Dear SPR Members,

It has been a privilege to serve as the President of the Society for Prevention Research, particularly during this very special year in which we celebrate the organization’s 20th anniversary. Originally 19 prevention scientists came together to establish SPR. Today the organization boasts over 700 members, sponsors an influential journal, and hosts a lively and well-attended Annual Meeting. We have come a long way in 20 years, and much more is in store!

I’m pleased to have the opportunity to share with you some highlights of the contributions of many outstanding SPR members during my term as president. These generous and talented individuals have taken time from their busy schedules to help advance the work of SPR and to ensure its continued success in the coming years.

One of these highlights is what are you reading right now: the inaugural issue of the SPR Community. It has been a goal of SPR to enhance the communication and sharing of information between the leadership and the membership, between members, and between the executive office and members. A Member Communication Task Force was created in 2010 to develop communication tools to work on achieving this goal. This Task Force, chaired by Dr. Greta Massetti, determined that several new or enhanced communication tools were needed. The SPR Community, our new electronic newsletter, is the first of these initiatives for 2011. I am personally delighted that the SPR Board of Directors member Dr. Hanno Petras has volunteered to serve as the founding editor of SPR Community. Initially the newsletter will be issued semi-annually. We encourage you to submit articles and commentary for future issues, and we welcome your feedback. In addition, this spring the Member Communication Task Force will be implementing a redesign of the SPR website, posting entries on Wikipedia for SPR and prevention science, and linking to social media tools such as Facebook.

We all look forward to the Annual Meeting as a terrific place to share ideas and to have multiple opportunities for networking. The SPR Annual Meetings have continued to be extremely well attended, despite the difficult economy during the last two years. We anticipate 750 to 800 attendees this year in Washington, DC at the 19th SPR Annual Meeting “Prevention Scientists Promoting Global Health: Emerging Visions for Today and Tomorrow”. This overarching theme reflects the SPR Board of Directors’ interest in encouraging and creating opportunities for international collaborations, sharing cross-national comparative research findings, and advancing policies, strategies, and programs for promoting global health. Dr. Brenda Miller, program chair of the 2011 annual meeting, also chairs the International Task Force. With this synergy we can anticipate a stimulating forum for the advancement of evidence-based prevention research in the U.S. and internationally.

The multidisciplinary Mapping Advances in Prevention Science (MAPS) task forces are funded by the SPR R13 conference grant from the National Institutes of Health (NIH). The MAPS Task Force on Type 2 Translational Research, co-chaired by Drs. Richard Spoth and Luanne Rohrbach, continues to define and advocate for Type 2 Translational Research. This task force provided input into the Office of National Drug Control Policy’s 2010 National Drug Control Strategy and it continues to monitor the National Prevention Strategy. We can anticipate an upcoming article produced by this task force describing the next generation of Type 2 translational research.
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The work of the Standards of Replication Task Force, ably led by Dr. Jeffrey Valentine, is coming to fruition after several years. I am happy to announce that an article on replication in prevention science, along with two accompanying commentaries, will be published in Issue Number 2, June 2011 of Prevention Science.

Many of us have been watching the proposed creation of a new NIH Institute focusing on substance use, abuse, addiction, and related public health initiatives with great interest. In December 2010, I sent a Board-approved letter on behalf of the Society to Dr. Francis Collins, the Director of NIH, and Dr. Lawrence Tabak, the Principal Deputy Director of NIH and Co-Chair of the Substance Use, Abuse, and Addiction Task Force. That letter urged the task force to ensure that prevention science holds a prominent place in the agenda (See letter at http://www.preventionresearch.org/SPR_Letter_to_NIH.pdf) as it continues the important work of shaping a new NIH institute.

During the 18th SPR Annual Meeting in Denver, CO in 2010 we celebrated the 10th anniversary of SPR’s journal Prevention Science. Prevention Science provides an important forum for dissemination of new developments in the theory, research and practice of prevention. Under the continued leadership of Dr. Robert McMahon, Editor, the journal continues to excel. The two-year impact factor for 2009 (announced in June 2010) was 3.018, placing it 7th of 95 journals in the Public, Environmental, and Occupational Health category. In addition, we received our first 5-year impact factor, which is 3.750. I want to thank the editor, the associate editors, the editorial board, and the researchers who submit their work to Prevention Science for their contributions to its continued success.

This spring, the SPR Board of Directors recommended three revisions to the SPR Bylaws which were put to the membership for a vote. The first two revisions concern two very important and active standing committees of SPR, the Early Career Preventionist Network and the Diversity Network Committee. The chairs of these committees are ex-officio and voting members of the SPR Board of Directors. The Board recommended that the bylaws are revised so that the chairs of these committees are elected by a direct vote of all SPR members. The third revision is to create a Fund Development Committee that will be standing committee of SPR. The Fund Development Committee’s purpose is to provide guidance and support in raising funds to achieve the long term strategic objectives of the Society. I’m pleased to report that the membership voted and that the three bylaw revisions were approved and have been implemented.


Sincerely,

Linda M. Collins, PhD
President
Editor’s Welcome

Dear SPR Membership,

I would like to welcome you to the inaugural issue of the SPR Community, the newsletter of the Society for Prevention Research. As the new editor, I would like to thank the board for my appointment as well as sharing their vision for such a newsletter with me. I have been a member of the SPR since 2000 and I could not be more excited about the opportunity to engage researchers and practitioners in discussions about prevention. Based in the belief that “Prevention is Everbody’s Business”, the SPR Community will be a vibrant and relevant newsletter dedicated to publicizing significant accomplishments of the organization and its members. SPR Community is also dedicated to creating a virtual voice for SPR members to connect with each other over prevention research issues between annual meetings and to keep those members who do not attend the annual meeting on a regular basis informed and connected to SPR. To accomplish these aims SPR Community will showcase activities of the SPR committees and taskforces, summarize activities of the annual meeting, and create a forum where members can discuss topics related to prevention science. Through the accomplishments of these aims, the newsletter will facilitate the Society for Prevention Research’s commitment to its membership by becoming alive and personal. The newsletter will be published twice a year. Since this newsletter is published through the effort from volunteers, we welcome members to become actively involved through submitting prevention related articles or to volunteer for leading interviews with researchers on issues relevant to prevention. I would also love to hear your suggestions and opinions. You can contact me directly at hpetras@jbsinternational.com.

Sincerely,

Hanno Petras, PhD
Editor

A Role of Prevention Science in Preventing Verbal Violence and Its Consequences

By Felipe González Castro

Within the past year many episodes of remarkably aggressive, vitriolic and at times abusive speech have appeared nationally, speech used at times to attack individuals or organizations, sometimes for political purposes. Tensions introduced by an array of difficult socioeconomic problems that plague American society: the recession, the national deficit, health care reform, immigration issues, have fueled many of these angry and injurious verbal exchanges.

It is well known that the First Amendment to the U.S. Constitution guarantees freedom of speech, and with that many forms of dialogue and debate, both informed and uninformed. Nonetheless, certain passionate and at times vehement forms of verbal expression have filled the mass media airwaves whereby political pundits and citizens alike express a diversity of views ranging from thoughtful and well-informed scholarly dialogues to uninformed and illogical “hate speech”. This latter form of free expression may also be described as a form of “verbal violence”.

We know well that a major thrust within the field of prevention science is the conduct of scientific research that identifies major determinants of adaptive and maladaptive behaviors, including evidence regarding efficacious interventions that can enhance health and well-being. Such research has contributed towards the design of best social and behavioral science interventions that influence a variety of health-related outcomes.

As noted, a form of free and open speech that has recently become the focus of controversy is the use of abusive verbal language and deceptive campaign rhetoric that at times appears to be designed to foment intense negative affect ranging from anxiety and depression to extreme anger. In this regard, a key issue involves the need to specify whether and how such abusive speech, when conveyed via mass media channels and by recognized media commentators can prompt or encourage violent behaviors in certain impressionable individuals. Clearly within scientific analysis, attributing “causality” to a specific event is a difficult proposition, thus discouraging the assertion that, ‘hate speech ‘causes’ violent behavior’. By contrast, asserting as some have done that there is, “no relationship between hate speech and violent behaviors,” is entirely dismissive of a dynamic process that more than likely contributes to targeted acts of violence. The recent mass shootings in Tucson on January 8th, 2011 led to the wounding of Representative Gabrielle Giffords. Ultimately, this event adversely affected the lives of 19 people who were shot...
and of six people who were killed. This event has fueled a debate on whether hate speech and highly suggestive political propaganda truly foment or are directly responsible for provoking violent conduct in an individual influenced by such expressions to take planned and organized actions aimed at injuring a targeted person, actions that also compromise the lives of many innocent bystanders.

In response to the remarkable vitriol that has been propagated by political debate and anger over harsh social conditions, a ray of hope has emerged in the form of the University of Arizona’s National Institute for Civil Discourse, an institute dedicated to, “civility in political debate.” This Institute is described as a, “nonpartisan Center for debate, research, education and policy as this involves civility in public discourse,” (Horwitz, 2011). Clearly an entity of this kind can play an important role that can encourage freedom of speech and civil discourse, while also discouraging the expression of hostile rhetoric that can lead to acts of violence. Ideally this Institute will identify approaches for discouraging or diffusing verbal violence and its related violent consequences. This Institute’s inclusion of several prominent leaders form civic and political organizations, including former presidents Bill Clinton and George H. W. Bush as honorary chairmen, underscores the importance of having the support of renown social leaders in establishing such organizations that would serve as centers of social analysis and as a “national conscience” on civil discourse that is devoid of “verbal violence” and its destructive consequences.

Within this field, prevention science can play an important role in contributing relevant new knowledge regarding major factors that promote legitimate civil discourse, while eschewing provocative speech that prompts violent behavior. Clarifying the most effective ways to prevent verbal and behavioral violence as a consequence of hate speech would constitute an important contribution from prevention science. Clearly a major challenge in this field involves striking a balance between two competing imperatives: supporting First Amendment rights to freedom of speech, while also clarifying the context in which passionate dialogue extends into hate speech that produces psychological and behavioral injury towards individuals or groups, especially among those who are scapegoated and used as targets of such abusive speech. Identifying the processes and boundary conditions which distinguish passionate and persuasive social dialogue from injurious haste speech may be a key contribution that can emerge from prevention science research. Applying prevention science knowledge towards clarifying the conditions that define this boundary has social policy relevance, and could improve the quality of life of many members of various special populations who have suffered most from the injurious consequences of racism, bigotry, gender discrimination, and other forms of verbal and political abuse. Those who have been most often victimized by such “verbal violence” can benefit greatly from knowledge that defines the conditions that foment, and those that prevent, the verbal violence that injures the persons or groups who are targeted to receive it.

One may ask, “What reasonable constraints can be introduced that would allow freedom of speech, while also preventing the violent consequences of “verbal violence?” One may also ask, “What are the major factors that distinguish active and persuasive dialogue from those that constitute violent and abusive verbal speech, especially the form of abusive expressions that has a high probability of producing acts of discrimination or physical violence?” As one approach, knowledge from prevention science can be used in conjunction with clinical applications derived from the field of multicultural competence. The field of multicultural competence has identified clinical applications under which therapists and other behavioral health services providers can deliver therapeutic interventions. The cultural competence knowledge, attitudes and skills that aid in understanding how clients recover best from adversity may also be examined to help those who are victimized by acts of verbal violence. Conversely, such clinical applications can be used as information from the field that suggests the conditions most likely to create stress and distress, ultimately leading to long-standing traumatization, as experienced by marginalized members of these special populations. By integrating the scientific evidence accumulated from prevention science with the clinically-derived and culturally-grounded applications from the field of multicultural competence, relevant intervention approaches can be identified, designed and then tested, to ascertain their efficacy in preventing or mitigating the traumatic consequences of verbal violence. Such new knowledge can be generated, particularly as tailored to the needs of various members of these diverse special populations who have been targets of hostile and discriminatory actions. Within this pursuit, what are the most potent conditions - cognitions, attitudes, motivations, situational factors, interpersonal factors, and ecological factors, that produce the most injurious consequences among members of these special populations? And by contrast, what are related factors that can inoculate marginalized members of these special populations, as these factors can inform the design of prevention interventions to protect against the injurious consequences of verbal violence and related violent behaviors, and that promote adaptive coping and resilience among victims of these verbal assaults? At the policy level, prevention science has much to contribute in helping to inform current and future institutes for civil discourse. At the clinical level, prevention science has much to contribute in helping to build resilience against such verbal assaults among individuals, families and entire communities.
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One Day: In Search of Training Opportunities in Prevention Science

By J. Mark Eddy

The use of the phrase “prevention science” (e.g., Coie et al., 1993) to refer to our research discipline has gained in popularity over the past 20 years. One way to track that growth is through a search of words and phrases (called “ngrams”) in Google’s recently released database of 5 million digitized books (see the Ngram Viewer on the web; Michel et al., 2010).

Prior to the middle of the 1980’s, this phrase appeared infrequently, and usually referred to work in disciplines not generally associated with the work of the members of the Society for Prevention Research (SPR). However, usage of the phrase in relation to areas of common interest to members began to increase just before SPR was founded, and growth in usage since that time parallels growth in our membership (see Figure 1).

Accordingly, while the phrase “prevention science” is difficult to find in the seminal 1994 Institute of Medicine report on prevention (Mrazek & Haggerty, 1994), it is used prominently and repeatedly in last year’s follow-up report (O’Connell, Boat, & Warner, 2009). According to the Institute of Medicine, “prevention science” is:

A multidisciplinary field devoted to the scientific study of the theory, research, and practice related to the prevention of social, physical, and mental health problems, including etiology, methodology, epidemiology, and intervention. (p. xxvii)

The Society for Prevention Research has embraced the phrase, and in 2000, used it as the name for our flagship journal.

While prevention science is now considered a field, it does not have an academic home. The first degree granting “Department of Prevention Science” has yet to be established (or remains well hidden), at least at a U.S. college or university.

Instead, prevention scientists come from a variety of academic disciplines whose practitioners use a variety of terms to describe their work. Mrazek and Haggerty (1994) wrote of the “semantic confusion” that this has created in the prevention field, and noted that while “this problem has been recognized for many years, it has remained intractable” (p. 13). This problem persists today.

Thus, prevention science as a “field” is a concept that students or other newcomers are most likely to discover after they are engaged in work in other fields. And once discovered, exploring the training options in this new field may be difficult, even with the “easy” access to information provided by the internet.

To examine this hypothesis, I spent a day searching the web to locate training opportunities in prevention science. I approached the task as if I were an interested student looking for specific institutions that provided undergraduate, graduate, and post-doctoral training experiences in “prevention science”; I had no leads on possible institutions; and I had a limited amount of time to look for information (i.e., 8 hours).

Using Google (and in English), I tried numerous searches, all of which included the phrase “prevention science”. After an initial search of this phrase alone, I paired the phrase with relevant terms such as “degree”, “course”, “training”, “education”, “masters”, “doctorate”, and “post-doctoral”. After each of these searches, I looked through pages on the first 90 sites that were found.

Based on this method, here are my conclusions.

Training opportunities in prevention science are available in a variety of departments and colleges, and are often framed as interdisciplinary in nature. All of these opportunities are in North America. There are no colleges or departments of prevention science. There are no bachelors degree programs in prevention science. However, there are numerous institutions that include some type of training at the graduate or post-doctoral level. The details of the content and process of training and their relation to formal academic degrees at these institutions are often sparse.

Masters degree programs or graduate certificates with emphases in prevention science have been established at Emory University, Georgia State University, Harvard University, the University of Minnesota, the University of Oklahoma, and Texas A&M University. Doctoral degree programs with a formal focus in prevention science have been established at Arizona State University, Pennsylvania State University, the University of Wisconsin -- Madison, and the University of Washington.

Other types of pre- and post-doctoral training experiences are available through 27 institutions (see Table 1) as well as through

Figure 1. SPR Membership and Occurrence of the Phrase “Prevention Science” in Google Books

Accordingly, while the phrase “prevention science” is difficult to find in the seminal 1994 Institute of Medicine report on prevention (Mrazek & Haggerty, 1994), it is used prominently and repeatedly in last year’s follow-up report (O’Connell, Boat, & Warner, 2009). According to the Institute of Medicine, “prevention science” is:

A multidisciplinary field devoted to the scientific study of the theory, research, and practice related to the prevention of social, physical, and mental health problems, including etiology, methodology, epidemiology, and intervention. (p. xxvii)

The Society for Prevention Research has embraced the phrase, and in 2000, used it as the name for our flagship journal.
two research and training consortiums, the Canadian Prevention Science Cluster and the Prevention Science and Methodology Group. The intensity of these experiences range widely, from brief seminars, to quarter or semester long courses, to research internships or externships, to comprehensive fellowship programs.

Table 1. Other Institutions that Offer Prevention Science Training

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Arizona State University</th>
<th>Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation</th>
<th>University of Oregon</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brown University</td>
<td>Pennsylvania State University</td>
<td>University of Southern California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Claremont Graduate University</td>
<td>Tufts University</td>
<td>University of South Carolina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>University of California, Los Angeles</td>
<td>University of South Florida</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duke University</td>
<td>University of California, San Francisco</td>
<td>University of Washington</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa State University</td>
<td>University of Illinois at Chicago</td>
<td>Vanderbilt University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johns Hopkins University</td>
<td>University of Minnesota</td>
<td>Virginia Commonwealth University</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MD Anderson Cancer Center</td>
<td>University of Missouri</td>
<td>Weill Cornell Medical College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York University</td>
<td>University of North Dakota</td>
<td>Yale University</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Are these findings correct? Only you know the answer for your institution.

The SPR Training Committee invites you to help us create an accurate list of the undergraduate, graduate, and post-doctoral training experiences currently available in prevention science. Please email us and let us know what the specific prevention science training opportunities are at your institution, and whether any additions or corrections are needed to the above summary.

In addition, please conduct a generic search for “prevention science” on the web and find out how long it takes to find your institution, as well as how difficult it is to uncover specific information about your training opportunities.

If you discover that information about your program is difficult to find, that your information is out of date, and/or that your website is confusing to navigate, please consider updating your site, and in the new version, make sure to use the words “prevention science” in your description of your training program. Help your colleagues who are new to prevention science find out about what your situation has to offer in terms of training.

Please email corrected or expanded information about training in prevention science at your institution to the SPR Training Committee via marke@oslc.org.

New members to the committee are always welcome. If you are interested in training issues and would like to participate, please contact us via the same address.
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Interdisciplinary Methodology Groups Address the Challenges of Prevention Science and Train the Next Generation of Scientists and Methodologists

By C. Hendricks Brown and Katherine Masyn

Prevention Science and Methodology Group

The Prevention Science and Methodology Group (PSMG) is an interdisciplinary network that has received continued support from the National Institute of Mental Health and the National Institute on Drug Abuse for the past 24 years. It originated from a spin-off methods development R01 of the newly funded Hopkins Prevention Research Center in Baltimore. Its fundamental goal at that time was to lay a rigorous foundation for using a randomized preventive trial to test and improve theory and specific interventions, much like the now classic randomized controlled trial was used to test and improve medical treatments. In this first phase, the principal investigator, Hendricks Brown, led a team of methodologists, including Scott Zeger, Kung-Yee Liang, Steve Self, and Richard Royall, as well as mental health and drug abuse researchers Sheppard Kellam, Jim Anthony, and Bill Eaton, in integrating methods with science perspectives to advance research on the emerging prevention science model. Now standard techniques such as generalized estimating equations (GEE) for the analysis of longitudinal data were developed and applied during this time. PSMG’s mission and activities expanded greatly through its first competitive refunding, by partnering with other NIMH prevention research centers (PRC) at the Oregon Social Learning Center, headed by John Reid, Arizona State University's PRC led by Irwin Sandler, and the University of Michigan PRC directed by Rick Price. Through these partnerships, PSMG was able to identify critical methodologic problems that were holding back the science, to respond to these challenges, and to train the next generation of scientists and methodologists. Bengt Muthén joined Brown and Kellam as PSMG's co-principal investigator, and Muthén's and his colleagues' work greatly expanded the types of intervention designs, growth models, missing data, latent variable and multilevel approaches that are now commonplace in the analysis of prevention research. PSMG has continued to maintain close ties to the developers of the Mplus statistical package, allowing for a seamless integration of new statistical models, broad application of these models in existing software, and application of these new methods in existing trials. Likewise Dave MacKinnon's joining of this group added a strong emphasis on mediation analysis. George Howe provided scientific leadership for PSMG, and Getachew Dagne, Wei Wang, Alka Indurkhya, and Karen Bandeen-Roche developed new methodological approaches to prevention research.

With each period of successful competitive refunding, PSMG has expanded its mission and dissemination activities. The group focuses on designs and analyses for low-base rate disorders, using the prevention of suicide as a major direction of this work. Peter Wyman and others at the University of Rochester teamed up with Brown in conducting a new set of randomized trials focused on youth suicide based on this work. In this past year, PSMG has received an additional 5 years of funding from NIMH -- which will take it through 27 years of continuous competitive funding -- to fund new methodologic and substantive work on mediation and moderation, which in single trials are routinely underpowered and unable to address. This new work on synthesizing findings from multiple randomized trials using individual level data, is led by collaborators funded on this project, including Howe, MacKinnon, Muthén, Dagne, Hilda Pantin, Tatiana Perrino, Juned Siddique, Sandler and Bill Beardslee and focuses on adolescent depression. Other synthesis work on comparing intervention effects in large, multisite trials in the U.S. and the European Union, involve work by Zili Sloboda, Fabrizio Faggiano, Katherine Masyn, Wei Wang, Peggy Stephens, Ferdinand Keller, Brent Teasdale, Scott Grey, and Federica Vigna-Taglianti. PSMG is also collaborating on the development of methods for implementation research, partnering with Patti Chamberlain on her randomized implementation trial of 52 counties in two states, John Landsverk's NIMH center on implementation, and prevention, systems science and implementation researchers at the University of Miami, which is now the home for the PSMG network. Colleagues José Szapocznik, Willy Prado, Hilda Pantin, Mitsu Ogihara, Sara Czaja, John McManus are joined by USC researchers Tom Valente and Larry Palinkas, and Emory HIV researchers Ralph Diclemente and Gina Wingood.

Today, the PSMG network includes more than 130 researchers with a strong emphasis on collaboration and mentoring of K-awardees. The group conducts virtual Grand Rounds presentations on a weekly basis and co-sponsors conferences to identify new scientific and methodological challenges and solutions. PSMG also uses distance research workgroups to develop new methods, and to refine and integrate these into research and practice.

Prevention Science and Methodology Group II

The Prevention Science and Methodology Group II (PSMGII), began in 2004 as a satellite offshoot of PSMG with a founding membership of early career prevention researchers and methodologists with strong past and ongoing connections with the parent organization. Throughout the years since its creation, PSMGII has been grateful to receive both material and moral support from the senior PSMG leadership and, indirectly, from the PSMG funding sources of NIMH and NIDA.

At its inception, PSMGII was intended to create a smaller and more elemental forum for early career PSMG members to interact with each other for the following purposes: the joint and cooperative study of emergent statistical methodology leading to the direct application to individual members’ own research; the provision of informal peer reviews of research in-progress; to fostering cross-site
research collaborations, to creating an early career interdisciplinary network embedded within the larger and extensive PSMG network; and to organizing paper and poster symposia as well as preconference workshops at national conferences, primarily the annual Society for Prevention Research (SPR) meetings, to highlight the complementary and collaborative work of its members, putting its work in conversation with related efforts in the broader Prevention Science research community. Past symposia have included topics related to extensions and applications of the following analytic approaches in the context of behavioral, health, and educational outcomes in prevention research: growth mixture models, discrete-time survival analyses, latent mixed Markov chain models, continuous and discrete autoregressive cross-lagged models, multilevel latent variable models, regression mixture models, factor mixture models, pattern mixture models, mediation analyses, behavioral time series analyses, intervention impact analyses on proximal and distal outcomes, causal inference, and joint models of multiple processes or multi-faceted processes. 

Along with the above mentioned activities, PSMGII has evolved to become an independently functioning workgroup, laboring collectively on projects related to what we term analytic methods’ fidelity in prevention research. Similar to the theories of fidelity-of-implementation, the group conceptualizes analytic fidelity-of-method to include: (1) method adherence – the use of a particular analytic method on actual data following the specific recommended “best practices” e.g., the recommended procedures for a specific model specification, estimation, evaluation, and interpretation; (2) quality of application – the analytic method used is appropriate for the actual data, e.g., the distributional assumptions of the select model are tenable for the given data, and the analytic process applied to the data is transparent and replicable; (3) method differentiation – the analytic method selected is optimally matched to the intended research question or aim. The current joint undertakings of the group are motivated by pressing substantive questions in prevention science with common methodological challenges. The work of the group emphasizes the development, potential applications, systematic implementation, and the translation and dissemination of statistical methods for high-fidelity use at the various phases of prevention research, from epidemiology and etiology studies, to efficacy and effectiveness trials.

Prevention Science and Methodology Group II current members and their institutional affiliations:

Eric Brown, University of Washington; Shauna Clark, Virginia Commonwealth University; Wendi Cross, University of Rochester; Getachew Dagne, University of South Florida; Dan Feaster, University of Miami; Paul Greenbaum, University of South Florida; Craig Henderson, Sam Houston State University; Kim Henry*, Colorado State University; Frauke Kreuter, University of Maryland, College Park; Patrick Malone, University of South Carolina; Mildred Maldonado-Molina, University of Florida; Katherine Masyn*, Harvard University; Karen Nylund-Gibson, University of California, Santa Barbara; Juan Peña, University of Washington; Hanno Petras, JBS International, Inc.; Elizabeth Stuart, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health; Lee Van Horn, University of South Carolina; Wei Wang, University of South Florida; Katie Witkiewitz, Alcohol and Drug Abuse Institute.

*PSMGII organizational support provided by Kim Henry and Katherine Masyn.

Examples of collaborative publications produced by PSMGII members:


For information on joining PSMG or PSMGII contact Hendricks Brown at chbrown@med.miami.edu.
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Prevention in the World: A Brief Summary of the First Meeting of the EU-SPR in Amsterdam

By Zili Sloboda

The EU-Society for Prevention Research held its first meeting November 10-11, 2010 in Amsterdam. The meeting was held just prior to the European Public Health Association conference.

The attendance was good, about 50-70 people representing a range of European countries. The meeting consisted of “plenary” presentations on Day 1 around the issue of health disparities. Walter Ricciardi from the Universita Cattolica del Sacro Cuore, Rome, Italy and President of the EU-Public Health Association spoke on the report, Europe Calls for a Reinforcement of Prevention Research to Reduce Inequalities in Health. Dr. Ricciardi presented his view that we are currently in a period that he calls ‘the third revolution in health interventions”. The first was focused on public health practices such as improving sanitation and providing clean water. The second was a period of medical technology and drug development. This current period is occurring through the Internet and equal access to information.

The second speaker was Joan Benach from the Universitat Pompeu Fabra, Barcelona, Spain who summarized the findings from the WHO Report “Closing the Gap in a Generation” and the Role of Prevention: Strengths and Limitations. In his talk, Dr. Benach discussed the extent to which lifestyle factors impacted health. He discussed the important roles of health promotion and prevention interventions.

This talk was followed by Mike Kelly from the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence, London, UK. Dr. Kelly whose talk, Can Prevention Based on Behavioural Change Reduce Social Inequalities? discussed how our lives are becoming more and more complex and presented the concept of lifeworlds, the intertwining of cognitive, physical and social spheres, how each impacts the other. He discussed the implications of this concept on prevention.

Dr. Finn Rasmussen from the Karolinka Institute, Stockholm, Sweden spoke next about his work on obesity—A Glance on Evaluation: The Case of Primary Care Interventions for Prevention of Obesity.

Finally, Dr. Tony Biglan from the Oregon Social Learning Center, Eugene, Oregon, USA was the last speaker of the day discussing his concept of the nurturing neighborhood which was a very upbeat vision for the group after the first sessions.

Day 2 was more focused on the work of the EU-SPR. I was asked to speak about the US SPR and its history and our recent work on defining prevention science. Dr. Farida Allaghi, the Executive Director of Mentor Arabia, spoke on behalf of the Mentor Arabia, spoke on behalf of the Mentor Foundation but also about the drug abuse problem in the Arab countries and her desire to have an Arab SPR to be initiated at a prevention conference in Dubai in 2012.

After these talks, the attendees broke up into three workgroups: evaluation methodologies, training, and dissemination. These groups outlined tasks for the EU-SPR to work on and made suggestions for topics for the 2nd EU-SPR meeting scheduled for December 8-9, 2011 in Lisbon, Portugal, hosted by the European Monitoring Centre for Drugs and Drug Addiction (EMCDDA). The groups reported back to the full group of attendees and there was discussion.

Next Rosaria Galanti discussed the incorporation and registration of the EU-SPR in Poland through the University of Warsaw. A draft of the Bylaws was circulated and there was a short discussion about committees. A vote was taken to support the continuation of the Steering Committee until elections at the next meeting.

There was a suggestion to continue the EU-SPR newsletter and to maintain contact through email and other mechanisms.

The EU-SPR was formalized on December 30, 2010. The EU-SPR’s website is: http://www.euspr.org/.

The weather was cold and rainy but for my first trip to Amsterdam, I found it a very interesting city. Public transportation was excellent!!!

Zili Sloboda, ScD, a director at JBS International, Inc. is the immediate past-president of the Society for Prevention Research and a founding member of the Society.
International Networking Forum and International Task Force Report

By Brenda A. Miller

The second annual International Networking Forum was held at the 2010 SPR annual meeting on June 1st, in Denver. A total of 33 individuals were present, with attendees representing countries from around the world. During the day-long meeting, a number of ideas emerged about how SPR as an organization and the annual meetings in particular, might facilitate global connections among researchers and prevention specialists. Specifically, attendees expressed a commitment to goals related to improving prevention research focused on global health and to implementing the best prevention strategies for global health.

There is considerable interest in using the annual meetings as a meeting point and as a catalyst for developing collaborations. The theme for the 2011 Annual Meeting (May 31-June 3, 2011, Washington, DC) which emphasizes international research and collaborations across countries is entitled, “Prevention Scientists Promoting Global Health: Emerging Visions for Today and Tomorrow.” The call for abstracts resulted in our largest submission by international colleagues to date with more than 100 abstracts. Invited plenary sessions and highlighted roundtables, papers, and posters will provide numerous opportunities to engage in sessions that emphasize the interconnectedness of global health issues from a prevention viewpoint.

Since the last annual meeting, the SPR Board of Directors approved the formation of an International Task Force (ITF) and at present the members include: Linda Collins (SPR President), The Pennsylvania State University, US; John Toumbourou, Deakin University, Australia; Moshe Israelashvili, Tel Aviv University, Israel; Zili Sloboda, JBS International, U.S.; Hanno Petras, JBS International, U.S.; Jeffrey Lee, Mentor Foundation, U.K.; and Brenda Miller (Chair), PIRE, U.S. Josipa Basic, University of Zagreb, Croatia, has recently joined the Task Force following the resignation of Sven Andreasson, Swedish National Institute of Public Health, Sweden. The ITF meets via teleconference and emails and will be meeting at the annual meeting in June. The ITF was instrumental in identifying plenary speakers for the upcoming conference. In addition, the ITF is actively engaged in facilitating the International Networking Forum to take place on May 31st from 2-5 p.m., just prior to the opening reception and international poster session hosted by NIDA. Everyone interested in international prevention research is welcome to attend and further details are posted on the conference website.

One of the suggestions that emerged from last year’s networking forum was to be in communication with the international community via a newsletter. The Board of Directors has implemented a newsletter for the entire SPR membership and our initial efforts will be targeted at providing a regular column in this newsletter that will be highlighting information relevant to the international prevention research community.

Many other ideas and suggestions for enhancing the interaction among international prevention scientists and prevention specialists emerged at last year’s networking forum. For example, there is interest in doing more to engage policy makers involved in global health and communicating the best practices for adaptation. The formation of structures to support collaborative working groups across international boundaries and to encourage the diffusion of knowledge and ideas across national boundaries and different cultures was identified as a need. An interest was expressed in encouraging more publications that are based upon international findings and that reflect the diversity of prevention science around the world. Participants recognized the difficulties for many international colleagues to travel to the U.S. for the annual SPR meetings. Future efforts are needed to help increase the participation and involvement of international prevention scientists and specialists.

Major steps are in place to support a continued growth and strengthening of international collaborations among prevention scientists and specialists around the world. We look forward to the upcoming conference, which we expect will be a catalyst for further growth, involvement and interest in international research on prevention science addressing global health concerns. Hope to see you soon at the international networking forum on May 31st and at the annual conference, May 31-June 3, 2011 in Washington, DC.

Brenda A. Miller, PhD, a senior research scientist at the Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation, is a member of the Society for Prevention Research Board of Directors, chair of the International Task Force, and chair of the 2011 Conference Program Committee.

Brenda A. Miller

WWW.PREVENTIONRESEARCH.ORG
Countdown to the SPR 19th Annual Meeting
By Brenda A. Miller

We are in the final stages of preparation for this year’s Annual Meeting in DC. Thanks to an outstanding response, we had a record number of national and international submissions for the conference. Please check the online program before making your airplane reservations, because Friday is a full day and the agenda is filled with many excellent presentations!!

The agenda is packed with exciting and interesting sessions in various forms: plenary sessions, roundtables, organized paper symposia, organized poster sessions, grouped individual papers, and poster sessions. In addition, there are pre-conference workshops, the international networking forum, committee meetings and receptions, and exhibitors at the conference. We’ve tried to schedule sessions representing different themes throughout the different time slots on the days of the conference. However, given the many fine presentations, it will be necessary at times to choose between two (or three) sessions in your areas of interest that are offered simultaneously. We hope that you will attend some sessions that are outside your usual choices. Finally, we want to hear from you after the conference about what types of sessions are most important to you so that we may have your continued involvement at the annual meetings.

Because we expect a high number of international colleagues at this year’s conference, we encourage everyone to interact with people who you have not met before. We want to extend a special welcome to colleagues who are attending SPR for the first time. Some SPR members will be wearing specially designed buttons that indicate a willingness to answer questions about the organization and/or connect people at the conference. In addition to the opportunity to learn about ongoing research for prevention science, the conference presents an excellent opportunity for more one-on-one networking across international boundaries as well as within the U.S.

On behalf of the entire program planning committee and SPR Board of Directors, we look forward to seeing you soon in DC!

Brenda A. Miller, PhD, a senior research scientist at the Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation, is a member of the Society for Prevention Research Board of Directors, chair of the International Task Force, and chair of the 2011 Conference Program Committee.

For more information about the SPR Annual Meeting, please visit our website at www.preventionresearch.org and click on Annual Meeting

An Interview with the Diversity Network Committee

In 2009, the SPR membership approved a revision to the SPR Bylaws and created the Diversity Network Committee (DNC) as a standing committee of the organization. This is an important step for the organization as a whole, and presents several opportunities for moving forward. To learn about this new committee, SPR Community interviewed the current DNC chair, Sharon Lambert.

SPR Community: What exactly is the DNC?

DNC: Right now the main DNC membership is the steering committee. We are a small group of prevention scientists with varied backgrounds, disciplines, career levels, and research and intervention foci. We share a commitment to promoting and advocating for prevention science that is attentive to issues related to diversity of all types, particularly since many of our membership work directly or indirectly with diverse groups. We are interested in diversity as it relates to training, membership, etiology, efficacy, and methodology, in SPR and in the broader areas in which we work.

The DNC chair is also a member of the SPR Board of Directors and so the DNC’s interests are addressed at the board level.
**SPR Community:** What are the requirements for membership in the DNC?

**DNC:** The only requirement is an interest in the conduct of high quality prevention research and practice with racially and ethnically diverse populations. But our interests are not limited to just those types of diversity. We have a broader interest in diversity as it relates to underserved and underrepresented groups, and health disparities. I think a misconception has been that membership is only open to members of ethnic minority backgrounds.

**SPR Community:** What types of activities does the DNC sponsor?

**DNC:** Our main activity has been the Diversity Network Reception held at the SPR annual meeting. This reception has been a chance for DNC members and others interested in diversity issues to create partnerships, exchange ideas, and learn about opportunities for prevention research and practice that is attuned to diverse populations. We expect to grow from this to sponsor other events and work with other SPR committees to develop programming of interest to the SPR membership. For example, there may be opportunities to host pre-conference workshops that focus on engaging communities in research and intervention efforts, methodological issues related to working with diverse samples, or understanding differences in intervention effects across groups. This year, the DNC is sponsoring a symposium focused on challenges and best practices for prevention intervention research with American Indians and Alaska Natives. The presentations will highlight cultural protective factors unique to these groups, as well as tribal-based participatory research methods. I think that learning more about the process of designing and implementing randomized intervention trials in these communities will be interesting and helpful for those of us working to engage all types of communities in the process of prevention research.

**SPR Community:** Do you envision activities beyond those taking place at the annual conference?

**DNC:** We have focused on activities at the annual meeting because of the ease of having many of the membership together. But as the group grows it is certainly conceivable that we have other activities outside of the annual conference, or DNC members may convene outside of the conference to participate in prevention activities. Certainly a hope is that membership will foster collaborative relationships and information exchange that can advance the field of prevention science, and make valuable contributions at the conference and elsewhere.

**SPR Community:** How does the DNC support new and early career scholars with interests in prevention science?

**DNC:** Annually SPR sponsors the Minority Travel Award program which provides travel funds to students and new scholars to attend the conference. In addition, the DNC provides more informal support by sharing information about opportunities that are available for training and other experiences related to diversity and health disparities. Also, members of the DNC Steering Committee are active in other committees of SPR and in this way we are able to raise issues and offer perspectives related to the many types of diversity issues that are important to prevention science.

The Minority Travel Award program is supported in part by the Annual SPR Minority Scholarship Dance. We encourage all SPR conference attendees to join us for an evening of dancing to the music of SPR’s own Mothers of Prevention.

**SPR Community:** What is your vision for the DNC in the coming years?

**DNC:** I personally would like to see the DNC better integrated into the larger organization. In fact, we all are active members of SPR and advocate for diversity issues in the types of work that we do as prevention scientists and SPR members. In addition, I would like us to do more partnering with other SPR committees to develop programming for the larger membership that highlights how integral the issues of interest to us are for the larger group. We have started some of this work already, and I expect that these efforts will continue.

**SPR Community:** How can interested individuals find out more about the DNC or offer suggestions for DNC sponsored events or programming?

**DNC:** We are happy to hear from current members interested in joining the DNC or anyone interested in becoming an SPR member. We can be reached at dncinfo@preventionresearch.org.

"I am because we are and we are because I am."

~ African Proverb

You Are Cordially Invited to the SPR Diversity Network Reception

Wednesday, June 1, 2011
7:45 pm – 8:45 pm
Hyatt Regency Washington, Regency B

Come and share in an evening of fellowship and networking opportunities for SPR’s diverse membership. This includes opportunities to become more involved in SPR’s Diversity Network Committee, as well as opportunities to identify others interested in conducting prevention science research with populations diverse with respect to race, ethnicity and culture, both within the US and across international communities.

ALL ARE WELCOME!
Refreshments and a Cash Bar will be provided.
Treasurer’s Report
By Ron Prinz, Treasurer

In FY 2009 the Society’s revenues were $501,154 and expenses were $468,861 resulting in an increase in unrestricted net assets of $32,293. Despite the downturn in the global economy, both annual meeting conference registrations and membership dues revenues were relatively stable compared to recent prior years. The SPR Annual Meeting is supported by a five-year NIH R13 conference grant which ends April 30, 2011. The SPR Board has been working on R13 conference grant proposals to continue NIH funding for another five-year period. The SPR Board acknowledges that the Society must expand its fund development activities to raise funds to ensure the financial stability of the Society and to enable the development and implementation of new programs for the advancement of prevention science. The recently created Fund Development Committee will be working to raise funds to achieve the long term strategic objectives of the Society.

The financial results depicted below are derived from the Society’s independently audited December 31, 2009 financial statements, which contain an unqualified opinion. The Society’s complete, audited financial statements can be obtained by calling 703-934-4850, ext. 213.

STATEMENT OF FINANCIAL POSITION, FY 2009

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assets</th>
<th>2009</th>
<th>2008</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cash and cash equivalents</td>
<td>$237,222</td>
<td>$199,488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants Receivables</td>
<td>$ 2,746</td>
<td>$ 22,550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Receivables</td>
<td>$ 13,592</td>
<td>$  966</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepaid Expenses</td>
<td>$ 22,617</td>
<td>$ 14,601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property &amp; equipment, net</td>
<td>$  1,129</td>
<td>$  651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Assets</strong></td>
<td>$277,306</td>
<td>$238,256</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Liabilities &amp; Net Assets</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accounts Payable</td>
<td>$  4,819</td>
<td>$  8,219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deferred Revenue</td>
<td>$ 24,155</td>
<td>$ 13,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Liabilities</strong></td>
<td>$ 28,974</td>
<td>$ 22,217</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Net Assets, unrestricted      | $248,332 | $216,039 |
| **Total Net Assets**          | $248,332 | $216,039 |

| **Total Liabilities & Net Assets** | $277,306 | $238,256 |

FY 2009 Audited Revenue

- Member Dues: 19%
- Grants: 25%
- Journal/Royalty: 5.0%
- Contributions: 0.5%
- Interest: 0.5%
- Annual Mtg registrations: 49%

FY 2009 Audited Expenses

- Annual Meeting: 53%
- Operating Expenses: 31%
- Advocacy: 3%
- Member/Journal: 13%
Member News

PROFESSIONAL APPOINTMENTS

Rohanna Buchanan, PhD, has been appointed as a Research Scientist at the Oregon Social Learning Center.

Phil Fisher, PhD, a senior scientist at the Oregon Social Learning Center and a professor of psychology at the University of Oregon, has accepted membership invitations to the National Scientific Council on the Developing Child and the National Forum on Early Childhood Policy and Programs (formerly the National Forum on Early Childhood Program Evaluation).

Gordon Harold, PhD, has been appointed as Chair in Behavioural Genetics and Developmental Psychopathology at the University of Leicester, UK.

Jennifer A. Kam, PhD, an Assistant Professor in the School of Communication at Ohio State University, will be joining the Department of Communication at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign as an Assistant Professor, starting July, 2011.

Jean Kjellstrand, PhD, will leave her position as a research associate at the Oregon Social Learning Center and the Oregon Research Institute during the summer of 2011 to begin a new job as an assistant professor in the School of Social Work at Columbia University in New York City.

Marie-Hélène Véronneau, PhD, has accepted an assistant professor position in the Department of Psychology at the Université du Québec à Montréal (Canada). After completing her postdoctoral training at the Child and Family Center (University of Oregon), she is looking forward to pursuing her research on youth adjustment with a focus on school perseverance in children and adolescents in her new position.

Helene R. White, PhD, Rutgers University, was promoted to Professor II (Distinguished Professor).

AWARDS and HONORS

Celene Domitrovich, assistant director of the Prevention Research Center at Penn State University, has been awarded a Joseph E. Zins Award for Action Research in Social and Emotional Learning. The award is given to one researcher each year by the Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning (CASEL), an organization devoted to promoting the success of children in school and life. The award was presented at the 2011 CASEL Forum held in Washington, D.C. on April 14, 2011.

PUBLICATIONS


J. Mark Eddy, PhD, and Julie Poehlmann, PhD, co-edited the book Children of Incarcerated Parents: A Handbook for Researchers and Practitioners, published in 2010 by The Urban Institute Press. Since 1991, the number of parents in prison in the U.S. has increased 80 percent. Today, at least 1.7 million minor children have a parent in prison. These children are at elevated risk for antisocial behavior and mental health problems. Few prevention programs have been developed and tested for incarcerated parents or their children.


SPR Community welcomes contributions to Member News a regular feature of the newsletter. If you would like to have your recent honor, award, professional appointment, and publication featured in the next issue please forward the details of your achievement to Hanno Petras, PhD, SPR Community Editor at hpetras@jbsinternational.com.
In Memoriam

G. Alan Marlatt

G. Alan Marlatt, Ph.D., was Professor of Psychology at the University of Washington and Director of the Addictive Behaviors Research Center at that institution. He received his Ph.D. in clinical psychology from Indiana University in 1968. After serving on the faculties of the University of British Columbia (1968-1969) and the University of Wisconsin–Madison (1969-1972), he joined the University of Washington faculty in the fall of 1972. He conducted pioneering research in three areas: harm reduction, brief interventions, and relapse prevention.

In 1996, Dr. Marlatt was appointed as a member of the National Advisory Council on Drug Abuse of the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA). He served as the President of the Society of Psychologists in Addictive Behaviors from 1983-1984; President of the Section for the Development of Clinical Psychology as an Experimental-Behavioral Science of the Society of Clinical Psychology (Division 12 of the American Psychological Association), 1985-1986; and President of the Association for the Advancement of Behavior Therapy, 1991-1992.


Marlatt received continuous funding for his research from a variety of agencies including the National Institute on Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism, the National Institute on Drug Abuse, the ABMRF/The Foundation for Alcohol Research, and the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. In 1990, Marlatt was awarded The Jellinek Memorial Award for outstanding contributions to knowledge in the field of alcohol studies from the International Society for Biomedical Research on Alcoholism. In 2001, he was given the Innovators in Combating Substance Abuse Award by the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation, and in 2004 he received the Distinguished Researcher Award from the Research Society on Alcoholism. He received the Distinguished Psychologist award for Professional Contribution to Knowledge from the Washington State Psychological Association in 1990 and the Distinguished Scientist Award from the Society for a Science of Clinical Psychology in 2000.

Dr. Marlatt passed away on March 14, 2011.

Michael D. Newcomb (1952-2010)

Michael D. Newcomb was a gifted psychologist who had an indelible impact on the study of drug etiology and consequences. He was a prodigious scholar, capable of weaving together the most challenging methodological, developmental, and psychological concerns, all framed by a deep clinical acumen. He resolved some of the most difficult challenges facing longitudinal researchers examining the range of psychosocial forces affecting drug use and deviant behaviors.

Michael Newcomb was born on December 20, 1952, in Laguna Beach, California, and died in Santa Monica, California, on February 13, 2010, after a long and courageous battle with a degenerative neurological disease. He received his bachelor’s degree in social ecology from the University of California, Irvine (1974), where he pursued joint studies in developmental psychology and mathematics. Much later, he would forge these two academic disciplines together in a rare and powerful blend examining substance use etiology and consequences.

Newcomb received a master’s degree in psychology (1976) at the University of California, Los Angeles (UCLA) and then a doctorate in clinical psychology, also at UCLA (1979). His dissertation mentor and a central figure in his early methodological training was Peter M. Bentler, an intellectual giant in the field of statistics and psychology. Newcomb completed his clinical internship at the Veterans Administration Medical Center in Los Angeles, receiving specialized training in family therapy, sex therapy, gestalt therapy, and hypnotherapy. He became professor in the Rossier School of Education at the University of Southern California (USC) in 1991, a position he held until his death. Newcomb was chair of the USC counseling psychology program since 1992 and also served as program director of the marriage, family, and child counseling program. He maintained his clinical license in psychology throughout his professional career.

Along with colleague and longtime friend Peter Bentler, he carved out a much-needed fresh approach to drug etiology, one using the most innovative multivariate statistical procedures and erected on a foundation of strong theoretical underpinnings. Together, Bentler and Newcomb conducted longitudinal studies of community samples at the Center for the Study of Drug Abuse Etiologies and Consequences, which profited from their meticulous tracking and research skills. Their book Consequences of Teenage Drug Use: Impact on the Lives of Young Adults (1988, Sage) signified a breakthrough not only for its methodological rigor but also for portraying drug use as resulting from myriad influences, as embedded in a cultural context, and as influenced by a plethora of psychosocial forces. Newcomb was one of the first investigators to address the long-standing arguments about whether drug use impairs development by fostering a hiatus in skill acquisition or accelerates development via pseudo-maturity.
In Memoriam

Continued

Newcomb was a careful and meticulous scholar who used a wide range of theories and pointed out numerous methodological considerations to improve the field’s understanding. In over 200 publications emphasizing primarily drug etiology and consequences, he made certain to delineate the differences between “use” and “abuse” and to showcase empirical work supporting claims that some minor experimental drug use may not be injurious. His American Psychologist article “Substance Use and Abuse Among Children and Teenagers” (1989, 44, 242–248) was a cause célebre and a call for a passionate research community to begin teasing apart the multidimensional roles of consumption and risk.

Newcomb’s second book, Drug Use in the Workplace: Risk Factors for Disruptive Substance Use Among Young Adults (1988, Auburn House), represented a follow-up to his concern about drug use in the general population, albeit focusing exclusively on the workplace. He then coauthored with Gail E. Wyatt and Monika H. Riederle Sexual Abuse and Consensual Sex: Women’s Developmental Patterns and Outcomes (1993, Sage). Newcomb made a natural segue to this newly discovered research emphasis, using his statistical gifts and clinical insight to identify risk factors for psychological trauma in women with early histories of sexual abuse.

Michael Newcomb was a member of the editorial board of several prominent clinical and research journals. He was actively involved in more than 10 professional societies and was a fellow of the American Psychological Association (APA), the American Psychological Society, and the Western Psychological Association. At APA he was quite visible, participating in eight different divisions. He consulted for the National Academy of Science and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, served on numerous National Institutes of Health institutional review groups, and worked closely with various federal agencies, tirelessly reminding them of the need for conducting high-quality longitudinal research.

In my editor’s acknowledgment in the Handbook of Drug Use Etiology (2010, APA), I noted that Michael professed “all good things come from the heart.” I truly believe this. Michael made latent constructs come alive, something that many of us overlook or fail to fully appreciate. He was a staid nonconformist, which was reflected in his ardor for research on deviant lifestyles. His “liberal” tendencies were captured well by his long, flowing mane of reddish-blond hair tied back in a pony tail. This coiffure and his Birkenstock sandals worn with socks and jeans were the distinctive trademarks of his personal style. He was a modern Wittgenstein, a connoisseur of wine, food, travel, and friendship, and probably the most widely read person one could meet. To those of us fortunate enough to visit his bungalow in Santa Monica, enjoy his musical interests, and share some vegetarian repast he had prepared, he was the quintessential mentor, and his life force will remain indelibly etched in our minds. Collectively, his students’ sojourn and their own grappling with lofty ideals are a mere reflection of his caring professional tutelage. Most important, to all of us who knew him, Michael was a friend, and our lives are that much better for having been touched by his.

Lawrence M. Scheier
LARS Research Institute, Inc., Las Vegas, Nevada

March 1, 2011

Dear Colleague,

It is with deep sorrow that I inform you about the untimely death of Dr. Charles (Bob) Schuster, a much admired and respected member of our scientific community and past NIDA Director.

Bob's prodigious career includes seminal contributions that will continue to illuminate the path of future generations of behavioral pharmacologists and neuroscientists. His achievements would be too many to list. But he was a true visionary, well ahead of his time, who saw the potential of addiction immunotherapies, for example, almost three decades before other researchers would finally commit resources in what is now a rapidly maturing and promising treatment strategy. He left us not only a plethora of discoveries and achievements from which to draw inspiration, but also the memory of a gentle and generous man who was able to make a difference in the lives of millions through the work that he so much loved.

Bob received his Ph.D. in Psychology in 1962, after being mentored by Professor Joseph V. Brady at the University of Maryland. After holding numerous and prestigious faculty positions, he founded the University of Chicago's Drug Abuse Research Center. From 1986 to 1992, he served as the director of the National Institute on Drug Abuse, a position from which he oversaw the development of grant and contract programs to fund research into the etiology, prevention and treatment of drug abuse, and its medical and social consequences. In 2000, he became Director of the Addiction Research Institute at Wayne State University, a position he held until his premature death. He is a past President of the College on Problems of Drug Dependence and a Nathan B. Eddy Award recipient. Bob has been a prolific writer, having authored or co-authored over 200 scientific journal articles, as well as numerous book chapters and several books.

Please join me in expressing our deepest sympathy to Bob's vast circle of loved ones, our appreciation and gratitude for the wisdom and knowledge he has bequeathed us, and the certainty that he will be sorely missed.

Sincerely,

Nora D. Volkow, M.D.
Director
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Prevention Puzzle

Like all other parts of your body, your brain also needs exercise. Research has shown that solving a Puzzle is one of the most beneficial exercises for the brain.

You are to find 10 terms related to Prevention-Intervention Development and Implementation. The solution is shown at the bottom of the page. Good luck!

Prevention Intervention Development and Implementation
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