



ASSOCIATION FOR CHEMORECEPTION SCIENCES

NEWSLETTER

edited by Thomas R. Scott

VOLUME 6, NUMBER 1

MARCH, 1988

I. General Comments.

This being the spring edition of our newsletter, there are several items that pertain to the annual meeting. Also, since many of our members were trained in or are affiliated with departments of psychology, I have taken the liberty of focussing attention on what may be the most pivotal movement in the history of the American Psychological Association. Finally, there are meetings to be announced and awardees applauded.

II. From Charlotte Mistretta (wearing Executive Chairperson's hat).

Dear AChemS Members,

I am writing to encourage your attendance at our Business Meeting during the AChemS Meeting in Sarasota. As well as our usual list of exciting topics, this year we should discuss two items of major concern. The first has to do with the Structured Review Study at the NIH--an experiment to learn whether the peer review system can be shortened and made more efficient through use of a new structured form for reviewers' preliminary comments and for subsequent summary statement preparation. Among the study sections that will participate in the experiment is Sensory Disorders and Language, which receives many chemical senses grant applications.

The second item for discussion is the proposed National Institute on Deafness and Other Communication Disorders at the N.I.H. that would

include programs concerned with "disorders of hearing, balance, voice, speech, taste and smell." Although substantial legislative action related to the proposed institute probably will have occurred already, as an Association we should at least be informed about the proposal and consider making some formal statement.

We will have detailed information about each of these items at the meeting. I look forward to seeing you soon.

III. Reorganization of the APA.

The American Psychological Association was founded nearly a century ago as a scientific society. Over the years it has weathered several reorganizations, most recently in 1945. The proposed reorganization of 1988 is the most significant to date, however, because APA's fundamental role as a scientific society is in danger. If reorganization does not succeed--and its success is unlikely--APA will die as a scientific society, either slowly by attrition or suddenly by revolt.

Background.

The APA was organized in 1892 by 7 scientists who then nominated 24 others for membership. In addressing that first gathering of 31 members, President G. Stanley Hall boldly hailed the organization of the new science of mankind which would dominate the next century. By 1900 the first pressures between scientists and practitioners were being felt, but scientists retained firm control. This was true partly because of the stipulation, in

force until the 1940's, that to be a member of APA, the applicant had to have published at least two articles in APA journals. Applied psychologists felt underrepresented, and with good reason. Early in this century APA had 371 members and only 16 were practitioners. The war years changed this. The physical and psychological stresses of war were responsible for a huge increase in mental problems, and no nation was prepared to deal with it. The U.S., however, was physically intact and relatively wealthy and so could afford to respond to the need for clinicians. The practice of psychology began a period of vigorous growth that continues today, and the number of practitioners in APA became significant, then dominant. With the rise in membership of practicing psychologists, academicians increasingly fled the APA or never joined it. Thus the balance has tipped suddenly and the trend is accelerating, with particular losses in the more biological and cognitive subareas of psychology.

The newfound strength of the practitioners has not generally been applied toward reconciliation of differences with academicians. Decades of subtle rejection, brought up to date by what many practitioners feel is a pervasive message of the loftiness of research and the derogation of practice that they received in graduate schools have evoked some feeling among practitioners that the tables now deserve to be turned. Practitioners now appear to be nearly evenly divided between those who want the present trends to continue--leading to eventual usurpation of all authority--and those who feel that a psychological guild with no scientific base would be a blow to the perceived and actual legitimacy of their profession.

The APA today.

There are 64,200 members plus affiliates who bring the total to over 100,000. The administrative

office has a staff of 400, directed by Len Goodstein and operates with an annual budget of \$40 million. Last year the APA lost \$2.5 million, mainly as a consequence of the 3.5 million loss sustained by Psychology Today. The disastrous decision to purchase the magazine for \$12 million was made several years ago. It has been a severe financial drain ever since, and was recently sold for \$6 million, not even enough to cover the notes still outstanding from its purchase. To avoid a liquidity crises in 1987, the Central Office and the Virginia building were both sold.

The governance of APA is expensive and bloated. There is a 12-member Board of Directors and a 120-member Council of Representatives. Administrative gridlock arises from the 90 boards and committees that convene regularly in Washington, usually refusing to vote themselves out of existence even after their reason for being has vanished.

Of new Ph.D.'s, 71% of clinicians join the APA within three years; 66% of those in I/O do the same; the percentage of those in general experimental who join is 50%; for biopsychology, 20%. Even if s/he joins, a biopsychologist was three times as likely as a clinician to resign from APA in 1987, an experimental psychologist 2 1/2 times as likely. The membership is now 52% health service providers.

The proposed reorganization.

Reorganization attempts have been in process for a decade. The major thrust is to establish a buffer between the scientists and practitioners so as to protect the former from the agendas and the dues structure of the latter while still preserving a single voice to represent the field of psychology. A compromise plan was narrowly defeated by the Council of Representatives last year, increasing the urgency in the voices of scientists to secede. Council meetings became brawls. In what was seen to be a final effort to avert disaster, a group of 14 was appointed and dubbed the Group on

Restructuring (appropriately, GoRe). GoRe eventually devised a reorganization plan that was approved by its membership, 11-3. The plan then went to Council which, after minor amendments, approved it by a vote of 76-41. The plan will now go to the membership, where a 2/3 majority is necessary for passage (historically 90% of the amendments proposed to the membership fail).

The plan is composed of 1) a bill of rights and social responsibilities and 2) a revision of the governance structure. There would be a 15-member Board of Directors, whose authority would be expanded; a 50-member Legislative Assembly to replace Council; five semi-autonomous societies with power to a) establish their own by-laws, b) collect dues, c) initiate policies, d) hold meetings, e) publish journals and f) advocate. The proposed societies would be called

1. Science and Applied Psychology
2. Scientist-Practitioners
3. Public Interest
4. Practitioners
5. States

Is the APA worth saving?

Reorganization is not likely to pass even with the unified support of scientists. Without that support it will fail. If reorganization is defeated, there are two likely scenarios. The soft landing model projects a continuation and acceleration of the present trends until the last scientist flicks off the light early in the next century. The hard landing model sees the precipitous withdrawal of the several divisions that are incorporated, and the incorporation and subsequent withdrawal of others. The APA would be hurt scientifically and financially. Competing journals would be established, further eroding APA's financial base in subscription and advertising revenues. There would be suits over APA's remaining assets, tying all of them up in the courts for years. Cash flow would be disrupted and the organization would


be bankrupt, financially and scientifically.

Should we seek to prevent this? Yes. For now, this reorganization plan seems the only option that will both substantially address the issue and have an opportunity for passage. My own view is that this is an intermediate step toward eventual separation of scientists and practitioners, following the models of the physical sciences (into physicists and engineers) and the biological sciences (into biologists and physicians). It is, however, a necessary step to permit an orderly evolution to take place over the next several decades. A violent divorce now would be destructive to both groups, especially since practicing clinicians are still being trained to receive the Ph.D. primarily in scientific departments. Ballots will be available in early May. Roughly 15,000 "yes" votes will be needed for passage. I hope AChemS members will supply as many of those as we can.

IV. The Autumn Quotes Contest.

The unveiling of our chemosensory quotes contest in the last newsletter was greeted with total silence. While that response may have amounted to tacit approval, both Gary Beauchamp and I would have been reassured by reports of raucous debates over the identity of the passages. The response did not, I must confess, send either Gary or me scurrying for more literature. Below, the sources of the autumn quotes are revealed.

1. Dog assessing the subtle scents on the wind: The Story of Dr. Doolittle by Hugh Lofting. New York: Frederick A. Stokes Co., 1920.
2. Dog contemplating the olfactory significance of excretion: Sirius by Olaf Stapledon. London: Methuen and Co., 1944.



V. Electronic Mail.

We are probably to the point where many or most of us communicate with our colleagues through an electronic mail system, notably BITNET. The telephone tag I have played with several of you over the past year reinforces the notion that we should be more aware of how to contact one another using these networks. Mike Meredith (Membership Chairperson) is the appropriate person to organize a BITNET directory of AChemS members. Please contact Mike, either before or at AChemS X, with your BITNET address to get the process underway.

VI. Newsletter Items.

I am open to suggestions for features you feel should be in the AChemS newsletter. There are often professional-political issues that warrant our attention and debate, and the newsletter may be a fitting forum for presenting them. Brief reviews of books might increase our awareness of their publication and help us separate the exceptional from the merely good. Perhaps the composition and context of the newsletter should itself be an item of discussion at our business meeting. In any case, I encourage you to contact me with material you would like to see in the newsletter or with suggestions about how it might evolve to serve the membership better.

VII. Call for Nominations.

The fifth annual Don Tucker memorial award will be presented to a graduate student who has performed outstanding research in the chemical senses. The recipient will receive a \$200 cash award and have his/her name and university affiliation added to an engraved plaque that hangs in the Bio Unit I building at Florida State University. If you are a graduate

student and first author of an abstract for presentation at AChemS X, please submit a copy of the abstract by April 15 to:

Dr. John Caprio
Dept. of Zoology and Physiology
LSU
Baton Rouge, LA 70803-1725

VIII. Meeting Announcements.

A. Computers, neurons, brain and cognition.

Florida State University will host a symposium-workshop to explore connections among circuit models of neural systems, neural models for computer architecture and computer models of cognitive processes. The meeting will be held at the University's conference center in Tallahassee on April 14-15, 1988. For additional information contact Mike Meredith at (904) 644-3427.

B. Trigeminal chemoreception.

An international conference on chemical irritation in the nose and mouth will be held on June 9-10, 1988 at the Monell Chemical Senses Center. Topics to be covered include the neurophysiology, neuropharmacology and psychophysics of trigeminal chemoreception. Topics of clinical and applied interest will also be addressed. For information, contact Barry Green [(215) 898-3093] or Russ Mason [(215) 898-4999].

C. Chemical Senses Day.

The fifth annual conference on the chemical senses was organized and hosted by Dr. Robert J. Hyde at San Jose State University on September 19, 1987. The meeting included a workshop on descriptive analysis of wines conducted by Professor Ann Noble. CSD VI will be hosted by Vivienne Drimmer on October 8, 1988 at the National Food Laboratory in Dublin, CA. Information is available from Professor Rose Marie Pangborn, Food Science and Technology, University of California, Davis, CA 95616.

IX. Award Winners.

NINCDS has announced the selection of 15 more winners of Javits awards, bringing the total number of recipients to 261. Among the most recent awardees were Charlotte Mistretta and Ralph Norgren.

Please note that NINCDS has revised its guide to extramural research and training awards. The new guide outlines application procedures and lists specific areas of interest for the five NINCDS extramural research divisions. The guide is titled NINCDS Extramural Research and Training Awards and may be obtained from the Office of Scientific and Health Reports, NINCDS, Building 31, Room 8A16, Bethesda, MD 20892; phone (301) 496-5751.

X. The AChemS Annual Meeting.

A report on the questionnaire constructed by Inglis Miller and sent out with the autumn newsletter is attached. It reveals a generally high degree of satisfaction with the location and format of the annual meeting. The item of greatest controversy is how to deal with the escalating requests for speaking time. Inglis has decided to run concurrent oral and poster sessions at AChemS X, with posters hanging long enough (5 hrs) to allow their viewing around the oral presentations.

A short version of the AChemS X program, designed to entice the still unregistered among you to come to Sarasota, is also attached.

AChemS-X Questionnaire Report

December 10, 1987

Reported by Inglis J. Miller, Jr.

The following report contains a summary of the replies to the questionnaire about the annual meeting which was sent to the entire membership of AChemS with the Autumn newsletter. A total of 81 replies has been received. The numbers represent the percent of total responses for each choice.

1. Are you satisfied with the opportunity and modes of presentation available at the AChemS meeting?
Replies: Yes: 93%, No: 5%, No answer: 2%
2. Do you favor retaining the general format of the meeting?
Replies: Yes: 93%, No: 5%, No answer: 2%
3. Have you participated in (4-6 PM) Discussion Sessions?
Replies: Yes: 69%, No: 31%
4. Would you consider making a videotape presentation?
Replies: Yes: 26%, No: 63%, No answer: 11%
5. Rate your choices for accommodating the demand for more slide talks.
 - A. Limit talks and assign the balance to posters.
Most preferred 26%, More preferred 43%, Less preferred: 9%, Opposed: 10%, No answer: 12%
 - B. Schedule more talk sessions in the afternoon or evening.
Most preferred 11%, More preferred 26%, Less preferred: 19%, Opposed: 28%, No answer: 12%
 - C. Schedule simultaneous talks.
Most preferred 21%, More preferred 28%, Less preferred: 16%, Opposed: 24%, No answer: 11%
 - D. Simultaneous talks and posters.
Most preferred 32%, More preferred 36%, Less preferred: 2%, Opposed: 19%, No answer: 11%
 - E. Reduce the number of long (symposium) talks.
Most preferred 19%, More preferred 18%, Less preferred: 21%, Opposed: 20%, No answer: 22%
 - F. Other
Most preferred 4%, More preferred 4%, Less preferred: 4%, Opposed: 2%, No answer: 86%
6. Food and beverage (level of service and cost).
Maintain current level: 59%, Expand service and cost: 6%, Reduce service and cost: 27%, No answer: 8%
7. General satisfaction with Hyatt hotel: service and cost.
Satisfied: 70%, Dissatisfied: 12%, No answer: 18%

ACHEM5-X Program Summary

Wednesday Evening April 27, 1988

7:00 PM Welcome and Opening Remarks
Hernando Desoto Ballroom

7:15 PM Talk Session
Chemical Signals: Detection and Processing

8:15 PM The Givaudan Lecture

9:00 PM Social Reception
Cash Bar
Prefunction Area

Thursday Morning April 28, 1988

7:30 AM Continental Breakfast
Prefunction Area

8:00 AM - 1:00 PM Poster Sessions
Sara Desoto Ballroom

Poster Session A
Human Taste and Stimulus Mixtures

Poster Session B
Sensory Evaluation and Consumer Research

8:00 - 11:00 AM Symposium
Hernando Desoto Ballroom
Insect Pheromone Systems: Behavior, Biochemistry,
Peripheral and Central Neurophysiology

9:15 - 9:45 AM Refreshment Break
Prefunction Area

11:30 AM - 12:45 PM Talk Session
Hernando Desoto Ballroom
Central Pathways of Smell

Thursday Afternoon April 28, 1988

Beach Transportation Departs from Hotel Front:
Hyatt to Lido Beach 1:30 PM and 2:00 PM
Lido Beach to Hyatt 4:00 PM and 4:30 PM

Discussion Session
Are There Parallel Pathways in Olfaction?
4:00 - 6:00 PM
Hernando Desoto Ballroom

Thursday Evening April 28, 1988

6:00 - 11:00 PM Poster Sessions
Sara Desoto Ballroom

Poster Session A
Central Pathways of Smell:
Anatomy, Physiology, Development and Behavior

Poster Session B
Chemical Signals: Detection and Processing

7:00 - 7:45 PM Talk Session
Hernando Desoto Ballroom
Sensory Evaluation and Consumer Research

8:00 - 10:00 PM Talk Session
Hernando Desoto Ballroom
Human Smell

9:00 - 10:00 PM Refreshments Available
Prefunction Area

Friday Morning April 29, 1988

7:30 AM Continental Breakfast
Prefunction Area

8:00 AM - 1:00 PM Poster Sessions
Sara Desoto Ballroom

Poster Session A
Structure and Function of Taste Receptors

Poster Session B
Olfactory Electrophysiology and Ionic Mechanisms

8:00 - 10:00 AM Talk Session
Hernando Desoto Ballroom
Central Pathways of Taste: Anatomy and Physiology

10:00 - 10:30 AM Refreshment Break
Prefunction Area

10:30 AM - 11:30 AM Talk Session
Hernando Desoto Ballroom
Human Taste

12:00 - 1:00 PM Talk Session
Hernando Desoto Ballroom
Clinical Studies of Chemosensory Dysfunction

**Friday Afternoon
April 29, 1988**

Beach Transportation Departs from Hotel Front:
Hyatt to Lido Beach 1:30 PM and 2:00 PM
Lido Beach to Hyatt 4:00 PM and 4:30 PM

Discussion Session
Clinical Chemosensory Trials: What, How and When?
4:00 - 6:00 PM
Hernando Desoto Ballroom

**Friday Evening
April 29, 1988**

6:00 - 11:00 PM Poster Sessions
Sara Desoto Ballroom

Poster Session A
Human Smell Perception and Clinical Studies

Poster Session B
Taste Receptors and Ionic Processes

7:00 - 10:30 PM Talk Session
Hernando Desoto Ballroom
Structure and Function of Chemosensory Tissues

8:30 - 9:30 PM Refreshments Available
Prefunction Area

**Saturday Morning
April 30, 1988**

7:30 AM Continental Breakfast
Prefunction Area

8:00 AM - 1:00 PM Poster Sessions
Sara Desoto Ballroom

Poster Session A1-A6
Central Pathways of Taste

Poster Session A7-A17
Chemosensory Behavior

Poster Session B
Structure and Function of Olfactory
Receptors and Other Structures

8:00 - 10:00 AM Talk Session
Hernando Desoto Ballroom
Taste Receptors: Ion Channels and Transduction

10:00 - 10:30 AM Refreshment Break
Prefunction Area

10:30 AM - 12:30 PM Talk Session
Hernando Desoto Ballroom
Olfactory Receptor Currents and Transduction

**Saturday Afternoon
April 30, 1988**

Beach Transportation Departs from Hotel Front:
Hyatt to Lido Beach 1:30 PM and 2:00 PM
Lido Beach to Hyatt 4:00 PM and 4:30 PM

**Saturday Evening
April 30, 1988**

ACheMS Business Meeting
5:30 PM Sara Desoto Ballroom

Social Hour and Cash Bar
6:30 PM Prefunction Area

The Freeman Award Dinner
7:30 PM Hernando Desoto Ballroom

? Registration?

**Sunday Morning
May 1, 1988**

7:30 AM Continental Breakfast
Prefunction Area

8:00 - 10:00 AM Talk Session
Hernando Desoto Ballroom
Chemosensory Behavior

8:45 AM Invited Lecture
Edward M. Stricker
Hernando Desoto Ballroom

10:00 AM AChemS-X Adjournment