd write your questions down as you say them and put your name and address down, so when we edit it, we'll know who said what.

When I was asked to serve as the chair of the Committee on Future Directions, I was delighted. Coming from a clinical research background, you feel reluctant to make any kind of statement for which you don't have empirical documentation, and so with a committee like this I saw the chance to perhaps come up with what we might call the perfect theory. Now you may ask, what is the perfect theory? And I'd like to let Lucy from the Peanuts cartoons explain what that might be. Lucy, as you may know, has had a long time romance with Schroeder, the pianist, and she says, "I've just come up with the perfect theory." And he's sitting there playing his piano, and he says, "What is this perfect theory?" She said, "It's my theory that Beethoven would have written better music if he'd been married." Schroeder is still leaning over the piano, and he says, "What's so perfect about that theory?" And she says, "It can't be proved one way or the other."

The way I see us trying to come up with the perfect theory, in terms of this present symposium on professional schools, is to say, What kind of model for psychology do we hope to have ten or

twenty years hence? And if we can agree on that model, then we can begin to set up training programs now which will train psychologists to meet that model.

I'd like to just briefly touch on three areas that are going to be elaborated on by the speakers. The first issue is what we might call the vision of psychology. I think that the research, such as Walter Michel's personality research, suggests that there's a strong environmental determinism, a situation specificity to our behavior, that environment, such as the physical environment, the social environment, the cognitive environment really have a strong influence on how we act. And what psychological research at this level is doing is describing what is. From a different traditions, which may be the organismic tradition -- Goldstein, and later Maslow and Rogers -- and I guess from a religious standpoint, people like de Chardin are describing this kind of self-actualizing vision, this innate organismic view of us unfolding. There's something very beautiful about that, and what I see necessary is that the literature may show that that's not an accurate empirical finding, that Michel may in fact be right from a research standpoint. On the other hand, in terms of the vision of who we can become, we know from the placebo literature, we know from our attitudes who we think we can become is very important. So at some level the clinician-scientist has to bridge the research literature which shows what is and also be able to have a vision of what psychology can become. And I think psychologists,

particularly professional psychologists, are right in the middle, that they're trying to translate what is into what could become. And this will be discussed in particular by Bob Kantor, in terms of a vision of what psychology can become, and also by Ted Dixon, in terms of the scientist-practitioner model, how to integrate those two.

The second issue is one that's probably dear to all of our hearts which is the predicted job market. And I'd like to just give a quick personal example that relates to this. Some of the research I've been doing on self-regulation strategy -- I've gotten many requests for reprints -- and two of these speak to this issue. One was a request from an institute of cardiology in Leningrad and the other was from a licensed psychologist in Michigan who mows lawns for a living. The reason I bring up the issue of the Leningrad institute of cardiology is that more and more physicians are turning to psychologists in health related issues, realizing that psychosomatic illness, rather than being a medical problem is a behavioral problem, a problem of how we live. And here psychology really has something to offer. I think as we look to the future we need to see innovative kinds of roles for psychologists, not only in terms of the health sciences -- which I think is going to be a very important issue -- but also in terms of the crisis intervention, working with police, how we interface with other community agencies. So that's the one side. When we think of the job market, we really need to be innovative. On the other hand I think professional schools have an ethical responsibility that you need to let your

students know what the job market is. We don't want our people to end up licensed and mowing lawns.

The final issue is that -- this was supposed to have been spoken about by Mervin Friedman, whom I don't see. Maybe it's a really bad job market, I'm not sure. The third issue is the issue of competence, and I think this has two different aspects. One aspect is, What is a "competent" professional psychologist? And how can you operationalize these criteria to make sure, as a professional school, that's who we're training. You may talk about the interpersonal skills, like accurate empathy and communication and non-judgmentalness. You may also talk about some of the social learning skills. How do you teach the client skills where they have deficits: assertive training or social skills. So that, on the one hand, we need to assess how well we're teaching what we're supposed to be teaching. The second thing we need to do is to assess -- okay, say somebody knows the skills, how well do they teach them to the client and how does that help the client. Some kind of evaluation of our effectiveness. There was a recent American Psychological Association committee on ethics, and one of the fellows that was on it was named Michael Strickland (?) -- I think he's at Berkeley now -- and he's a philosopher, not a psychologist, and he made two points. The first one he made is that the Federal Drug Administration would ban psychotherapy, given its rate of effectiveness. You all know that the outcome literature, somewhere like 66-2/3%. That's just not good enough in terms of a drug. The second point he makes is that even if we may believe we're effective, he said, "Sincere belief in the effectiveness of snake

oil as a treatment for health problems does not mean that it's effective." So at some level we really have to evaluate and honestly convey how well we do work with people. I guess it was pointed out in this article that Strickland (?) wasn't invited back to that committee the following year.

Okay, enough said from me. What I'd like to do is turn the panel over to our speakers, and the first speaker is Bob Kantor, who is going to talk about psychological training, and deal with some of the issues of the vision of psychology.