



# INTERBEHAVIORAL PSYCHOLOGY NEWSLETTER

Volume 1  
Number 3  
May, 1970

Regarding the stimulus-response event as essentially a single behavioral happening with the stimulus and the response as mutually necessary functional features analyzed out for logical convenience, Organismic or Interactional Psychology emphasizes the interactional relationship between these two variables. The psychological stimulus is considered an action or function performed by a stimulus object corresponding to the action or function of the whole responding organism. A given interaction of these two variables is held to be dependent on the former interactions of the two, so that regardless of the physical properties of the stimulus object it takes on a particular stimulus-function which evokes a characteristic response to the object. The response is not conceived as a fixed or static configuration of bodily activity but as the functional adjustment of the whole organism to the stimulus-function. This view eschews descriptions of psychological stimulus-response exclusively in terms of physical properties and corresponding anatomical or physiological processes, holding that though such descriptions may be satisfactory for physiology and physics they are inadequate in any fundamental psychological sense. The main objection to this concept is that it is confined to a purely descriptive and analytic level in its approach to psychological problems. However, what it lacks in ready explanations appears to be due more to the limitations of our present knowledge than to any inherent defect. Moreover, it has the recommendation of avoiding over-simplified, teleological, mentalistic, and other scientifically fallacious implications, and of recognizing a psychology with its own unique field without relying on wholesale borrowings from its sister sciences.

--Jerry Carter: "On Experimental Study of Psychological Stimulus-Response."  
Psychological Record, 1938.

## THE AGORA

Two articles of considerable interest have appeared in the JOURNAL OF THE EXPERIMENTAL ANALYSIS OF BEHAVIOR. In 1969, pages 329-347 was W.N. Schoenfeld's "J.R. Kantor's Objective Psychology of Grammar and Psychology and Logic: A Retrospective Appreciation." This is a magnificent tribute to Dr. Kantor and invites reading or re-reading of these two works. In 1970, pages 101-108, appeared J.R. Kantor's "An Analysis of the Experimental Analysis of Behavior (TEAB)" which was his invited address to Division 25 at APA, September 3, 1969. There were approximately 300 in attendance and they gave a standing ovation at the conclusion of the paper. This is perhaps one of the finest papers he has written and is directly relevant to current psychological research in general and operant research in particular.

\*\*\*\*\*

T.X. Barber has published a book that summarizes his extensive program of research to date in de-spooking hypnosis: HYPNOSIS: A SCIENTIFIC APPROACH, Van Nostrand, 1969, \$2.95 in paper. He has succeeded in producing all of the phenomena of hypnosis without the so-called trance state and offers a naturalistic account. Along similar lines is C.E.M. Hansel's ESP: A SCIENTIFIC EVALUATION, Scribner's, 1966, which provides an on-the-spot investigation of many of the alleged ESP events including those at Duke and provides plausible explanations.

\*\*\*\*\*

There have been a few requests for lists of names of people and their areas of interest for purposes of corresponding and exchanging information. If readers will jot down this information and send it in (a postcard will do), a list will be compiled and published. Other requests call for a list of readings along the lines of interbehavioral psychology, especially for students. A future issue of the Newsletter will contain such a list. In the meantime, a perusal of issues of THE PSYCHOLOGICAL RECORD will turn up a host of relevant items. The articles appearing just before the book review section during the last couple of years by "Observer" are especially noteworthy as are most of those under "Perspectives in Psychology."

\*\*\*\*\*

The Cheiron Society (International Society for the History of Behavioral Sciences) meeting included quite a number of interbehaviorists. Dr. Kantor was to receive an honorary doctorate from the University of Akron but received a postponement due to the closing of the university subsequent to the nearby Kent State tragedy. The Society presented him with a certificate. Attending in the honor guard were Sam Campbell, Jerry Carter, Arthur Kahn, Parker Lichtenstein, Marion McPherson, Paul Mountjoy, Stanley Ratner, Noel Smith, Robert Topper, Irv Wolf.

\*\*\*\*\*

In this issue are reports (abridged) of the awards to Jerry Carter, the first Ph.D. student of Dr. Kantor, and Julian Rotter, also a former Kantor student, presented by George Albee from Division 12. Also included are two contributions by students. Ronald Heyduk is at the University of Michigan and Jacqueline Farrington at the State University College at Plattsburgh, New York.

AWARDS AND CITATIONS - by GEORGE ALBEE

Distinguished Contributions to the Science and Profession of Clinical Psychology

Jerry W. Carter, Jr.

Jerry W. Carter Jr. is a familiar and beloved figure in clinical psychology; indeed, in all areas of psychology.

Dr. Carter, despite his obvious youth, is one of the old-timers in the clinical field in years of service. He completed his graduate training at Indiana University in 1938, and so preceded the enormous influx of people into clinical psychology that followed World War II.

In 1948 he began his career in the United States Public Health Service in the Commissioned Officer Corps. During these years his travels took him up and down the land where he visited every department and center and participated in every significant conference which involved planning the role of psychologists in community service.

In 1962 he was appointed Acting Chief and Training Specialist in Community Mental Health in the Manpower and Training Branch of NIMH, and in 1965 he became Chief and Training Specialist in Community Mental Health in the Inservice Training Section of the Manpower and Training Branch of the NIMH. Two years ago he was appointed Special Assistant for Personnel in State Mental Health Programs at NIMH.

These formidable sounding titles do not convey the human warmth, and mature wisdom and insight, that Jerry Carter has brought to Bethesda and to Chevy Chase. His wise counsel and his sensitivity to the important issues in public health mental health have been felt throughout the country and the world. He has been a leader of the Conference of Psychological Directors and Consultants in Federal, State, Territorial Mental Health Programs. He has been actively engaged in nurturing a number of significant conferences where the contributions of psychology to the mental health field have been examined in detail. He currently has a monograph in press entitled "Research Contributions from Psychology to Community Mental Health." He has written extensively on broad programs for improving the care of the retarded, on the role of cottage personnel in residential care facilities, and on mental health in the schools. In 1956, long before the current preoccupation with community mental health, he wrote a chapter on the training needs of psychologists in community mental health programs.

During his early years Dr. Carter made important contributions to case study, to the field of psychodiagnosis and to the development of the functioning of the psychologist in psychological service centers.

Division 12 is by no means the first to honor Dr. Carter. He received the National Defense Service Medal in 1964, and the United States Public Health Service Commendation Medal in 1966.

This award expresses our appreciation for your long, devoted, significant and continuing service to clinical psychology, to American psychology, and to psychology throughout the world.

Julian B. Rotter

Professor Julian B. Rotter is professor of psychology and director of the clinical psychology training program at the University of Connecticut where he has been a member of the faculty since 1963.

He completed his Ph.D. at Indiana University in 1941 after service as a personnel consultant in the United States Army and as an Aviation Psychologist in the Army. In 1946 he went to Ohio State University where he moved through the ranks from assistant professor to professor.

It is impossible for me to summarize briefly the enormously productive research contributions which Professor Rotter has made to clinical psychology and the stimulating concepts he has added to the field. I am sure that everyone in this audience has read with interest and profit his articles and chapters on psychological testing assessment, or has used the Rotter Incomplete Sentences Test, or has been influenced by his writings on social learning theory and clinical psychology. His books on clinical psychology have been required reading for graduate students for at least the past fourteen years. I must add that Dr. Rotter was one of the first clinical psychologists to criticize the "illness model" and his eloquent writing on the defects of this model anticipated by more than a decade the recent debate on this topic. His recent Psychological Monograph dealing with internal versus external control of reinforcement, in the judgment of many in the field, is one of the most significant contributions to heuristic theory of the past 20 years. Certainly it has stimulated tremendous interest and research activity, and especially dissertation research, since its appearance. Dr. Rotter's work and his writing have always captured the enthusiasm of students; many of his students have gone on to leadership positions in the field.

This award signifies our appreciation for the distinguished contribution you are making and will continue to make to our field.

THE CLINICAL PSYCHOLOGIST

\*\*\*\*\*

A STUDENT'S VIEW OF THE INTERBEHAVIORAL CONFERENCE  
Jacqueline Farrington

As an adult student returning to the world of "academeia" who attended the Summer Community of Scholars' Conference on Interbehavioral Psychology, my commentary is somewhat different than that of the attending scholars who have thus far reported to the Newsletter.

For me, the conference provided a further impetus toward my own goal of inter-relating knowledges and experiences in several fields. Informal and formal presentations of those attending the conference assured me that the science of psychology both should and could realistically encompass the innumerable major and minor strands of human concern which pervade man's cultures. I recognize the broad idealism of such a statement. However, when one considers the "specialties" within the field of psychology which were represented by individuals who applied the interbehavioral approach in experimental, historical, clinical, philosophical, industrial and linguistic fields as well as in teacher-student situations, the simple fact that such an approach is viable in areas which are often in practice treated as distinct disciplines, becomes a significant and meaningful event for the observing and participating student.

It is for such reasons that the student chooses to investigate further the writings of Dr. Kantor, and to continue to pursue a goal which is both an ideal and a pragmatic path of discovery through observation. The interbehavioral approach offers

a coherent and honest system which many students, were they given ample opportunity to explore its principles and quite natural consequences, would comfortably and to advantage utilize throughout lifetimes of study, vocations and avocations. Employing such an approach, the long assumed dichotomy between arts and sciences disappears as readily as does that of "mind and body". Concerns about "self" integration, curricular integration, the generation gap, community integration and even world integration can be turned from wordy actionless theory to constructive action as the human organism, his individual and collective enterprises, experiences, relationships and concerns are understood as continuing events within a broader field of organism interacting within the total environment.

Last summer's conference was an exciting and broadening experience for me. I sincerely hope that students, both undergraduate and graduate, will be enabled to participate in the conference during this coming summer.

\*\*\*\*\*

CRACKS IN THE "BILLIARD BALL"<sup>1</sup> ORGANISM  
Ronald G. Hayduk

A prevailing pessimism is often noted among interactional psychologists with respect to the possibility of interbehavioral models of the organism serving as the basis for general experimental research. Indeed, this pessimism is understandable. Mahan (1970) notes in his Primer of Interactional Psychology that the psychological laboratories are among "the last bulwarks to hold out in defense of the physiological and dualistic traditions as explanations of behavior,"<sup>2</sup> and contrasts this to the more receptive and progressive attitudes among personality (Lewin), developmental (Piaget), and social psychological (Mead) systematists.

Fortunately, the outlook for the future of interactional models with "hard line" researchers may not be so bleak. There is substantial evidence that a saccadic movement in the direction of conceptualizing the psychological event as an interactive, non-localized process is occurring in experimental psychological circles. This shift toward more naturalistic models has been catalyzed by the growing number of investigators who are dissatisfied with the limited subset of psychological events which have heretofore been subject to analysis. There is increasing interest in modeling the natural stream of behavior, and it has become apparent that new methodologies and metatheories are required for this endeavor.

The exceptionally enlightening distinction between "behavior tesserae" and "behavior units" drawn by Barker (1964) is relevant to the problems encountered by these pioneering psychological researchers. On the one hand are the "fragments of behavior that are created or selected by the investigator in accordance with his scientific aims."<sup>3</sup> These "tesserae" (pieces used in mosaic) have been the interest

---

<sup>1</sup>My apologies to P.E. Lichtenstein, "The Significance of the Stimulus Function," Interbehavioral Newsletter, January 1970.

<sup>2</sup>Harry C. Mahan, A Primer of Interactional Psychology (San Marcos, California, 1970), p.83.

<sup>3</sup>Roger G. Barker, "The stream of activity as an empirical problem." In R.G. Barker and H.F. Wright, The Stream of Behavior (New York, 1963), p.1.

of a majority of experimenters, probably because they fit neatly into a classical methodology where manipulation of an independent variable (stimulus) is supposed to produce some effect upon a dependent variable (response). Likewise, they are parsimoniously conceptualized within the framework of a "reactive organism" theory where stimuli are the necessary causes of event initiation and termination.

Less popular with researchers are "behavior units," defined by Barker as "the inherent segments of the stream of behavior."<sup>4</sup> These psychological events, not dependent upon the investigator for their duration or quality, demand new taxonomical systems, experimental methodologies, and the sort of metatheoretical underpinnings which can only be provided by interbehavioral models of the organism, models not restricted by simplistic notions of causality, action, or reaction.

Barker's distinction aids in isolating the logical basis for the predominance of "billiard ball" models in experimental psychology, but it has been the task of others to evolve the methodologies and constructs required to appropriately study the stream of activity in an interactional reference system. Progress is being made on two fronts at the University of Michigan. Research in the laboratories of E.L. Walker concerns the complexity interaction patterns of organisms in free-access environments. Experimental techniques are being refined within the framework of a compelling theory of motivation and choice sequences (see Walker, 1964). Simultaneously, J.W. Atkinson and J.D. Birch are formulating a highly ambitious "theory of action" on the premise that the determinants of the flow of activity and not activity per se are the appropriate interests of experimental psychology. The kernel concept of their behavioral system, the "persisting tendency," may be an example of a truly interactional construct with heuristic value. Unique research into the determinants of simple activity shifts is in progress.

Despite such evidence for optimism, champions of the interbehavioral approach can hardly afford to presume that naturalistic attitudes will prevail. Progress reports from other laboratories at other universities are needed, and interbehavioral psychologists are especially capable of detecting such progress. Also, the struggle begun by Kantor (1923) against "mentalistic" attitudes toward the nervous system must be intensified. The notion that stimulus-initiated neural events explain psychological events has not promoted an understanding of psychological phenomena any more than chemical theory has helped to explain the rolling of a ball, but such a reductionistic view continues to be a powerful ally of stimulus-bound theories. If major progress toward more naturalistic models as the basis for research is to be made, the assumptional bases of dualistic interpretations of the nervous system must be undermined. The role of the interbehavioral psychologist is therefore clearly delineated if he wishes to widen the cracks in the "billiard ball" organism.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

Atkinson, J.W. and Birch, J.D., The Dynamics of Action, in print, 1969.

Barker, R.G. The stream of behavior as an empirical problem. In R.G. Barker and H.F. Wright, The Stream of Behavior, New York, Appleton, 1963.

Kantor, J.R. The organismic versus the mentalistic attitude toward the nervous system. Psychological Bulletin, 1923, 20, 684-692.

Lichtenstein, P.E. The significance of the stimulus function. Interbehavioral Newsletter, 1970, vol. 1, No. 1.

Mahan, H.C. Appendix: Foundations of interactional psychology. In H.C. Mahan, A Primer of Interactional Psychology. San Marcos, California: Project Socrates Press, 1970.

Walker, E.L. Psychological complexity as a basis for a theory of motivation and choice. In D. Levine (ed), Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 1964. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1964.

---

Psychological constructs, like constructs in any other science, are methods created by the scientist to describe and explain. If we speak of frustration tolerance or rate of learning, it is not necessary--in fact it is fallacious--to think of some entity that exists within the person like so much nickel in a steel alloy. When we stop thinking this way, we do not seek to localize our constructs in a part of the body or behavioral and physiological constructs in set proportions or ratios. An understanding that the constructs are instruments of the scientist, not entities, allows us to deal freely with a logical and useful set of wholly psychological and scientific constructs.

--Julian Rotter: Social Learning and Clinical Psychology, p.43.

Interbehavioral Psychology Newsletter  
Noel W. Smith, Editor  
State University College of Arts & Sciences  
Faculty of Social Sciences  
Plattsburgh, New York 12901

EDWARD K MORRIS  
~~670 DODDS LANE~~  
~~GLADWYN PA 19035~~

Gen'l Delivery  
Hephzibah, Ga., 30815

JUL 4 1970