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EDITORIAL


Robin Winkler award for applied community psychology research

The Council of the Australian Psychological Society has approved the Board of Community Psychologist's to award a $250.00 prize for applied Community Psychology Research for the year 1988-1989. Each year a judge will be selected from Australia to determine the recipient of this annual award. Professor Emeritus George Singer will act as the sole judge for the 1988-1989 year's award. Professor Emeritus Singer was selected due to his work relationship with the late Robin Winkler and his expertise in applied research. The award will be presented at the annual conference of the Australian Psychological Society and announced on the previous June 30th. Please let the Board know of any research which might be in the running for this prize.

24th International Congress of Psychology Wrap-up

The 24th International Congress of Psychology was a resounding success for the Board of Community Psychologist's. The symposia were very well attended. The quality of the papers was generally excellent. The AGM was the most well attended to date with over 50 people present. The dinner at e Afrik cafe was a full-house and feedback about the night was good.

Julian Rapaport's invited address was excellent. Dan Adelson's chairing and contributions over several symposia were outstanding. Both Julian's and Dan's contributions will be remembered as hallmark events which contributed to a new standard of excellence for Australian Community Psychology. Ira Iscoe, Kyoshi Hayashi, Max Abbott, Ingrid Huygens, Pam Oliver, Grace Pretty, Pierre Ritchie, Neville Robertson and many other noted non-Australian Community Psychologists were in attendance and made significant and much appreciated contributions to the formal and informal events. A special note of commendation to Dave Thomas from New Zealand who contributed so much to both the formal and informal programmes.

Amongst our local Community Psychologist's, Robyn Robinson was appointed as the Board of Community Psychologist's first nominee for Fellow of the Australian Psychological Society. Heather Gridley was awarded the Board of Community Psychologist's prize for her contribution to Professional Community Psychology practice. Jan Howell was awarded a prize for the most promising student of Community Psychology.
New State Representatives of the Board of Community Psychologist's

New representatives of the Board were formed as a result of actions taken at the 24th International Congress. These new representatives will be listed on the inside front cover of Network henceforth; they are Glenn Ross - (North Qld.) Andrew Ellerman - (Toowoomba) Chris Williams/Jim Young - (Hobart) Steve Fyson - (Sydney).

New Committee Representatives of the Board of Community Psychologist's

New Committee members for the 1988-1989 term of office for the National Board of Community Psychologists are Ross Williams from the Western Institute in Victoria, Des Hatchard from Bendigo CAE in Victoria. Welcome aboard.

1989 APS Conference

The Australian Psychological Society Conference is scheduled for the 25-29 August. The Board of Community Psychologist's have committed themselves to making the Conference in Hobart a memorable event. After consultation with Tasmanian colleagues and consultation with State Representatives, the Board has committed itself to developing a programme looking at aspects of Environmental Issues. The Board will be broadly canvassing opinion and action with regard to this theme for the Hobart Conference. Ideas are most welcome at this point. 'Hands-on techniques for mobilising people about environmental issues' is one proposed workshop (Di Bretherton); the 'Psychology of disaster planning' (with an overseas speaker - possibly Levine who monitored the Love Canal Disaster in the United States) is tipped as a major focus (either symposium or invited address); and a Behavioural Toxicology Symposium (George Singer). Think you have got an idea which might be appropriate to this context? If so, please contact Denise Brunt who will be the Board's Co-ordinator for the Hobart Conference activities.
This 9th, serial volume of *Human Behavior and Environment: Advances in Theory and Research* deals with a fascinating and complex topic in the environment and behaviour field. Neighbourhoods and communities are in various stages of formation and transition in almost every society, nation, and culture. Thus we see nomadic people settling into stable communities, new towns sprouting up around the world, continuing suburban sprawl, simultaneous deterioration... and so on.

As in previous volumes, the range of content, theory and methods represented in the various chapters is intended to be broadly based, with perspectives rooted in several disciplines - anthropology, history, psychology, sociology and urban studies. Many chapters deal directly with citizen participation (especially 3, 4, and 7).

Contents:

Chapter 1 - The Neighbourhood, Personal Identify, and Group Affiliation, L.G. Rivlin.
Chapter 2 - Crowding, Conflict and Neighborhood Regulation, S.E. Merry.
Chapter 3 - Community Dynamics in Coping with Toxic Contaminants, M.R. Edelstein and A. Wandersman.
Chapter 4 - Can Resident Participation in Neighborhood Rehabilitation Programs Succeed? Israel's Project Renewal Through a Comparative Perspective, A. Churchman.
Chapter 6 - The Symbolic Ecology of Suburbia, A. Hunter.
Chapter 7 - Neighborhood Preservation and Community Values in Historical Perspective, D.R. Goldfield.
Chapter 8 - Communities in Transition From the Industrial to the Postindustrial Era, W.V. Vilet and J. Burgers.
Handbook of Prevention
Barry A. Edelstein and Larry Nichelson (Eds.)

Review by Richard A. Winett, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University

This volume is must reading for the serious preventionist. It provides great breadth of coverage (e.g. from genetic factors in psychopathology to prevention of environmental problems), with virtually every chapter written in a scholarly and interesting style. It lives up to the name of "handbook" by providing incisive reviews in so many different areas, including prenatal and infant developmental disorders, childhood behaviour disorders, achievement deficits, children's social skills, marital and family problems and schizophrenia, among others.

While I have said that it is "must" reading, at the same time the volume has some important editorial and conceptual shortcomings. On the editorial side, I was somewhat surprised that there are no sections written by the editors to introduce chapters and sections and make connections between chapters. All 16 chapters are written by experts in the field and do stand well alone; however, the book might have more impact had there been critical comments and integrations by the editors.

A somewhat similar shortcoming is found particularly in those chapters which are more in the mental health arena. These chapters are each individually quite excellent, but as a set beg for a conceptual and action framework for prevention. While there is certainly disagreement in the field about the nature and extent of such a framework (e.g. focus on DSM-III disorders versus larger-scale quality of life interventions), few of these chapters grapple with these important issues. Indeed, most of these chapters are actually about person-centred secondary prevention and treatment.

Interestingly, many of the chapters in nonmental health areas (e.g. alcohol abuse, crime and delinquency) are more sophisticated with regard to analyzing system influences and constraints on preventive behaviours. And, not surprisingly, those chapters more squarely in the public health domain (e.g., cancer, injury prevention) offer more systems-level conceptualisations and a range of strategies (e.g., economic, legal, regulatory) for promoting prevention. Thus, one important contribution that this volume can make is to expose mental health professionals to a wider range of prevention concepts and strategies.

The book also has some other shortcomings, at least one of which is quite central to community psychology. Perhaps what is most missing from some of
the chapters is the mission-like fervour for prevention that has characterised community psychology. Likewise, with some exceptions (e.g., Jason, Thompson, and Rose's chapter on methodology and the one by Neitzel and Himelein on crime and delinquency prevention), there does not appear to be an awareness of the many complex value and political issues raised over the years by Rappaport and others. Thus, also not surprisingly, community psychology has succeeded in making prevention a top agenda item in many fields of psychology, but something valuable has been lost in the diffusion process.

There are two more omissions which are pet peeves of this reviewer. Social marketing as a program design and intervention framework is barely mentioned and then mostly dismissed (e.g., in the Robertson chapter on injury prevention). Also, few of the chapters seriously address cost-effectiveness and cost-benefit issues beyond noting these terms. Since cost-benefit is one of the central arguments for (and debates about) prevention, this is an important oversight.

These points aside, this is still an excellent text and one that is recommended as a starting point for all serious preventionists.

Handbook of Social Skills Training and Research

Review by Joseph A. Durlak, Loyola University of Chicago.

The Handbook of Social Skills Training and Research, part of the prestigious Wiley series on personality processes, evaluates the burgeoning literature on social skills training. It is loosely divided into six major sections totaling 25 chapters. The middle four sections contain 16 chapters describing programs for either special populations (e.g., children, couples, mentally retarded) or on special topics (e.g., life skills training, heterosexual skills). These middle chapters are nestled between three introductory chapters that describe historical and methodological issues in social skills training and assessment and five concluding chapters that focus broadly on the current status of the field and future directions.

The volume starts impressively. In their excellent preface, L'Abate and Milan succinctly highlight four major issues that can serve as a guide to evaluate the quality of social skills training and research. These are: (a) empirical identification and validation of the separate components of social skills training, (b) methodological attention to replication and generalisation of training effects, (c) confirmation that program components are indeed responsible for whatever changes are achieved, and (d) concern about cost-effectiveness in the delivery of
services. Unfortunately, when this four-point template is applied to the handbook's chapters, the literature is found severely wanting. This is not the fault of the volume's contributors who, by and large, are well-known and respected researchers and practitioners. Rather, the deficiencies rest with the current data bases.

Notwithstanding some notable exceptions (e.g., some child programs and Goldstein's Structured Learning Therapy), there are very few bona fide social skills programs described in this volume. Many of the interventions reviewed are reconceptualised as social skills training after the fact. In reality, many programs were initially offered as straightforward clinical interventions for marital couples, parents, or the mentally retarded. These interventions are discussed primarily because they targeted such responses as communication or conflict-resolution skills which are now subsumed under the general rubric of social skills.

However, since most of these clinical programs were never originally designed to answer the basic conceptual and empirical questions currently facing the social skills change agent, most of the fundamental issues in the field remain unsolved. While most of the contributors acknowledge these limitations, the net result is nevertheless unsatisfying. In fact, in some areas, there are virtually no programmatic data to evaluate (e.g., training for divorced individuals, women's issues, training for professional helpers, and programs in business and industry).

Social skills training is appealing to many since it represents a conceptual direction away from the traditional pathologically-oriented clinical and social interventions. However, if social skills training is to meet the enthusiastic expectation of its adherents, much more basic research and practice have to be accomplished. Thus, publication at this time of a handbook devoted to social skills training and research may have been premature. A much briefer volume highlighting the most exemplary programs and recommending future directions would have been preferable.
ABORIGINAL HOUSING DESIGN IN NEW SOUTH WALES - GOING BACKWARDS OR FORWARDS?
by
Paul Memmott, PhD

The invasion of Aboriginal Australia commenced in 1788 and with it began a lengthy history of miscommunication, misperception and misconception between whites and blacks. It took until the 1970s for politicians and governments to concede that Aborigines had, and are continuing to have and maintain, a different cultural existence to mainstream Australian society despite prolonged attempts at annihilation, imposed institutional change, forced assimilation and other methods of cultural engineering implemented by the colonisers. Now it is being recognised that there are positive values within Aboriginal culture that can be promoted and marketed as part of Australia's national heritage and tourist appeal. Take Michael Nelson Tjakamarra for example, one of the most renowned of contemporary painters for the Papunya Tula Artists school. For Australia's Bicentennial gem, the new Parliament House, Tjakamarra has provided the impressive mosaic forecourt design drawn from the millenia of desert art tradition. Papunya itself however is one of the great desert ghettos, an Aboriginal settlement whose destroyed and abandoned buildings bear testimony to the failure of government housing schemes in Aboriginal Australia.

Aboriginal housing is one of the glaring examples of a lack of common understanding and planning between white and black Australians. One pertinent issue that has recently been raised (in the press) is "how big should a house for an Aboriginal family be?" The N.S.W. Department of Housing is in the process of providing some houses for large families in rural towns, that have five, six and in some, seven bedrooms. This has produced some reaction in certain quarters of the Department. One officer fears there may occur a white backlash against the Aboriginal community in these small country towns due to the Aborigines receiving such large houses.

It is easy to assume that a demand for large houses is simply a result of overcrowding. However this is not necessarily the case. But to understand cultural differences in Aboriginal lifestyle one has to turn back the clock to understand the traditions of camp life that are still remembered and maintained in certain ways.

Traditionally, Aboriginal people had a reasonably mobile lifestyle, keeping nevertheless within their prescribed local territories, and travelling from campsite to campsite in response to seasonal influences, social occasions, religious and ceremonial obligations. The spatial arrangement of shelters in camps,
particularly large camps, was very complex. It was in turn based on the complex social relationships and organisation of Aboriginal people, which were radically different to those of Anglo Australians. Today a typical Australian extended family would consist of a number of nuclear families with a few common grandparents or great-grandparents who might still be alive, and inter-linked with other families through in-law relations. However such a kinship structure formed only one part of Aboriginal societies. Overlaid with this was a complex class system that generated further kin relations with everybody in a region, despite a lack of connection through blood. People camped in groups that were usually based on class identity, tribal or language group identity as well as close family relations. At the same time there were numerous rules that out of mutual respect, forbid specific relatives from camping in proximity to one another, or even talking to or looking at one another. For example, such was the case between a man and his mothers-in-law, not only his actual wife’s mother, but her sisters and other women who through class relations were also regarded as mothers-in-law.

Aboriginal social organisation forms a major research subject of Australian anthropology. Its diverse forms and complexity, and associated rules dictated choice of marriage partners, camping patterns, the sharing of resources and many other aspects of everyday behaviour, are regarded as a highly significant component in the world history of cultural adaptation and human evolution. It is time that non-Aboriginal Australians were taught more widely about this part of Aboriginal culture, both in schools and in the popular media. It too forms a significant part of Australia’s cultural heritage and, like Aboriginal painting, music, dancing, and religion, should be recognised and respected as such.

In the current debate therefore, certain facts need to be recognised. First, it has been well established that many rural groups of N.S.W. Aborigines have chosen to remain in the vicinity of their traditional land and maintain emotional and spiritual ties to it, rather than move to urban centres where their economic lifestyle might improve. Secondly, that many individuals and groups continue to reside in closely knit communities despite lengthy government attempts at assimilation and mixing Aboriginal houses through towns under a policy called "scatterisation". Thirdly, many Aboriginal people enjoy living in large extended families and maintain their human security and bonds in this way. Finally, many of these families have requested accommodation to suit the size of their household and the architects of the current housing programme have responded accordingly after in-depth consultation and research.

N.S.W. Aboriginal people have put up with a longer history of forced change and genocide than in most other States. It is sad to see Government red tape trying to tie back a progressive project of the Department of Housing. Not only is it remarkable that aspects of traditional social organisation continue to survive in N.S.W., but it needs to be recognised that family ties, sharing and support
amongst kin continue to provide the people with their very means for survival and for maintaining their Aboriginal identity.

The new N.S.W. Government has only one constructive course of action in this problem and it should be in the interests of the quality of life-style of its clients and the national cultural heritage. Selling out to a possible community backlash is a 'cop-out' that has ruled the day too many times before in the unfortunate history of paternalism and racism in this State.

Note

1. Dr. Paul Memmott is an architect/anthropologist who provides a research consultancy service on Aboriginal housing, and has a research unit at both the University of Queensland and the University of Sydney.

Reprinted from PAPER.
PSYCHOLOGISTS' ACTIVITIES IN COMMUNITIES IN JAPAN
by
Kiyoshi HAYASHI
Dept. of Psychology, Shiraumegakuen College, Kodaira, Tokyo, Japan,


Distribution of Psychologists Working Community Settings

Community psychology and psychology which is perceived in community settings are indeed different. It is difficult, however, to differentiate between psychologists who either are only really oriented to community psychology principles and those active in community settings. So, for convenience sake, first let's show the number of the psychologists studying psychology in community settings by the following means.

4355 people are listed in the 1985 Japanese Association of Psychology. Teachers (including professors) and students constitute 72.2% of the list. 52.2% are teachers who are employed in higher education institutions, whilst 3.2% are teachers in other institutions. The remaining 17.0% are graduate students. Only 13.3% of the list are professional psychologists who study and work at psychology in the community.

Out of these, 8% work as consultants for children. Another 8% work at research laboratories or educational counselling centres. 4.3% work at the hospitals, 3.2% for institutions related to welfare, 10% as educational counsellors in school settings (including universities), 2.4% in juvenile Justice system, 8% in local mental health settings. There are relatively more people who work at hospitals, institutions and welfare, and relatively less people who work in educational settings. One explanation is the existence of separate interest groups (e.g. the Japanese Association of Educational Psychology). The other is that only small numbers of teachers who teach in primary education or secondary education, participate in the Japanese Association of Psychology.

Methods used by Japanese Community Based Psychologists

The psychologists who actually work as community psychologists are attempting to increase the cohesion in the relationship between individual and community systems. Most of these psychologists work as counsellors,
therapists, or testers. To understand this, let's look at the history of Japanese counselling and psycho-therapy.

The history of psychological testing, vocational guidance and counselling began before World War II. Morita Therapy, Zen and psychoanalysis were already utilised before World War II.

The latter 1940's are considered the post-war age of Japan. At this time the counselling institutions, such as consultant offices for children and so on, were established under the new law and they became the places to practice counselling and psycho-therapy.

From 1950 to 1960 Carl Rogers' Client-centred counselling greatly influenced the field of educational counselling and industrial counselling. E.G. Williamson's Clinical Counselling had a great effect on the field of vocational guidance. As well F.P. Robinson and F.C. Thorne's Eclectic Counselling began to substantially influence the various counselling fields. At the same time Momo's Psychodrama was also introduced to us and has since been developing in a culturally appropriate way.

At this time the number of psychologists was very small. Students counselling centres were established in the big universities. Some enterprises created counselling programmes for employees. In the 1960's the professional societies presenting various fields of counselling and psycho-therapy were established. The usage of the word, "counselling" became more common in our society. After the mid 1960's, the influence of Behaviour Therapy gradually began to appear. Naikan (self-insight) Therapy which is based on the idea of Buddhism became generally accepted.

In the 1970's Client Centred Counselling, Encounter Groups, Behaviour Therapy/Behaviour Counselling all commenced and were eagerly adopted. By the mid 70's, Transactional Analysis was generally used. It was not until the 70's that the concept of applying different counselling and psycho-therapies, depending on the case, was supported by many practitioners. It was also in the 70's that Gestalt Therapy was introduced and utilised. Around this time Telephone counselling started in Japan and it is just now establishing its status as a major form of counselling. Private counselling institutions started. (Although the counsellors were part-timers or volunteers).

The influence of C.G. Jung, which started in the 1970's, must be mentioned as one of the major influences in the 1980's. The influence of Client Centred counselling was so strong that Behaviour Therapy borrowed cognitive theory and gave the theoretical bases to educational clinics and hospital clinics. Ellis's Rational Emotive Therapy and Family Therapy founded on System Theory, and
the Micro Counselling practices of A.E. Ivey have also been taken into practice in the 1980's.

The Study

Questionnaire Investigation. The activities of psychologists who either study the community and/or work in community settings were investigated. A questionnaire was constructed by the following means.

First a preliminary investigation of psychologists was made by asking the following open-ended question: "I'd like to investigate the psychologists' role in the community, what do you think our professional role is or could be in the community settings? Please write anything you can think of".

From this result, the actual questionnaire was constructed. It consisted of fifty items. Each question was asked from the following point of view:

(A) "Are you engaging in this job now? (1. Yes, 2. No)

(B) "Do you think this activity is being practised as the work of psychologists in our country?" (1. No ---- 5. Yes, it is in full activity).

(C) "What do you think about the future of this activity? Do you think it will be developed as the future subject?" (1. No, nothing will be done. ---- 3. Yes, it will be developed actively).

One hundred and fifty people who were both current members of the Japanese Association of Psychology and 'professional psychologists engaged in psychological activity in the community' were asked to answer these questionnaires (distribution occurred in June, 1988). Sixty-one questionnaires were answered, and collected and analysed. The rate of completion was 40.7 percent. Table 1 shows the result summary.

Column (1), in which it was asked if this activity is currently practiced, items 12, 13 and 14 were responded to at a relatively high rate and 5, 6 and 49 were responded to at a relatively low rate. The field of education and welfare were frequently identified as well serviced. In column (2), the question about the potential for future activity of psychologists, items 5, 6, 47 and 49 were relatively less valued. Education and/or welfare was relatively more valued. Japanese Psychologists thought less of social activism, especially 'social backing activity'. This is because people were somewhat influenced by the image that the Japanese public have of the 'social backing activity'.
SELECTED SUMMARY RESULTS OF THE SURVEY

(1) Do you think Psychologist's work in this area in our Country?
(2) Do you think that Psychologists will work in this area in the future?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>(1) Men</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>(2) Men</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aiding or participating in local public health services</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiding or participating in administration</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aiding or participating in the local residents movements</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselling, psycho-therapy or testing in educational research centres or educational counselling centres</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselling, psycho-therapy or testing in hospital settings</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Counselling, psycho-therapy or testing in the consultation offices for children</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sports psychology</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting activity to social movement</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In 1987 at the 51st Annual Conference of Japanese Association of Psychology, a Symposium on Community Psychology was held and presided by Prof. Yamamoto from Keio University.

Prof. Yamamoto defines the concept of community psychology as the following:

"to research the mediating ways to help to reform not only the individual but also the family, the group to which a person belongs, the structure of the community or the work-place so that the people and the surroundings fit as well as possible. It is the territory to develop the study to acquire the basic knowledge about the interaction between the individual and the system of society by engaging in the concrete psychological subject". Community psychology is research about the basic knowledge and strategies which are required to make the person and their surroundings fit best. It researches ways to solve the various psycho-sociological problems, without discriminating on the basis of physical, psychological, social and cultural background." (Yamamoto, 1986)

In this symposium the possibilities of Community Psychology approaches to reform the system (to solve problems) mainly about the creation of local backing activity through offering volunteer telephone counselling, the facilitation of social support from important people and the establishing of mental health facilities for delinquents.

Prof. Yamamoto says that in 1975 Community Psychology practice and discussion started in Japan.

The future role of the psychologist includes (1) the function of ombudsmen, (2) adjusting problems in community settings, (3) establishing institutions for psychologists who work in the communities, (4) training of volunteers who engage in the psychological activities, and (5) training more people to help and aid the elderly to keep up with the projected increases in the old people's population. These activities are going to be our future applications.

References

EMPOWERING OUR NATURAL COMMUNITIES
- An alternative to prevention
by
Ingrid Huygens, M.A.
Dip. Applied Psych. (Community)


Introduction

This paper is directed at community psychologists and all those from other branches of psychology who speak of themselves as working from an empowerment model, working for social change, or working for social justice.

It is interesting to look back at our motives for adopting empowerment or social justice values in our work and in our lives. The empowerment model in psychology arose partly because of flaws in philosophical and practical aspects of primary prevention (Rappaport, 1981). The philosophical flaw is that one group (usually the more powerful one) sets the goals for other groups, while the practical difficulty is that these goals are usually expressed in terms of the things we do not want, such as television violence, drug abuse, wife beating or poverty rather than in terms of the things we do want. The result is a series of single-cause campaigns which, even when successful, usually leave us with a society or community that still does not look quite the way we hoped, and rapidly throws up further problems. The empowerment model recognises that our mental and physical health and our quality of life ultimately depend on the control we have over decisions affecting our lives.

A simple diagram illustrates this: (Figure 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Decisions</th>
<th>Lifestyle</th>
<th>Quality of Life</th>
<th>Symptoms</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td>Power</td>
<td>Choices</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Health</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary</td>
<td>Primary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prevention</td>
<td>Prevention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

You can only do this for yourself

Others can do this for you

Figure 1: Points of Intervention
Ideally, when we work on empowering a group, we relinquish control over (i) the goals they will set for their own primary prevention and (ii) how they will organise their own secondary and tertiary prevention.

As a community psychologist of six years standing who theoretically practices in this way, and as a lesbian for the same length of time who is theoretically one of the recipients of some of this empowerment, I suggest that very little empowerment happens in this direct way. Very few of us commit time and resources specifically to help others get power. The best we usually do is help them achieve some primary, secondary or tertiary prevention goal, like better housing or child care for their community where the spin-off is a place on city or local council in the next election. Most of us would spend only meagre amounts of time lobbying our community or society for our target group to be represented on council because they are black, or because they are mothers, even though we know perfectly well that they have poor housing because our society is racist, and there is poor child care because society is sexist.

Some might protest that they are well aware that their empowerment of various groups is indirect, and achieved via more overt prevention goals. We need to ask ourselves why we avoid being more direct in lobbying for power on behalf of others. In fact, most of us will have spent some time working for direct empowerment of oppressed groups - marching for black or civil rights, writing to the local paper about homosexual rights, or arguing amongst friends about women's rights to make decisions about their own bodies - but these actions have usually taken a minimal proportion of our time, and have seldom been ongoing themes in our professional life. Why do we play it so safe? Why are we not at the forefront of social change? If we have no answer to these questions, we are possessors of "artificial competency", working with empowerment tools but without an awareness of the system in which we use them. (Albee, 1980)

Empowering ourselves

To gain a clearer picture of our own position in the empowerment stakes it is helpful for each of us to place ourselves on the simple continuum below. The continuum represents the power differential in a person's own society. Power is defined as the amount of choice a person has over their life. Secondly, it is helpful for each of us to list the groups we feel have more power than we do, and those we feel have less power (Figure 2).
It is interesting also to consider the groups to which we belong in our private and professional lives, and to inspect the goal and process of each group. A tennis club probably has a primary prevention goal, if it maintains our quality of life, or falls under secondary prevention if we are at risk of developing hypertension. An AA group is probably tertiary prevention, as are other self help groups. In many groups in our private lives we can influence the decision making and resource allocation through committee meetings, our purses or our personal contacts. In general, most of us do a lot of primary prevention for ourselves. Moreover, we do it as participants in an empowering process.

It is perfectly natural to do this. Empowering ourselves is simple and straightforward. We can make fairly accurate assumptions about the needs and resources of others like ourselves, and we understand the norms and restraints within which our group operates (Helean and Huygens, 1986).

Empowering others is always more difficult and awkward, requiring constant consultation and checking of our assumptions. Even when we intend to empower others, we often skim off some of the benefits for ourselves. Most of us would name ourselves as the authors of a book or article on the empowerment of someone else. As a profession, we are quite careless of who benefits from such a publication. We know from our empowerment principles that the readers who
will identify with the project will be others like ourselves - not, for instance, other young people wanting a youth centre or other agoraphobics wanting a support group. We know that they are unlikely to identify with the project unless it is written by other groups like themselves. By appealing to other psychologists and community workers, we are increasing our group's range of skills, experiences, and competencies. With more sensitivity to who would benefit, and using similar resources, we could have arranged a speaking tour for the group, called in the television news, had the group speaking for themselves, and distributed the video of the television coverage to other groups like our target group.

Since it is so easy to revert to empowering ourselves, we must continually check our assumptions and goals in working with other groups (Konopka, 1981). However, there are ways in which we can harness our naturally self-directed energy to promote social change.

Getting out of the way of Social Change

Freire's model of social change suggests that it is like the cutting edge of a knife, with key change agents at the sharp point, translators and early adopters acting as the blade, and the mass of people following behind (Freire, 1970). Structural analysis is a strategic tool based on this model which encourages people to recognise where they are in society and how much power they have (Note 1). It suggests that, if we already have substantial choice over our lives, we will have little investment in real social change, whereas, if we have little choice, we also have little to lose. Those who have power and no investment in change, and those who have not been made aware or "conscientised" about where they are comprise the mass (Figure 3). These people can move to being early adopters, but will only move to being translators if they really identify with the issues in question.

Key change agents are the leaders of social change who are willing, and can afford, to take risks.
Referring back to Figure 1, most of us would have to agree that as professionals we have little investment in social change, and are members of the mass. Our most helpful move to promote social change is to get out of the way of the key change agents. We need to let them speak for themselves, to support them when they do so, and to create as many opportunities as possible for them to do so, and to create as many opportunities as possible for them to do so. Psychology conferences, even those with themes around social justice, are notoriously bereft of participants from key change groups in society. As a Feminist Lesbian, I am a natural key change agent on issues of sexism and heterosexism, as I have not investment in the status quo, but I have yet to be asked to describe my analysis of our society and how it could avoid sexism at a psychology conference. I understand that no local Koori, or other Aboriginal people have been asked to present at this conference an alternative analysis of the Bicentennial celebrations, even though they would probably have the clearest vision of social justice in this country.

Participants in structural analysis workshops will know that the most elaborate and detailed visions of how our society could be more just and equitable come from minority groups, not from community or social psychologists. When a
person is out in the cold, away from the decision-making that will shape their lives, she or he spends a lot of time imagining exactly how a warm, cosy hut should look and what it should provide.

This particular model of social change has several advantages:

(i) it is parsimonious - it allows the haves and the havenots to work with the same model;

(ii) it is acceptable to those with less power (even empowerment models can feel quite patronising when you are in the target group); and

(iii) it allows for individuals and groups to move between categories depending on the issue, and depending on their level of awareness and activity on an issue.

As professionals, we can work on supporting key change agents, and becoming early adopters of radical viewpoints. As individuals, we can look more closely at our own potential to be key change agents.

Recognising our own Oppressions

If we accept that social change comes most energetically from those who can afford to change, then it is disempowered "minority" groups who will lead social change.

If we consider groupings in our society which we are expected to "rise above", such as being fat, being a migrant, or being a drug user as examples of minority groups, we find that there is almost no one left in the "mainstream". If each of these groups becomes politicised about their suppressions and oppressions, we would all be leading some aspect of social change.

Again it is interesting to list all the groupings each of us belongs to, and to check our potential for leading social change in any of these. Most of us belong to some groups which need more power, and to some which disempower others. There are two ways in which we can empower ourselves in a manner that will benefit others, and make us key agents for change:
(i) identify our own "minority" status and work to empower our own group; and

(ii) identify the ways we disempower specific groups and work among our own group to lift this oppression.

Both of these processes are difficult for us.

Most professionals are extremely resistant to labelling themselves, even though we happily label others. We are also extremely reluctant to see ourselves as "problems" rather than "resources". I suggest that while we are noble to encourage many others to see themselves more as resources (Roberts and Thorsheim, 1982) we would do well to counter our own complacency by seeing ourselves more as problems. We can empower our own particular minority group in all the ways that the psychiatric survivors, the recovered drug users and the Mothers Against Drunk Driving have shown us. In the Auckland lesbian community, the efforts of lesbian counsellors and a group called Lesbian Alcohol and Drug Action has raised awareness, and changed norms in a way that no outside intervention could have done. Although no evaluation of changing drinking levels has been carried out, it is clear that my efforts within my natural
community have hit home in ways that could not have been achieved by more removed personnel.

We are even less familiar with the idea of working on our own oppressive behaviours and finding ways to reduce our power. While many of us uphold anti-racist or anti-sexist views, pitifully few of us are actually in anti-racism groups, or men's groups where the focus is our own racism or sexism and so on. We have probably sat through challenges on these issues, felt guilty and defensive, but spent no time on how to ameliorate this problem behaviour in ourselves. And yet we have all the tools to do so. We know how to call a support meeting, how to encourage self-disclosure, how to set goals for groups, how to make our stand public, how to build in small successes, and so on. Probably the only truly mysterious aspect of such a "disempowerment" is the question of where the reinforcement would come from. Knowing that we have achieved a higher goal of our own empowerment philosophy is rather abstract when our woman partner thinks we may have gone quite soft, or our Jewish friends say we're quite naive. It is important to build in reinforcement from politicised groups who can give feedback from a similar model to our own empowerment philosophy. A men's network in Hamilton, New Zealand, who work on their own sexism and violence, and run groups for other men, use the local Battered Woman's collective as consultants. This encourages them to keep as a priority the safety of the woman partners of the men with whom they work. The anti-racism network in Auckland lesbian community use the Maori and Pacific lesbian group as consultants. An Auckland North Shore alcohol and drug abuse network comprised mostly of professionals and community workers asks local recovering alcoholics for feedback. A group of university men working on sexism in universities could, for instance, use the women on the university's sexual harassment committee as consultants. Using politicised minority groups as consultants for your own disempowerment work is recognising them as "experts" on their own oppression.

In conclusion, we need to acknowledge our positions in society and get out of the way of social change, and direct our natural self-interest to our own oppressions using minority groups for guidance. In these ways we become genuine actors for social change.

Notes
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AN INVITATION TO JOIN THE ELECTRONIC COMMUNITY

by

Denis Gray

Have you ever reflected back on how you survived before the invention of the word processor? I find it hard to remember how I got anything accomplished before the PC entered my life. Another application of modern technology is currently revolutionizing communications and may have a comparable impact on our professional lives. Electronic mail or e-mail involves electronic transmission, storage and retrieval of computer generated files, typically over a telephone line. Individuals who belong to an e-mail network can send or receive short messages, data sets or complete manuscripts to another network subscribe across the country in a matter of seconds.

Applications of e-mail systems are almost endless. I am involved in a national study involving over 35 researchers at difference locations. Much of our regular communication takes place by e-mail. An electronic newsletter for psychologists, PSYCHNET, already exists, Electronic submission of manuscripts for publication is already being piloted by some journals. Eventually, the whole publication could be accomplished without a single piece of paper being entrusted to the local postman.

How would you like to join a network of other community psychologists linked by e-mail? Sound expensive? Not really. Almost every university in the country subscribes to the national serviced called BITNET. Therefore, if you have an account on a university mainframe and easy access to a terminal or a PC and modem you can network electronically with most of your colleagues. Generally, there is no special charge for this service; basic logon and CPU charges for editing time are charged to your account. The only hang up is you need to know the address or "destination" of your correspondent(s).

The Community Psychologist would like to facilitate the formation of an electronic network among community psychologists by publishing a BITNET directory. If you would like to participate, all we will need is your BITNET address: your personal logon name, the "@" symbol, and the code for the mainframe "node" you have an account on. Your computer center can provide you with the code for your node (be precise, some universities have 10 or 15 different nodes) and tell you how to access the system; 4-5 commands accomplish most applications.

I have agreed to coordinate the creation of this directory. If you'd like to be listed, please send my your name, university agency and BITNET address. Depending on
PRELIMINARY NOTICE

Future Event

16-31 August, 1989

The New Zealand Psychological Society Meeting are scheduled for 16-19 August, 1989. These meetings will be followed by a two day workshop on Community Psychology which will be held on an Island North of Auckland, New Zealand. This workshop is scheduled for the 19th and 20th of August and will be co-jointly sponsored by New Zealand and Australian Community Psychology groups. As well, the workshop will be an official activity of the World Mental Health Congress which is scheduled in Auckland for 21-25 August. Dave Thomas suggests anyone needing to justify their absence from their employers to do so on the basis of presenting papers and attending work related sessions at the Psych. Society Meetings or the Mental Health Congress. Needless to say, more details be provided as they come to hand.
A system of psychological therapy is described which is based on the evolutionary model. The system presented offers all possible therapeutic responses to a given situation and, therefore, simplifies the entire field of psychology. A role-playing case study is included to illustrate key points.

Introduction

The entire field of psychology is a mess. The rapid proliferation of journals, coupled with the covariable of total articles produced, has afforded everyone - including cloistered preppies - a shot at the psychological big time. The resulting phantasmagoria of possible therapeutic techniques has stimulated research, swelled the ranks of practising psychologists, and increased the relative probability that any given clinician will turn up on a late-night talk show. Unfortunately, this situation has clouded one of the central issues in the field: just how do we define appropriate behaviour in response to a crisis situation? With this goal in mind, the author herein describes the quintessential model for coping behaviours, thus unifying the field of psychology and rendering all other theories superfluous.

The AMMD Paradigm

The AMMD Paradigm is the result of lengthy research and discussion by some of the leading theorists in the field of behavioural science. The research was sparked by this postulate: Humans are smart, animals are stupid. The corollary is: Humans often make dreadful mistakes, animals seldom do. The operational (and philosophical) question then becomes: Why? Reasoning that animals functioned for millions of years and made few critical errors during that time, it was decided that an evolutionary model best explained this successful behaviour. However, a reduction of the overcumbersome theories in this area was needed so that effective therapeutic protocols could be defined. In one of his few flashes of sobriety, R. Serrette defined the essential elements of the drive to survive: Adapt, Migrate, Mutate, or Die. Thus, AMMD. It has since been discovered that this paradigm adequately defines the parameters of appropriate human responses as well. The Development of (R)Evolutionary Coping Skills [(R)ECS] therapy based on the AMMD model thus limits the total number of appropriate response classes to four, thereby clearing up this whole messy business of psychology.
A Case Study

In order to illustrate the simplicity of this approach, let us examine the following example in which you are to imagine yourself in the patient's role:

The local chapter of a particularly notorious motorcycle gang has decided to take up residence in a home which happens to be located next door to your own domicile. As a result, you are now subjected to 93 loud motorcycles, 93 loud motorcycle owners, assorted friends, continuous wild parties, and possible illicit drug use.

You are experiencing the symptoms of prolonged stress, decreased sleep and appetite, and increased lapses into fantasy.

Given this unfortunate situation, what are your options for appropriate behaviour?

A quick visit to your local (R)ECS therapist would help define the following options:

Adaption: Adjust your behaviour to fit the situation. Brick up your windows, learn to sneak into your house through the back door. Wear earmuffs year round. With this behaviour you have maintained your health and have not infringed on the rights of your new neighbours.

Migration: Rent your home to an unsuspecting visiting scholar. If this fails, have that wild-eyed kid who sits in the back of your intro class torch your house. Then migrate to St. Thomas. You have maintained your health and justified a long overdue vacation.

Mutation: Transform your being to fit the prevailing environmental conditions. Buy a motorcycle. Stay up late. Invite dubious individuals to your home. Play noxious music at unbearable volumes. In other words, join the party. You have successfully treated your stress symptomology, but may have created secondary problems with your tenure.

Die: Not much of an option as we see it, but an option nonetheless. Besides, it is the only option left if you can't be a mature, responsible adult and choose, A, M or M. In addition, this option has a certain historical validity as evidenced by the Inquisition and the French Revolution. You don't have your health, but then again you don't have any health-related problems, either.
Discussion

The AMMO paradigm offer a simple, clear, and rational approach to therapy. By unifying the field of psychology, this approach actually promotes greater public mental health by eliminating those troublesome choices between various alternative therapies, reading a multiplicity of self-help books. In addition, the simplification of psychology will result in graduate school being shortened to one year and clinical internship to 30 minutes. A giant step for psychokind.

Unfortunately, progress may bring problems. While (R)ECS therapy will surely please most professionals in the long run, initial acceptance may cause some employment problems for those practicing less effective methods. To these individuals we say: adapt, migrate, mutate, or die.

References

1. Colloquium site was a particularly notorious pizza parlor near a major southern university and research centre. Participants included two psychology graduate students, one psychology graduate nymphette, a bartender, and two members of a local softball team. The pizza was sausage and mushroom.
2. In fact, when animals make mistakes it's often a human's fault. This may be confirmed in any physiology lab in the country: We lesion 75% of a rat's brain and are then surprised when he starts doing stupid things. "It is no longer capable of learning," we say.
3. This was a turning point for Serrette. Realising his grasp of a tremendous amount of nonessential information, he graduated from school and became a bar owner in Lafayette, Louisiana.
4. Do not attempt this exercise if this situation has actually happened to you. Conflicting therapeutic modalities and expectations may be confounding and result in psychological deja vu.
5. Recent surveys of St. Thomas indicate that it is so mountainous that motorcycles are practically worthless. Therefore, it is the perfect place to avoid motorcycle gangs.
6. My dad said this once; I thought it was corny, but I'm glad I held on to it long enough to make some use of it. Waste not, want not.
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Abstract

How can psychological practice be more effectively applied to policymaking? The current emergence of a "policy science" which purports to incorporate psychology is examined. The parallel development of grassroots policy efforts by community psychologists is also noted. It is shown that psychology has much to contribute to policymaking through enhancement of decision processes and through clarification of the assumptive bases of policymaking. It is argued that empowerment is a useful tool for extending the relevant community of discourse during policymaking. However, it is also shown that empowerment requires augmentation by procedures designed to aid those being empowered to critically examine the roots and premises which generate current policy frameworks. Methods for implementing such procedures are described. Directions for a closer interplay between psychology and policymaking are suggested.

The pace of social, economic and political change continues to challenge psychology. Almost two decades ago, in his address to the American Psychological Association, George Miller (1969) notes that despite psychologists' attempts to apply social science to social problems, "we have been less effective than we might have been" (p.1063). Miller worried about this failure because "vase social changes are in the making" (p. 1065).

Miller's concerns were not new. In the midst of the Great Depression and the New Deal, psychologists at the 1936 APA meetings formed the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (see Harris, 1986 for a useful history). Members sought political activism, forthright culture critiques, and critical reanalyses of scientific psychology (Morawski, 1986). Ten years later, in the aftermath of the Second World War, John Dewey (1946) called for "experimental
production of social change; and experimentation directed by working principles that are tested and developed in the very process of being tried out in action" (p. 157). That same year, Kurt Lewin (1946) published his call for "action research," describing it as "research which will help the practitioner" (p. 34).

The problem with these clarion calls for social action and a socially relevant psychology was that they remained little more than that: clarion calls. As the vast social upheavals of the 1960's accelerated, psychologists gathered at Swampscott, Massachusetts for the Conference on Education of Psychologists for Community Mental Health. By the time that conference had ended, participants had expanded the conference mandate, and had called for creation of a new subfield to be called "community psychology" (see Bennett et al., 1966). The new subfield was to be oriented toward action research, with foci on prevention, ecological analyses, and institutional change.

Yet, by the 1980's, there were doubts about the efficacy of the community psychology endeavour. Navaco and Monahan (1980) content analysed research published in the American Journal of Community Psychology, and concluded that "an unduly large portion of the research in community psychology consists of methodologically inadequate answers to questions devoid of theoretical content" (p.142). They went on to contend that "the majority of research published in the field's leading journal has little to do with the stated objectives of the discipline" (p. 143).

The next year, Moitoza and Hersch (1981) published results of their survey of participants at the original Swampscott conference. Respondents expressed doubts about the field's effectiveness, relevance, and substantive base. Moitoza and Hersch noted that "the predominant sentiment was that community psychology would cease to exist as an independent field within the next two decades" (p. 230).

Two years later, Sarason (1983) took community psychologists to task for their failure to involve themselves in policymaking. Sarason argued that "community psychology will be viable to the extent that public policy becomes more central to its concerns" (p.250). However, Sarason noted his disappointment that "neither on a theoretical level nor on the level of practice and research has community psychology made illuminating contributions to our understanding of public policy" (p. 247).

Four years later, Walsh (1987) noted "a fundamental contradiction between the espoused communal values of the field and actual research practice in terms of relationships investigators establish with the individual citizens, groups, organisations or institutions investigated" (p. 774). According to Walsh, the research methods that psychologists are taught and that journal editors are
willing to publish distance researchers from the people they study. As a result, people become "subjects" who merely respond to interventions or manipulations. The individuals being studied seldom take any collaborative role in the research process. This fact, Walsh argued, contravenes the fundamental action research tenets upon which community psychology is founded.

Emergent concerns about community psychology have been paralleled by continued concerns throughout psychology to make the discipline relevant to processes of social, political and economic change. Thus, Jackson (1980) argues that psychologists should become active in policymaking by undertaking legislative advocacy; but DeLeon (1988) notes that psychology obtains scant involvement in legislative processes. Masters (1984) suggests that psychologists can combine policy relevance and disciplinary relevance in their research; but Hillerbrand (1987) concludes that the philosophical tensions in action research may militate against any simple melding of policy relevance and disciplinary relevance.

Despite more than half a century of seeking policy relevance, psychology has yet to obtain the impact that advocates of action research have sought. Why?

It may well be, as some have argued (e.g., Bazelon, 1982; Walsh, 1987), that the traditions of social science militate against appropriate methodologies. And it may also be, as others have argued (e.g., Reppucci & Kirk, 1984; Sarason, 1983), that the traditional psychological emphasis on individuals militates against a focus that is adequately societal. Yet these limitations alone do not fully account for the continuation of these limitations when the fact that these are limitations is well understood. Rather, it seems likely that our very conception of the links between psychological work, on the one hand, and policymaking, on the other hand, is insufficient (cf., Chalip, 1985).

The analysis that follows examines the relationship between psychology and the emerging field of policy analysis. Directions for linking psychological practice to policymaking are suggested.

Psychology and policy analysis

Psychologists were not alone in their sense that knowledge could (and should) generate more salubrious policies. By 1951, Harold Laswell, a social scientist whose work encompassed psychology, history, sociology, economics, and political science, called for social scientists to create a "policy science". Lasswell's framework for policy science had three defining characteristics: (1) it was to be oriented toward problems and their contexts; (2) it would be explicitly normative; (3) it would be multidisciplinary. Policy science would be the result of joint efforts from social scientists representing every social science discipline.
Psychologists would work alongside their fellow social scientists to generate knowledge of and for policymaking.

Lasswell's policy science took root, but in diminished form. Graduate programmes under the names "policy studies" and "policy analysis" have grown and flourished throughout the world. Ever since the days that John Kennedy brought his "brain trust" of policy analysts to Washington, the demand for graduates from these programmes has been high (see DeLeon, 1986).

In the discipline that is consequently emerging, lip service is constantly paid to multidisciplinarity. Two years before Lasswell called for a policy science, Robert K. Merton (1949) noted that it is "well known [that] a given practical problem requires the collaborative researches of several social sciences" (p. 163). Merton singled out social psychology, anthropology, sociology, and general psychology as particular necessities. In his 1970 prospectus for the emerging policy science, Dror concurred, noting that "policy sciences must integrate knowledge from a variety of branches of knowledge into a supradiscipline..." (p. 138). By the 1980's, the notion of multidisciplinarity had become implicit in the field's definition of itself. Thus, Dunn (1981) defines policy analysis as a "discipline which uses multiple methods of inquiry and argument to produce and transform policy-relevant information that may be utilised in political settings to resolve policy problems" (p. 35).

Dunn's definition highlights the relevance of psychology for policy analysis. The key points emphasise the need to serve decision making and problem solving -- areas that have long been concerns of psychology. Yet, despite the tradition of lip service to multidisciplinarity, there is scant contribution from psychology to policy analysis. The emphasis in policy analysis is on instrumentalist procedures typically drawn from economics and political science. In a recent content analysis of twenty current texts, Hale (1988) concluded that "they are teaching a false and dangerous lesson: namely that better procedures will produce better policies, which in turn will mean better government. Or that governing is a matter of finding the right technique" (p. 447).

The fallacy behind this emphasis on technique has been long understood. George Herbert Mead (1899) summarised it before the turn of the century:

In the physical world we regard ourselves as standing in some degree outside the forces at work, and thus avoid the difficulty of harmonising the feeling of human initiative with the recognition of series which are necessarily determined. In society, we are the forces being investigated, and if we advance beyond the mere description of the phenomena of the social world to the attempt at reform we seem to involve the possibility
of changing what at the same time we assume to be necessarily fixed. (pp. 370-371)

The point Mead is making is that it is epistemologically and methodologically inconsistent to treat social phenomena as if they derived from fixed principles of social behaviour and, at the same time to treat those phenomena as changeable. The very act of making a social policy presupposes that any problematic phenomenon addressed by the policy is remediable, and therefore subject to human agency. The concern is not with how problems arise, but with how our collective understandings of problems are produced, maintained, and altered. This is a fundamentally psychological concern (e.g., Moscovici, 1988; Snyder, 1984; Streuffert, 1987). It requires that we study and use the creative and transformative impact of human self-understandings.

**The multiple-voice imperative**

Human self-understandings are not static (Chalip, 1985). They are constantly invented, negotiated and transformed. The processes of problem recognition, problem comprehension, solution generation, and solution choice are inherently social (also see Swidler, 1986).

It serves policy formulation when the social bases of problem finding and problem solving are optimised via input from diverse perspectives. Diverse viewpoints permit triangulation and synthesis through critical examination of presuppositions in which the problems may be rooted (Chalip, 1985). Even outright controversy can serve problem solving by promoting fact seeking (Lowry & Johnson, 1981), inducing analysis via multiple frameworks (Tjosvold, 1988), and generating a higher level of reasoning (Smith, Petersen, Johnson & Johnson, 1986).

Content analysis of social problem research over a forty year period provides a vivid illustration of how this can operate in a policy context (viz., Gregg, Preston, Geist & Caplan, 1979). The attributions in studies of suicide, rape, delinquency, substance abuse, job dissatisfaction, and race relations were coded into three categories: person (e.g., personality, strength of will), milieu (e.g., family, peer group), and system (e.g., social stratification, institutions). An adequate examination of each problem requires balance and integration of these explanatory levels. However, four of the six problem domains analysed evidenced and overwhelming predominance of person blame. Rape and race relations were the only two topics in which the trend was toward a balance of the three levels. Significantly, these are the only two problems "in which there are organised social movements and organised, politicised constituency groups within the research community" (p. 51). The point here is that in these two cases, the
constituencies concerned were able to provide useful and complementary input into our emergent understandings of the social problems.

Okpala's (1987) recent critique of policy responses to African urbanisation provides another useful exemplar. He argues that effective policies have not been forthcoming because African urban problems have been assessed in terms of Western European analytic perspectives that suffer from their lack of indigenous African input:

Over the years, many concepts and theories have been transferred from studies of Western urbanisation. There, they have not usually been used as guides for inquiry, but generally as a means of validating preconceived conclusions which have not been borne out by the socio-cultural and economic facts at the locus of inquiry. ... Despite the fact that the negative consequences of 'borrowing' and 'testing' Western-derived concepts appear to have outweighed their positive benefits, and despite the remarkable lack of insight and lack of appreciation of the particular factors at work in African urbanisation, sweeping generalisations employing pejorative epithets have become increasingly common in the foreign literature on African urbanisation....

The irony is that the verdict is more a judgement of the uncritical transfer of received theories and concepts than of the capacity of local socio-economic and political structures to implement effective policies. (p. 148)

Okpala's allegations are consistent with Janis's (1983) analyses of failed American policies. Janis show how narrowly-derived policy frameworks can generate poor policies, even when the concepts and categories are domestic in origin.

Janis argues that policy failures can be traced to a high degree of group consensus during policy formulation. Janis finds that concurrence-seeking groups are overly optimistic, lack critical inquiry, and negatively stereotype outgroups. The resulting lack of dissent during policy formulation generates shared rationalisations that support inadequate policy recommendations. Experimental tests of Janis's "groupthink" model of policy failure supports his contention that policymaking is aided when critique and controversy are generated by a diverse community of discourse, but policymaking is harmed when the community of discourse is to narrow the generate adequate diversity and critique (e.g., Courtright, 1978; Flowers, 1977; Thompson & Carsrud, 1976).

The implication of these data is that policymaking requires input from diverse constituencies. Expertise is itself a source of presuppositions that hinder...
effective policymaking. This is not to denigrate expertise, rather, it is to suggest the importance of diverse perspectives during policymaking. We turn, then, to a consideration of factors that minimise policy inputs from disadvantaged groups.

Tackling hegemony

Inequitable distribution of wealth and power has been a common feature of virtually every society since the emergence of the modern state (Bottomore, 1966a). A significant outcome of this inequality is that disadvantaged groups -- particularly the poor and ethnic minorities -- obtain scant access to processes by which policies are formulated and implemented (Jennings, 1964; Lenski, 1966). This lack of access reinforces their disadvantaged position (Albee, 1986; Huckfeldt & Sprague, 1988; Merelman, 1986). Nevertheless, studies show widespread legitimation of the stratification upon which the disadvantages are founded, even among the disadvantaged themselves (Hochschild, 1981; Huber & Form, 1973; Lane, 1962). Although the disadvantaged are frequently dissatisfied or even angry about their plight, they can and do volunteer explanations that justify stratification (Della Fave, 1980).

The problem here is that the disadvantaged become unwitting accomplices of their own disadvantage. This is not to blame the victim; it is to stress that in order for the disadvantaged to exercise policy clout, they must first disavow the legitimacy of social diagnoses that hold them responsible for their own disadvantages. In order to have input into policy, the disadvantaged must disallow paternalism, and must assert their right to participate throughout processes of defining and redressing social problems. This transformation from victim to agent is a transformation of empowerment (Kieffer, 1984).

Although empowerment has emerged as a focal construct for community psychology (viz., Rappaport, 1987), its operationalisation remains problematic. As Gruber and Trickett (1987) observe, the act of empowerment is grounded in a contraction: Institutional structures that permit empowerment can also generate inequalities of power that undermine the bases for empowerment. Empowerment does not necessarily accrue when decision making authority is delegated; rather, empowerment requires that the group develop skills of critical observation and evaluation (Manz & Sims, 1987).

The lesson here warrants emphasis. Empowerment requires that skills for critical reflection be developed. We have long known that mere political education is insufficient even to generate simple political participation (Scmit, Tanenhaus, Wilke & Cooley, 1958). Rather, it appears that in order to become assertive in policy domains, the disadvantaged must first recognise and then grapple with the injustices of their situations (cf., Crosby, 1982; Moore, 1978).
Friere (1972) has elaborated methods by which the disadvantaged are aided in this process. In Friere's method, the disadvantaged are encouraged to locate contradictions in their everyday experience, and then to discuss, analyse and criticise them. For example, a lower standard of public service to the poor than is enjoyed by the better-off can serve as a contradiction to be explored, understood and criticised. The process is fully localised by being rooted in reflection on daily experience. The lesson to be derived from Friere is that empowerment requires that the currently disempowered seek to explain their social world and, via the resultant understandings, learn to criticise it. The act of empowerment is one of helping the disadvantaged to know and thus to change their world.

As effective as Friere's methods seem to be, there has been scant elaboration of the ways that critical analysis can be applied to policymaking. What methods aid critical analysis of problem definitions and policy proposals?

Critical policy analysis

In order to elaborate methods, a recent study (Chalip, in press) examined processes of reasoning and debate during incubation of American policies on Olympic sports. Although this policy domain seems far removed from such urgent social problems as racism, sexism, poverty, unemployment, and alienation, the policy discourse during formulation of these sports policies ideally suited the effort to generate methods for critical policy analysis. Two reasons were pivotal: First, the taken-for-granted character of contemporary sports provides an ideal context for examining the impact of presuppositions and problem definitions on policy processes. Second, the two-class system of sport that emerged -- highly privileged elite athletes, on the one hand, and a struggling grassroots, on the other hand -- provided a useful basis for critique.

It is pertinent to the discussion here to highlight key features of the critical methods that merged. In a manner consistent with the classic psychologist's injunction to separate phases of divergent and convergent reasoning during problem solving (e.g., Maier, 1970), it is heuristically useful to divide methods into task of elaborating policy frameworks and tasks of evaluating policy frameworks.

Framework elaboration. It is particularly useful to examine policy efforts in historical context. Examination of activity in a policy domain prior to a contemporary period of intensive policy incubation provides a sense of the received legitimations, their associated frames, and the institutions through which these become focused. As a baseline for comparison, the historical sweep of a policy domain's ebb and flow clarifies ways that legitimations for particular
policy interests have caused attendant frames to become anchored to policy and institutional agendas while alternatives have lacked any anchor. Through an examination of the interplay among legitimations, frames and institutions, existing foci of policy attention become susceptible to explication and critique.

Herein lies the Achilles heel of much contemporary psychological study of policy problems. The current practice of psychology is presentist -- it strips away the historical contexts that generate current problem definitions and the proposals for remediation of those problems (cf., Unger, 1986). As a result, the arbitrary and often accidental nature of contemporary representations of policy problems is opaqued. Historical data lend clarity to analysis of policy agendas.

A useful technique for furthering examination of the interplay among legitimations, frames and institutions is to scrutinise the effect of focusing events -- to study the effect of events that have made particular policy issues salient and/or topical. How, we must ask, did a focus on one or more particular events symbolic of the social problem shape and constrain the directions of policy debate? For example, a series of poor performances by the American team at the 1972 Munich Olympics provided the impetus for the intensive policy efforts that ultimately transformed American sports policies. This initial focus at Olympic-level events was itself elite, and, in turn, it contributed to the elite bias of policy research into sports problems and, resultantly, to the elite bias of the policies that eventuated.

Two adjunct tools are clearly important. The first is to identify the attributions for the problems made salient by focusing events. Discourse consequent on focusing events provides a particularly useful source of insight. Inspection of that discourse can highlight assertions of cause or blame. These, in turn, can be examined for their appropriateness, their generality, and their effect on elevating or obscuring particular alternative frameworks for understanding policy problems.

A complementary tool is to locate limits of existing frameworks and identify possibly complementary frameworks by actively seeking the boundaries of existing attributions. In other words, where should there be problems (according to the dominant attributions) where we do not find problems? Here, an attribution is treated as a popular -- naive -- theory about a policy concern. The psychologist can then test that attribution -- not necessarily to prove it right or wrong, but rather to locate the boundary conditions on its reasonable applicability. By seeking and elaborating conditions that suggest the boundaries of existing attributions, the psychologist will locate directions for the elaboration of complementary policy frameworks.
One objective of these methods for framework elaboration is to expand the community of policy discourse. The fundamental task is to identify relevant stakeholders, particularly those who have not been brought into the policy debate. For example, during debates on American sports policies, local community recreation personnel, grassroots clubs and teams, and non-elite athletes were excluded from the policy discourses. Had these groups been brought into processes of policy formulation, the subsequent two-class sports system might have been avoided.

We turn, then, to ways that elaborated frameworks can be evaluated.

**Framework evaluation.** For purposes of evaluating policy frameworks, the attributions upon which policy proposals are based are pivotal. Attributions make causal assertions. These can be subjected to evaluation and critique. Is each attributed cause tenable? What rival explanations seem equally tenable? What boundary conditions seem equally tenable? What boundary conditions seem likely? What challenges or alternative attributions have been asserted? How does the tenability of rival explanations or alternative attributions compare? What evidence and arguments support or inform each?

However, rival attributions and their attendant policy proposals are not necessarily oppositional. There is a tendency for social problems to become oversimplified in the frenetic world of policymaking. Different frameworks for dealing with social problems may be complementary, even if proponents of each treat them as rivals. A task of critical policy analysis, then, is to take seriously the possible complementarity of seemingly opposed arguments, and to logically and empirically examine their possible integration or synthesis.

In order to find complementarities, it is useful to test the commonsense notions of persons advocating varied courses of action. This effort requires testing and elaboration of stakeholder assertions by comparing those assertions to results of social research and contents of social theories. Stakeholder assertions provide a useful point of contact between the arena of policy debate and the world of social science, because stakeholder notions place the analyst on the same turf as other policy actors. The analyst moves to the right place to address stakeholders' explicit and implicit understandings of the policy domain.

Framework evaluation might substantiate stakeholder conceptions; evaluation might ascertain necessary accommodations; examination might suggest new implications. The exercise aids problem solution regardless of the outcome of particular notions. The object is to begin at and to seek to move beyond the locus of extant policy assumptions.
Conclusion

There is a useful lesson to learn from the failures of psychology to yet contribute fully to the tasks of policymaking. It is time that psychologists seeking to execute action research conceive of themselves not just as psychologists, but as social scientists sui generis. It is time for us to work in partnership with our fellow social scientists from sociology, history, economics, political science, geography, anthropology and law. We must be willing to learn their paradigms and, if necessary, their jargon. And we must be willing to help them learn ours.

The real world does not consists of "psychological problems" "sociological problems," "economic problems," or "political problems." Our social science disciplines are merely the administrative conveniences of our academic institutions. In the real world, policy problems are multifaceted and multidisciplinary. To participate we must take our own rhetoric lauding diversity seriously enough to be partners with our social science colleagues. If we pretend omniscience, our insights will seem naive, and our contributions will be trivialised.

Psychologists have a great deal to contribute to policymaking. We have a body of theory and methods that can aid the tasks of locating and critiquing the assumptive bases of policy formulation; we have tools that can expand the range of constituencies having input into or being served by a policy's formulation. Problem solution is furthered when the analyst localises the analysis by taking seriously the interpretations and meanings that stakeholders bring to the policy endeavour, locates alternative frames of references, and identifies connections among varied problem representations. The sharing of these skills is an act of empowerment.
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THE ROLE OF COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGISTS  
AFTER A NUCLEAR EXCHANGE  

by  
Kelly L. Hazel, M.A.  
Michigan State University

Community psychologists, and all other social biological, and natural scientists who manage to survive the initial searing blasts, strong winds, explosions, and devastating fires of a nuclear holocaust, will be involved in the not so simple task of remaining alive. Justifying humanity's existence on an earth which was once beautiful, lush, vibrant, never peaceful, yet relatively calm, after the human initiated devastation may be impossible for many. For those who choose not to commit suicide, or are not killed of radiation induced illnesses, simply remaining alive will be intolerably difficult. Medical facilities and aid will be extremely scarce, food and water contaminated, and if theories are correct, darkness will plague the earth many months, if not years. Highly invulnerable, reproductive and possible mutated insects, rats and other rodents will prey on bodies and carcasses of the millions of individuals, pets and animals left unburied. Thus, diseases and plagues incubated in rotting flesh left to the elements for lack of manpower to bury the dead, will spread and dominate the earth. Psychologists, sociologists, anthropologists, and social workers, if they survive the despair and devastation that ultimately follow a nuclear holocaust, will become makeshift nurses and doctors, food scroungers, and reconstructionists.

Community psychologists, who at one time were heard exclaiming catch phrases such as 'empowerment' and 'prevention' will be concerned simply with 'survival'. Efforts focused on preventing devastating international conflicts, if even attempted, would not have been undertaken soon enough or with enough force or conviction by enough people to matter anymore. Community psychologists, who once had the chance to focus their efforts toward preventing dangerous conflicts by encouraging peaceful conflict resolution through the recognition of 'community' and human interdependence, and empowering grass root efforts to pressure power brokers into settling disagreements and outright conflicts as responsible, life loving humans, will be faced with the human and biological waste that was wrought by their own species.

Empowerment efforts will no longer be focused on encouraging the disadvantaged to become their own power, since everyone will be equal, i.e. equally damaged, destroyed, and demoralised. Empowerment work will become survival work, focused on obtaining sustenance and medical treatment for the thousands of survivors of a world which no longer is plentiful or even adequate for human survival. Prevention work which, prior to nuclear disaster, may have
been focused on encouraging a sense of international community through international exchange, education and effective communication efforts, will become reconstruction work, focused on establishing colonies of survivors, relocation, and moral and spiritual healing and rebirth.

Prior to D-day, community psychologists' research efforts may have focused on the causes and consequences of ineffective communication between groups or nations or factors which lead to effective conflict resolution and dissemination of the concept of 'international community' with all its permutations, e.g. interdependence, acceptance of individual difference and open communication. After, research efforts will become application efforts at establishing small surviving communities, group and individual cooperation, and necessary actions to simply stay alive. Research will be cast aside as the pressure to 'do something now or else' forces people into necessary action.

Why was it that the feeling of necessary action failed to take effect until only after it was too late? The time for community psychologists to become involved in preventing nuclear disaster needed to be before empowerment work became survival work, and prevention work became reconstruction work. What about today, is it too late? NO! We must stop refusing to admit to ourselves that the ability of people to destroy the entire world exists. We must personally escape from psychic numbing and enter the world of feelings and anxiety in order to go beyond inaction to action for peace and human survival. We, as a society, must refuse to remain in the trap of the technological imperative. The problems we face are social problems, not technological, and therefore, can only be resolved through recognition of the social characteristics of the problems of international relations and social science research and social action to solve them. No technological solution can solve the international problems we now face in our world. Relying on 'Star Wars' can only increase the problem and delay the inevitable devastating outcome of continual inter-nation conflict. It is time for people to realise that scientific technology is not the panacea it has been believed to be since humans discovered the wheel. We must face ourselves, look at our relations with other people, and recognise and rejoice in our differences.

Our first task, as community psychologists, is to educate ourselves so that we may educate others and be more effective researchers, social activists, action coordinators, and citizen participants. The Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues Task Force on Peace is currently compiling an annotated bibliography ('Peace Bibliography project') of topics related to psychology and nuclear war (contact Robert Moyer, chair, at Bates College, Lewiston, ME 04240, for more information or if you would like to help). Several books and articles can be recommended and are but the tip of the iceberg. However, reading just one is a step in the right direction. Those interested in obtained a reference list which includes articles and books of special interest to psychologists, please
CHRISTMAS DINNER AND DRINKS

Thursday December 15

"Kiss at 10" Restaurant, Pelham St., Carlton
7.30 pm

An opportunity for new and old members and friends to get together before the Christmas break. All welcome.

Put it in your diary before it's too late!!

Bookings and Enquiries
John Farhall (03) 862 1233 ext463 (W)
Judith Cougle (03) 489 6421 (AH)
OFFICE BEARERS, 1987/88

Chairperson: Dr. A. Veno
Secretary: Ms. H. Gridley
Treasurer: Ms. J. Cougle
Board Representative on DPA: Mr. J. Farhall
Members of Committee:
- Ms. S. White
- Mr. J. Farhall
- Dr. R. Robinson
- Ms. J. Contole
- Ms. D. Brunt

Co-opted: Dr. R. Williams

Membership: 124

The Board continues to be most active in Victoria, with its large section membership and regular education nights. All Victorian Section Committee members double as National Committee members, and we look forward to the development of sufficiently viable sections in other states to enable rotation of the National Committee. The current situation however has advantages in terms of continuity and cohesiveness, both evident in the workings of the Committee. The only changes were to the Chairperson, where Art Veno took over from Robyn Robinson, and to the role of Secretary, where Denise Brunt stepped down to focus on her tasks as DPA representative on the international Congress Committee. Both Robyn and Denise were foundation members of the Board, and their contribution has been enormous. We are fortunate to retain both as Committee Members, Heather Bancroft was unable to continue, and Ross Williams of Melbourne's Western Institute has been co-opted to fill the vacancy.

The Committee has continued to work as a friendly and supportive team, putting much energy and time into a number of activities which have potential impact not only for the Board but for the APS and the community in general.

(a) Training and Continuing Education. Education nights have been conducted every second month in Victoria - these nights are well attended by a range of...
people beyond our own membership, and are helping to challenge some of the steralized images of the profession within the community.


March 1988: 'Resolution of Conflict in Community Organisations' - Dr. Connie Peck.

May 1988 - 'Women's Health Issues and Services' - Delys Sargeant and Barbar Friday.

In August 1987, the Board presented its first National Training Programme at the Canberra APS Conference, bringing together a range of contributors from around Australia. The all-day workshop was well received and stimulated a number of enquiries from psychology students.

At the International Congress in Sydney, August 1988, the Board will be sponsoring at least four symposia in Community Psychology convened by Art Venö, David Thomas, Brian Bishop and John Farhall - a very exciting prospect.

Robyn Robinson and Susie White were amongst the key presenters at the Victorian Branch Conference in May 1988 at Lorne.

The Board is currently convening meetings to network teachers and trainers in Community Psychology. It is hoped that a 'resource bank' of teachers can be developed to enhance the profile of community psychology within tertiary institutions.

The Board is considering the establishment of an award for research in Community Psychology, subject to APS approval.

(b) Publications. Thanks largely to the work of Art Veno, 'NETWORK' continues to grow in size and stature, such that it is now much more than a Newsletter. Budgetary restrictions have meant a reduction in the number of issues, and hence it functions now much more as a Journal, with news items being circulated within State Branch newsletters. The Robin Winkler Memorial edition in December 1987 was a fitting tribute to an outstanding community psychologist.
(c) **Responses.** The Board has formulated responses to reviews, reports and submission such as the Victorian Social Development Committee Inquiry into Community Violence, and New Policy Directions for Psychiatric Services in Victoria. Board members' involvement in a wide range of community issues, from Substance Abuse to Critical incident Stress (viz Queen Street/Clifton Hill shootings) sees them well placed to respond realistically and authoritatively on such subjects.

(d) **Role within APS.** The Board has been represented on committees within APS such as the DPA (John Farhall) and Victorian Branch (Susie White) and for the APS on bodies such as VCOSS/ACOSS (Judith Cougle). Links with the Community Relations Committee, the Industrial Relations Committee and the International Congress Committee have helped to minimise duplication of activities and to speed up responses to submissions etc.

(e) **Membership.** Julie Contole has completed an overhaul of the Board's membership files such that those lacking documentation have been invited to support their application, and new membership applications can now be processed without delay as they arrive. Interest and involvement in any area of community psychology remains the only criteria for Board membership over and above APS membership requirements.

(f) **Finance.** Judith Cougle has managed to keep the Board's books 'in the black' in a year of financial stress for the Society in general.

(g) **Looking Ahead.** The main challenges faced by the Board are the need to develop interstate sections, the extension of the debate as to the teaching of community psychology, and the involvement of more members in the planning of Board activities. The Board can still claim to be one of the most energetic and accessible in the Society, and welcomes enquiries from colleagues or students at any time.
MEN'S PERSONAL DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP

RESIDENTIAL WEEKEND   9-11 DECEMBER 1988
VENUE: CENTRAL SPRINGS INN - DAYLESFORD

FULL COST: $335 (Includes - Meals, Accommodation and fees)

THROUGHOUT THE 1990s AUSTRALIAN SOCIETY WILL EXPERIENCE RAPID ECONOMIC AND SOCIAL CHANGE. THESE CHANGES WILL HAVE VERY SIGNIFICANT CONSEQUENCES FOR MEN AND WOMEN AS EACH OF THE SEXES RETHINKS THEIR ACCEPTED ROLE AND FUNCTION IN MODERN SOCIAL RELATIONSHIPS.

FOR MEN, THE PRINCIPLE OF EQUAL OPPORTUNITY BRINGS A SPECIAL CHALLENGE AS THEY SEARCH FOR MORE EFFECTIVE WAYS TO LIVE AS SENSITIVE, CARING AND THOUGHTFUL HUMAN BEINGS.

OUR AIM IS TO PROVIDE A RESIDENTIAL WEEKEND FOR 20 MEN TO JOIN TOGETHER IN ORDER TO LEARN ABOUT THEMSELVES AND THEIR IMPACT UPON THE WORLD IN WHICH WE ALL LIVE

KEY WORKSHOP ISSUES

* MALE COMMUNICATION SKILLS
* THE WOLE MAN REDISCOVERED
* MEN IN RELATIONSHIPS
* STRATEGIES FOR CHANGE
WORKSHOP LEADERS - MURRAY CREE & PETER HUMPHRIES

Murray Cress is a professional human resource management consultant and interpersonal counsellor with considerable experience in working with men in work, home and leisure settings.

Peter Humphries is a social worker and counsellor with wide experience in mental health, rehabilitation and human relationships training. He has a special interest in working with men.

REGISTRATION & FULL PAYMENT BY 21 NOVEMBER, 1988, TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS. CHEQUES PAYABLE TO: Murray Cress & Associates.

Enquiries: Murray 03-329-5479 or Peter 03-372-1402 (A.H.)/03-375-4066 (bus.)
NEW MEMBERS SINCE JULY 1988

VICTORIA

Bretherton, D.
Brown, I.
Dorrington, S. (Student)
Drent, A.
Hicks, R.
Hook, S.

Kingston, L.
Leitch, I.
McGrath, H.
Morgan, W.
Williams, R.
Woodward, R. (Student)

TASMANIA

Young, J.

NEW SOUTH WALES

Allen, R.
Johnson, C.

Howell, J. (Student)
Lennings, C.

WESTERN AUSTRALIA

Carroll, J.

Howieson, N.