

References

- Bloom, B. S. (1968). Learning for mastery. *Evaluation Comment, 1* (Whole No. 2).
- Bloom, B. S., Madaus, G. F., & Hastings, J. T. (1981). *Evaluation to improve learning*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Buskist, W., Cush, D., & DeGrandpre, R. J. (1991). The life and times of PSI. *Journal of Behavioral Education, 1*, 215–234.
- Cross, M. Z., & Semb, G. (1976). An analysis of the effects of personalized instruction on students at different initial performance levels in an introductory college nutrition course. *Journal of Personalized Instruction, 1*, 47–50.
- Dweck, C. S. (2000). *Self-theories: Their role in motivation, personality, and development*. Philadelphia: Taylor & Francis/ Psychology Press.
- Dweck, C. S., & Leggett, E. L. (1988). A social-cognitive approach to motivation and personality. *Psychological Review, 95*, 256–273.
- Eppler, M. A., Carson-Plentl, C., & Harju, B. L. (2000). Achievement goals, failure attributions, and achievement performance in nontraditional and traditional college students. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 15*, 353–372.
- Graham, R. B. (1999). Unannounced quizzes raise test scores selectively for mid-range students. *Teaching of Psychology, 26*, 271–273.
- Johnson, W. G., & Croft, R. G. F. (1975). Locus of control and participation in a personalized system of instruction course. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 67*, 416–421.
- Johnston, J. M., & O'Neill, G. (1973). The analysis of performance criteria defining course grades as a determinant of college student academic performance. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 6*, 261–268.
- Keller, F. S. (1968). "Good-bye, teacher..." *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 1*, 79–89.
- Koestner, R., & Zuckerman, M. (1994). Causality orientations, failure, and achievement. *Journal of Personality, 62*, 321–346.
- Kulik, J. A., Jaksa, P., & Kulik, C.-L. C. (1978). Research on component features of Keller's personalized system of instruction. *Journal of Personalized Instruction, 3*, 2–14.
- Kulik, J. A., Kulik, C.-L. C., & Cohen, P. A. (1979). A meta-analysis of outcome studies of Keller's personalized system of instruction. *American Psychologist, 34*, 307–318.
- Morris, C. J., & Kimbrell, G. M. (1977). Individual differences and PSI: A re-analysis. *Journal of Personalized Instruction, 2*, 47–49.
- O'Dell, C., & Hoyert, M. (2001, April). Goal orientation and challenge in college students. In M. Ironsmith & M. A. Eppler (Chairs), *Toward a scholarship of teaching and learning in developmental psychology*. Symposium conducted at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Minneapolis, MN.
- Pascarella, E. T., & Terenzini, P. T. (1991). *How college affects students*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Roedel, T. D., Schraw, G., & Plake, B. S. (1994). Validation of a measure of learning and performance goal orientations. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 54*, 1013–1021.
- Roediger, H. L., & Karpicke, J. D. (2006). Test-enhanced learning: Taking memory tests improves long-term retention. *Psychological Science, 17*, 249–255.
- Schraw, G., Horn, C., Thorndike-Christ, T., & Bruning, R. (1995). Academic goal orientations and student classroom achievement. *Contemporary Educational Psychology, 20*, 359–368.

Notes

1. Our PSI course Web site can be found at: <http://core.ecu.edu/psyc/ironsmithe/Developmental/dev3206.htm>.
2. Send correspondence to Marsha Ironsmith, Department of Psychology, East Carolina University, Greenville, NC 27858–4353; e-mail: ironsmithe@ecu.edu.

Integrating Science in Applied Psychology Programs: A Student-Operated Journal

Daniel Antonius

*The New School for Social Research and
Nathan S. Kline Institute for Psychiatric Research
Orangeburg, New York*

Adam D. Brown, McWelling Todman,
and Jeremy D. Safran

The New School for Social Research

As a requirement of APA accreditation, many PhD programs in applied psychology subscribe to some variant of the scientist-practitioner model. However, critics have argued that integrating science into an applied psychology curriculum may be too challenging a task. This article describes the development of The New School Psychology Bulletin, a student-operated journal dedicated to publishing original research articles written by psychology graduate students. We argue that the process of publishing a student-operated journal can have a positive effect on students' attitudes toward research and has the potential to serve as a model to foster integration of research and training experiences in an applied psychology program.

The majority of applied psychology graduate programs that adopt the scientist-practitioner model consider research experience an important component of

training. Teaching students to understand and conduct research prepares them to appreciate the benefits of science in psychology, whether they pursue an academic or a practice-related career on graduation. Moreover, the Committee on Accreditation of the American Psychological Association (APA) emphasizes in their guidelines the importance of including research, in addition to practice, in the training of professional psychologists (APA: Committee on Accreditation, 2005).

However, although APA-accredited doctoral programs often have requirements (e.g., courses, labs, presentations, thesis) designed to train students in the science of psychology, concerns exist regarding programs' success in accomplishing such integration (Gelso, 1997; Larson & Besett-Alesch, 2000; Shivy, Worthington, Wallis, & Hogan, 2003). Critics argue that there is a lack of consensus about how one meets the guidelines for the scientist-practitioner model (Addis & Jacob, 2000) and that many programs emphasize one aspect of the model at the expense of the other (Bernstein & Kerr, 1993). Maher (1999) suggested that a failure to reconcile research and practice poses a threat to the integrity of professional-applied psychologists because of a decline in competence of graduates to conduct research.

A student-operated academic journal provides an innovative model for integrating research experience into applied psychology training. Unfortunately, few journals exist that focus on work produced by students. An extensive search on the Internet, using Google and entering terms such as *psychology*, *student*, *graduate*, *publication*, and *journal*, revealed the existence of only three student-based journals that all focus on research conducted by undergraduate students (*Psi Chi Journal of Undergraduate Research*, *Journal of Psychological Inquiry*, and *Canadian Undergraduate Journal of Cognitive Science*). We also found references to other student-based journals; however, these publications appeared inactive or had not been published, in paper or electronically, for several years. Reports on student-based journals have tended to ignore the benefits such publications have on developing research interest and attitudes in students. Instead, investigators have focused on student-based journals' ability to improve candidacy for graduate admission (Powell, 2000) and faculty awareness of the publications (Ferrari & Davis, 2000).

The New School Psychology Bulletin

In 2003, doctoral students (the first two authors) at The New School, New York, created *The New School*

*Psychology Bulletin*¹ (NSPB) to provide an out-of-classroom alternative for graduate students, in particular applied psychology students, to become involved in the various facets of scientific research. The journal was immediately welcomed by the psychology department, which consists of approximately 250 graduate students and offers degrees in both general (MA and PhD) and clinical (PhD only) psychology.

Published semiannually, NSPB operates on a limited annual budget (\$5,500) allocated by the University's Graduate Student Psychology Society and the Dean's Office. The majority of the budget covers printing costs; the remaining funds are used for outreach, Web site development, and conference presentations. The budget allows for a circulation of approximately 200 paper copies per issue, which are distributed among first-year New School graduate students in psychology (as a way of promoting the journal and research to new students), New School faculty, contributing authors, and mailed by request to individuals at other universities. To increase circulation, published articles are also accessible through NSPB's Web site, which follows current standards of online publishing by making each article available in Adobe PDF format.

NSPB models traditional peer-reviewed academic journals to ensure high quality and to provide student authors with an opportunity to go through the same process as submitting to a traditional journal. The production of the journal occurs in sequenced phases. In the initial phase authors are recruited through requests for manuscripts, which are sent to psychology departments at randomly chosen universities. The journal requires authors to submit manuscripts in the format of Microsoft Word, tables and figures in TIFF or EPS format, and to follow APA's guidelines for publications (APA, 2001). This phase takes place in the beginning of the spring and fall semesters. In the next phase, graduate students anonymously peer review manuscripts for content and style, adhering strictly to APA guidelines. Three reviewers read each manuscript. In the third phase the editors-in-chief return reviewed manuscripts to the individual authors. Manuscripts are either "accepted," "accepted with corrections," or "rejected." Authors have the opportunity to edit and resubmit their article. Currently the NSPB receives 7 to 13 articles per semester; the acceptance rate is approximately

¹NSPB was initially published (Fall 2003) under the title *The Id: Graduate Faculty Psychology Society Bulletin*, which later was changed to the *Graduate Faculty Psychology Bulletin*, before the journal received the current name.

90%. Articles are formatted using the software program Quark Express in the subsequent phase. The final phase consists of printing the issue of the journal, which is carried out by a professional printing/copy house. The electronic versions of the articles, created by the printing/copy house, are made available online after the paper copy is published.

NSPB staff includes two editors-in-chief (the first two authors), an editorial board, and one Web coordinator. The editorial board consists of volunteer graduate students in psychology who are recruited through presentations at The New School and outreach to other universities. Currently 16 students from The New School and 13 students from other universities serve on the editorial board. The editors-in-chief select editorial board members after a review of their qualifications. Although no specific requirements exist for becoming an editor, skills such as interests in research, previous research experience, and publications factor into the selection. As in traditional journals, peer review responsibilities include editing articles for content and style and providing constructive feedback to authors. The Web coordinator comes from the Online Media department at The New School and is responsible for maintenance of the Web site. The editors-in-chief oversee the entire staff and coordinate the different phases to ensure that deadlines are met. The editors-in-chief are also responsible for public relations and budget allocation. In addition, two faculty members (the last two authors) function as mentors.

Discussion

The response to NSPB has been positive and encouraging. Students, faculty members, alumni of different psychology programs, and individuals from fields outside psychology have been enthusiastic about the project. Faculty in the psychology department at The New School report a noticeable increase in interest in the department's research fairs after the introduction of the journal. In addition, graduate students are starting to serve as mentors for an ever-growing pool of undergraduate researchers. This reception is also reflected in the journal's continuous growth and greater student involvement.

Factors associated with students' research interest and attitude, such as student perceptions of research training (Bishop & Bieschke, 1998; Kahn, 2001), early and minimally threatening involvement in research (Gelso, Mallinckrodt, & Judge, 1996), research self-efficacy (Bishop & Bieschke, 1998; Phillips & Russell,

1994), students' age (Bishop & Bieschke, 1998), quality of training environment (Kahn, 2001), teaching of relevant statistics and logical research designs (Gelso et al., 1996), the degree to which training emphasizes the relevance of science to practice (Gelso et al., 1996), quality of interpersonal relationship between students and faculty (Gelso et al., 1996; Shivy et al., 2003), personality styles (Zachar & Leong, 1992), and the characteristics of mentors (Cronan-Hillix, Gensheimer, Cronan-Hillix, & Davidson, 1986) may be affected by a student-operated journal. The journal provides opportunities for students to work together and collaborate with faculty, thereby fostering professional relationships within a psychology department. In addition, the journal gives students an opportunity to get involved in research projects early in their training, which acclimates them to research being conducted within the department. The journal also allows students to publish in a relatively visible peer-reviewed journal that offers shorter-than-average publication lag, approximately 2 to 5 months, and greater latitude in articles accepted than traditional academic journals. Furthermore, a student-operated journal gives students a chance to serve as editors and reviewers, which can improve skills in conducting research and scientific writing and provide an opportunity to learn what authors expect from editors (e.g., acceptance or rejection of manuscripts; Nickerson, 2005) and reviewers (e.g., timely delivered insightful and constructive reviews; Nickerson, 2005). In summary, a student-operated journal may serve as a model to facilitate the integration of science/research into the training of doctoral students in applied psychology and assist programs in meeting the guidelines and principles for the science-practitioner model as defined by the Committee of Accreditation on the APA.

References

- Addis, M. E., & Jacob, K. (2000). On the process and outcome of graduate training in clinical psychology: Where do we want to go, how will we get there, and who will join us? *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice*, 7, 364–367.
- American Psychological Association. (2001). *Publication manual of the American Psychological Association* (5th ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- American Psychological Association: Committee on Accreditation. (2005). *Guidelines and principles for accreditation of programs in professional psychology*. Retrieved January 5, 2006, from <http://www.apa.org/ed/G&P052.pdf>
- Bernstein, B. L., & Kerr, B. (1993). Counseling psychology and the scientist-practitioner model: Implementation and implications. *The Counseling Psychologist*, 21, 136–151.

- Bishop, R. M., & Bieschke, K. J. (1998). Applying social cognitive theory to interest in research among counseling psychology doctoral students: A path analysis. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 45*, 182–188.
- Cronan-Hillix, T., Gensheimer, L. K., Cronan-Hillix, W. A., & Davidson, W. S. (1986). Students' views of mentors in psychology graduate training. *Teaching of Psychology, 13*, 123–127.
- Ferrari, J. R., & Davis, S. F. (2000). *Undergraduate student journals: Perceptions and familiarity by faculty*. Retrieved January 5, 2006, from http://www.psichi.org/awards/winners/hunt_reports/ferrari.asp
- Gelso, C. J. (1997). The making of a scientist in applied psychology: An attribute by treatment conception. *The Counseling Psychologist, 25*, 307–320.
- Gelso, C. J., Mallinckrodt, B., & Judge, A. B. (1996). Research training environment, attitudes toward research, and research self-efficacy: The revised Research Training Environment Scale. *The Counseling Psychologist, 24*, 304–322.
- Kahn, J. H. (2001). Predicting the scholarly activity of counseling psychology students: A refinement and extension. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 48*, 344–354.
- Larson, L. M., & Besett-Alesch, T. M. (2000). Bolstering the scientist component in the training of scientist-practitioners: One program's curriculum modifications. *The Counseling Psychologist, 28*, 873–896.
- Maher, B. A. (1999). Changing trends in doctoral training programs in psychology: A comparative analysis of research-oriented versus professional-applied programs. *Psychological Science, 10*, 475–481.
- Nickerson, R. S. (2005). What authors want from journal reviewers and editors. *American Psychologist, 60*, 661–662.
- Phillips, J. C., & Russell, R. K. (1994). Research self-efficacy, the research training environment, and research productivity among graduate students in counseling psychology. *The Counseling Psychologist, 22*, 628–641.
- Powell, J. L. (2000). Creative outlets for student research or what do I do now that my study is completed? *Eye on Psi Chi, 4*, 28–29.
- Shivy, V. A., Worthington, E. L., Jr., Wallis, A. B., & Hogan, C. (2003). Doctoral research training environments (RTEs): Implications for the teaching of psychology. *Teaching of Psychology, 30*, 297–302.
- Zachar, P., & Leong, F. T. L. (1992). A problem of personality: Scientist and practitioner differences in psychology. *Journal of Personality, 60*, 665–677.

Notes

1. NSPB (Print ISSN: 1931-793X; Online ISSN: 1931-7948) can be viewed electronically at www.nspb.net.
2. We thank Matthew J. Hoptman for his assistance in editing this article.
3. Send correspondence to Daniel Antonius, Nathan S. Kline Institute for Psychiatric Research, Clinical Research

Division, 140 Old Orangeburg Road, Orangeburg, NY 10962; e-mail: antonius@nki.rfmh.org.

Peer-Taught Drug Awareness in the Introductory Psychology Course

Kerri A. Goodwin
Loyola College in Maryland

In contrast to “Just Say No” lectures on drug use common in K to 12 drug education programs (e.g., Drug Abuse Resistance Education, or D.A.R.E.), this activity used peer teaching in an Introductory Psychology course to promote active learning and open discussion of controversial issues about drug use. Working in small groups, students researched the neurological and behavioral effects of an assigned drug and presented controversial discussion questions. One week later they presented their findings to the class. Students reported that the presentations were informative and awareness-raising, provided an open environment for discussion, and allowed them to make more informed decisions about drug use.

Drug prevention programs have become commonplace in many school settings; the most widely used program is Drug Abuse Resistance Education (D.A.R.E.), which targets all K to 12 grade levels (D.A.R.E., n.d.; Dusenbury, Falco, & Lake, 1997). However, such drug prevention programs arguably impose morality judgments in the form of “Just Say No” slogans that overshadow the effects of drugs on the brain and behavior. In addition, research has warned that drug education programs, such as D.A.R.E., may be hazardous in that they glorify drug use (Baressi & Gigliotti, 1975; Blum, Garfield, Johnstone, & Magistad, 1978). Given potential problems of programs such as D.A.R.E., instructors should consider alternative methods of educating about drug use.

Surprisingly, only one published study addressed use of a pedagogical activity in a psychology course to increase knowledge and awareness of drug-related course content. Bristow, Provost, and Morton (2002) reported that students in their Drugs and Behavior course who attended 12-step meetings increased their understanding and awareness of addiction. Although drug education is evident in upper level courses designed for psychology majors, as illustrated by Bristow et al., students can benefit from drug education in nonmajor