

the Behavior Therapist

Table of Contents

RESEARCH-TRAINING LINK

The Application of Behavioral Contracting to Authorship Status93
Derek R. Hopko, Sandra D. Hopko, and Tracy L. Morris

SCIENCE FORUM

The Role of Disgust in Blood-Injection-Injury Phobia.....96
David F. Tolin, Craig N. Sawchuk, and Thomas C. Lee

LIGHTER SIDE

Donna Wollerman Ronan100

BOOK REVIEW

Sowers-Hoag, K., & Harrison, D. F. (1998)
Finding an Academic Job101
George C. Tremblay and David DiLillo

OPEN FORUM

Behavior Therapy and Behavioral Genetics Are Not Enemies:
 A Reply to Hayes102
Norman C. Weissberg and David R. Owen

PROFESSIONAL ISSUES

Saul D. Raw103

CLASSIFIEDS.....106

Research- Training Link

The Application of Behavioral Contracting to Authorship Status

Derek R. Hopko, Sandra D. Hopko,
and Tracy L. Morris, *West Virginia
University*

The "publish or perish" phenomenon refers to the notion that professional advancement is contingent on both the number and quality of published manuscripts, and that failure to publish will ultimately result in one's professional demise. This phenomenon is widely recognized, and affects professionals from a variety of disciplines (e.g., Berardo, 1993; Jones, 1996; Kalichman & Friedman, 1992; Moskowitz, 1993). Applied specifically to clinical psychology, the pressure to publish is experienced at many levels. For example, undergraduate students seeking admission to graduate programs, graduate students applying for internship, postdoctoral, or academic positions, and associate professors striving to earn tenure all work toward establishing themselves through publications and presentations. Although these academic endeavors are essential in disseminating progress in our field, there may be a certain danger that evolves from a more concentrated effort to publish. For example, as graduate students recognize that there are both limited internship positions and even fewer academic positions (Routh, 1998), a competitive environment may result—breeding inappropriate and even unethical professional behavior. For instance, an individual's con-

Starting with Volume 6 in
Cognitive and Behavioral Practice

read an article → take a quiz → earn CE credits

(all from the comfort of your home)

For information, call AABT: 212-647-1890;
 fax: 212-647-1865; email: publications@aabt.org

the Behavior Therapist

Published by the Association for
Advancement of Behavior Therapy
305 Seventh Avenue - 16th Floor
New York, NY 10001-6008

(212) 647-1890 Fax: (212) 647-1865

EDITOR.....	<i>George F. Ronan</i>
Editorial Assistant.....	<i>Laura E. Dreer</i>
Behavior Assessment.....	<i>J. Scott Mizes</i>
Book Reviews.....	<i>Ann L. Date</i>
Clinical Forum.....	<i>James D. Herber</i>
Dialogues.....	<i>Christine Maguth Nezu</i>
International Scene.....	<i>Matthew R. Sanders</i>
Lighter Side.....	<i>Donna M. Ronan</i>
Professional Issues.....	<i>Saul D. Raw</i>
Research-Practice Link.....	<i>Martin E. Franklin</i>
Research-Training Link.....	<i>Elizabeth A. Meadows</i>
Science Forum.....	<i>Jeffrey M. Lohr</i>
Special Interest Groups.....	<i>Gayle Y. Iwamasa</i>
Student Forum.....	<i>Jason Kilmer</i>
Technology.....	<i>Joseph J. Plaud</i>

AABT

President.....	<i>Steven D. Hollon</i>
Executive Director.....	<i>Mary Jane Eimer</i>
Director of Publications.....	<i>David Teisler</i>
Production Editor.....	<i>Stephanie Schwartz</i>
Projects Manager.....	<i>Anya Nepotnik-Rapoport</i>

Copyright © 1999 by the Association for Advancement of Behavior Therapy. All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form, or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopy, recording, or any information storage and retrieval system, without permission in writing from the copyright owner.

All inquiries concerning membership in AABT should be addressed to the Membership Chairperson at the above address.

Subscription information: *the Behavior Therapist* is published in 10 issues per year. It is provided free to AABT members. Non-member subscriptions are available at \$38.00 per year (+\$17.00 surface postage or +\$32.00 airmail postage outside USA).

Change of address: 6 to 8 weeks are required for address changes. Send both old and new addresses to the AABT office.

All items published in *the Behavior Therapist*, including advertisements, are for the information of our readers, and publication does not imply endorsement by the Association.

tribution to a project may not be adequately acknowledged or ghost authorship may be awarded (Bedeian, 1996; Jones).

The American Psychological Association (1992) outlines three general guidelines regarding publication credit: (a) psychologists accept credit (i.e., authorship) only for work that they have performed or to which they have substantially contributed, (b) authorship credit reflects scientific or professional contribution, regardless of the authors' relative status, and (c) a student is usually principal author on his or her dissertation or thesis. Clearly, there is a certain ambiguity in the language of this ethical code that could result in conflicts between collaborators (Holaday & Yost, 1995a; Shadish, 1994), such as interpretations regarding "substantial contribution" (Keith-Spiegel & Koocher, 1985). For example, whereas some researchers propose that assistance with data analysis merits authorship, others disagree (Brown-Wright, Dubick, & Newman, 1997). Additionally, the authors are aware of instances in which graduate students were excluded from presentations or publications despite their convictions that a "substantial contribution" had been made. Perhaps even more troublesome, in many of these instances a verbal agreement was made between student and faculty member regarding authorship inclusion.

Although emphasis has been placed on protecting students from maltreatment by faculty supervisors, interests of senior members of research partnerships should not be neglected. For instance, a faculty member may provide the conceptualization and design for a research project to be undertaken by a graduate student, as in the case of a master's thesis. Although in most cases the student is listed as first author and the faculty member as second author, situations may arise whereby an alternate authorship order may be more appropriate. For example, does the faculty member have the right to publish the research if the student does not prepare a manuscript for submission within a reasonable time period? Because of potential dilemmas such as this, and to prevent miscommunication, it is important that authorship issues are negotiated from the outset.

Authorship dilemmas have been implicated as causing damage to professional relationships, and are frequently described very negatively by those that are involved (Holaday & Yost, 1995b). Given the adverse consequences that may result from poorly established authorship criteria, Fine and Kurdek (1993) have speculated that "informed consent" forms may be useful in determining authorship order. The present authors take a stronger posi-

tion and argue that authorship status be formally documented prior to the initiation and throughout the entirety of all research projects. Based on this conviction, we present a strategy—behavioral contracting—whereby many of the pitfalls associated with authorship credit may be avoided.

Behavioral contracts provide very clear guidelines of what behaviors performed by what individuals will produce what reinforcers (Martin & Pear, 1996). According to these authors, behavioral contracts serve four functions: (a) they provide an agreement of goals, (b) they ensure that all involved individuals have an accessible reference to monitor progress toward goals, (c) they outline specific responsibilities of the individuals involved, and (d) they ensure that all individuals are committed to the project in that signatures are obtained, which, in our society, serve as discriminative stimuli eliciting a commitment. Certain elements of contracts tend to improve their success, including the use of negotiated forms and targeting process in addition to outcome behaviors (Kirschenbaum & Flanery, 1983). Contracting typically occurs in five phases, including initial decision making, generation of goals, identification of target behaviors, monitoring progress, and delivery of consequences (Kirschenbaum & Flanery, 1985). Psychologists have been using behavioral contracts successfully for years in the treatment of a variety of problems, such as childhood behavioral problems or the self-harm behaviors of the seriously mentally ill (e.g., Carns & Carns, 1994; Heinssen, Levendusky, & Hunter, 1995; Ruth, 1996). Evidence from numerous clinical trials and experiments in various contexts have indicated the efficacy of contractual approaches (Goldfried, 1980). Given the utility of contracts as a therapeutic modality—why not apply this strategy to ourselves? It seems feasible that this approach may aid in eliminating problems associated with authorship order and inclusion.

The initial contract (see Figure 1) should be drawn up during the "idea phase" of a research project. All individuals involved with the research project should meet, including faculty member(s), graduate students, and research assistants. During this initial meeting, seven objectives must be accomplished. First, the nature of professional contributions should be discussed (see Fine & Kurdek, 1993). The ethical guidelines regarding publication credit should be examined, and efforts should be made to delineate those behaviors that reflect "substantial contribution." Second, the goals of the research project should be established and identified in the contract. That is, are the authors' intentions to

publish the data and/or present the data in a poster or symposium format? Once determined, the publication or presentation goals should be reflected in the third objective, an outline of the responsibilities of all individuals throughout all phases of the project. For example, who will be responsible for: (a) completing and submitting the research proposal to the institutional review board (IRB), (b) collecting data, (c) data analysis, and (d) writing and revising the final manuscript. Also, if symposium or posters will be presented, issues such as who will prepare and deliver the presentations should be addressed. Fourth, the order of authorship for publications and presentations should be decided. Because authorship order may differ as a function of presentation or publication, it may be necessary to develop more than one contract for the same project. Fifth, potential problems and their resolutions should be identified. In this section, the consequences for failing to uphold responsibilities should be clearly detailed. For example, if someone withdraws from the project, how will authorship order change, and who will assume responsibility for uncompleted duties? Sixth, a tentative schedule for reviewing progress should be outlined. As Fine and Kurdek have indicated, unanticipated problems are likely to occur throughout the course of a project such that individuals may have to be included (e.g., to revise manuscripts), excluded (e.g., due to failure to meet responsibilities), or relocated in authorship order (e.g., because of an increase or decrease in contribution). Therefore, it is critical that progress meetings occur regularly. The most feasible times to conduct these meetings would appear to be prior to each phase of a project (e.g., IRB submission, data collection, data analysis, and writing). After reviewing whether individuals' responsibilities have increased or decreased since the last meeting, the contract (e.g., authorship order) may have to be modified accordingly. Although within this system the first author would be regarded as the chairperson, decisions should be made in a democratic manner, and all individuals involved should be encouraged to formulate opinions and suggestions. Finally, signatures should be obtained from all individuals involved signifying a commitment to the project. During progress meetings, if contractual changes are implemented, these changes are described in detail, and signatures are once again obtained. Throughout the entirety of a research project, a copy of the most recent contract should be distributed to all members.

The quantity of publications and associated authorship order are factors weighing heavily into decisions regarding internship placement, tenure, and salary

(Costa & Gatz, 1992). Given the importance of authorship inclusion and placement, a formalized system will help to ensure that influential contributions are appropriately reinforced. With the implementation of behavioral contracting to authorship status, there will be less uncertainty regarding authorship order and inclusion, the facilitation of positive peer relationships, and a more cohesive, team-oriented approach to research. In our view, behavioral contracting can serve to expedite the progress of a study, and simultaneously strengthen the relationships of all individuals participating.

References

- American Psychological Association. (1992). Ethical principles of psychologists and code of conduct. *American Psychologist*, 47, 1597-1611.
- Bedeian, A. D. (1996). Improving the journal review process: The question of ghostwriting. *American Psychologist*, 51, 1189.
- Berardo, F. M. (1993). Scientific norms and research publication: Issues and professional ethics. *Marriage and Family Review*, 18, 119-141.

- Brown-Wright, D. A., Dubick, R. A., & Newman, I. (1997). Graduate assistant expectation and faculty perception: Implications for mentoring and training. *Journal of College Student Development*, 38, 410-416.
- Carns, A. W., & Carns, M. R. (1994). Making behavioral contracts successful. *School Counselor*, 42, 155-160.
- Costa, M. M., & Gatz, M. (1992). Determination of authorship credit in published dissertations. *Psychological Science*, 3, 354-357.
- Fine, M. A., & Kurdek, L. A. (1993). Reflections on determining authorship credit and authorship order on faculty student collaborations. *American Psychologist*, 48, 1141-1147.
- Goldfried, M. R. (1980). Toward the delineation of therapeutic change principles. *American Psychologist*, 35, 991-999.
- Heinssen, R. K., Levendusky, P. G., & Hunter, R. H. (1995). Client as colleague: Therapeutic contracting with the seriously mentally ill. *American Psychologist*, 50, 522-532.

Continued on page 107

Figure 1. Sample authorship contract.

We hereby enter into an agreement, as outlined below, regarding the project tentatively titled:

This contract applies to:

(a) Publications _____ (b) Presentations _____ Both (a)&(b) _____

First Author: _____ (print) _____ (signature)
Brief description of basic responsibilities/role on project:

Second Author: _____ (print) _____ (signature)
Brief description of basic responsibilities/role on project:

Third Author: _____ (print) _____ (signature)
Brief description of basic responsibilities/role on project:

Fourth Author: _____ (print) _____ (signature)
Brief description of basic responsibilities/role on project:

Problems and Resolutions

Date contract signed: _____
Progress review meeting: _____
IRB submission deadline: _____
Expected date of data completion: _____ Date project completed: _____
Expected date of manu. submission: _____ Date manu. submitted: _____

patients with agoraphobia and obsessive-compulsive disorder. Our successful candidate will have dual responsibilities: half-time providing direct clinical treatment under supervision and half-time of active participation in ongoing clinical research projects and development of new research protocols. Ongoing projects include anxiety disorders in minority patients

and anxiety disorders in medical settings (i.e., cardiology, neurology, dermatology).

We require: a Ph.D. in Clinical Psychology, APA approved program preferred but will consider exceptional ABD candidates; experience in behavioral treatment of anxiety disorders and/or clinical research and a commitment to clinical research. We offer a professional and

supportive environment, a salary of \$20-K, excellent benefits, and a position commitment of one or two years. Send C.V. to: Steven Friedman, Ph.D., Professor, Department of Psychiatry/Box 1203, University Hospital of Brooklyn, State University of New York, Health Science Center at Brooklyn, 450 Clarkson Avenue, Brooklyn, NY 11203.

Continued from page 95

- Holaday, M., & Yost, T. E. (1995a). Authorship credit and ethical guidelines. *Counseling & Values, 40*, 24-31.
- Holaday, M., & Yost, T. E. (1995b). A preliminary investigation of ethical problems in publication and research. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 10*, 281-291.
- Jones, A. W. (1996). Some thoughts and reflections on authorship. *Alcohol & Alcoholism, 31*, 11-15.
- Kalichman, M. W., & Friedman, P. J. (1992). A pilot study of biomedical trainees' perceptions concerning research ethics. *Academic*

Medicine, 67, 769-775.

- Keith-Spiegel, P., & Koocher, G. P. (1985). *Ethics in psychology: Professional standards and cases*. New York: Random House.
- Kirschenbaum, D. S., & Flanery, R. (1983). Behavioral contracts: Outcomes and elements. In M. Hersen, R. Eisler, & P. M. Miller (Eds.), *Progress in behavior modification* (Vol. 15). New York: Academic Press.
- Kirschenbaum, D. S., & Flanery, R. C. (1985). Toward a psychology of behavioral contracting. *Clinical Psychology Review, 4*, 597-618.
- Martin, G., & Pear, J. (1996). *Behavior modification: What it is and how to do it* (5th ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

- Moskowitz, J. M. (1993). Why reports of outcome evaluations are often biased or uninterpretable: Examples from evaluations of drug abuse prevention programs. *Evaluation and Program Planning, 16*, 1-9.
- Routh, D. K. (1998). The internship crisis. *The Clinical Psychologist, 51*, 1-2.
- Ruth, W. J. (1996). Goal setting and behavioral contracting for students with emotional and behavioral difficulties: Analysis of daily, weekly, and total goal attainment. *Psychology in the Schools, 33*, 153-158.
- Shadish, W. R. (1994). APA ethics and student authorship on master's theses. *American Psychologist, 49*, 1096.

Continued from page 102

increase in a time span too short to be attributable to genetic changes.

Finally, Hayes (1998) confuses behavioral genetics with what he calls "biologism." No reputable behavioral geneticist embraces "biologism." Indeed, they take great pains to reject the view that hereditary factors alone totally control behavior (Plomin et al., 1990). Behavior therapists have nothing to fear from behavioral genetics; its assumptions are compatible with contemporary thinking in behavior therapy and its findings will not render us

unemployed. Can we not finally accomplish the long overdue burial of the historical antipathy between the behavior therapists' emphasis on the environment (not environmentalism) and the behavioral geneticists' emphasis on biology (not biologism); our science would advance and our blood pressure decline.

References

- Flynn, J. R. (1987). Massive IQ gains in 14 nations: What IQ tests really measure. *Psychological Bulletin, 101*, 171-191.
- Gottesman, I. I. (1991). *Schizophrenia genesis*.

- New York: W. H. Freeman.
- Hayes, S. C. (1998). Resisting biologism. *the Behavior Therapist, 21*, 95-97.
- McGue, M., & Bouchard, T. J. (1998). Genetic and environmental influences on human behavioral differences. *Annual Review of Neuroscience, 21*, 1-24.
- Plomin, R. DeFries, J. C., & McClearn, G. E. (1990). *Behavioral genetics*. New York: W. H. Freeman.
- Plomin, R., Owen, M. J., & McGuffin, P. (1994). *The genetic basis of complex human behaviors*. *Science, 264*, 1733-1739.
- Rose, R. J. (1995). Genes and human behavior. *Annual Review of Psychology, 46*, 625-654.

Continued from page 103

Psychologists Sue Over Managed Care

The Wall Street Journal, in its edition of December 11, 1998, reported a number of lawsuits filed by psychologists against managed care companies in a campaign said to be coordinated by the American Psychological Association. The psychologists' litigation was aimed at challenging alleged cost-driven practices by HMOs that favor medication over psychotherapy and that second-guess psychologists' decisions and dictate methods of care. This litigation uses legal strategies that are somewhat different legal standards than those that have been used in previous suits

against managed care. The suits maintain that managed care companies have made false promises to employers and patients. For example, the Virginia Academy of Clinical Psychologists sued Blue Cross Blue Shield of the National Capital Area alleging misrepresentation and contract violations. This suit alleges that the Blues Capital Care HMO advertised a mental health benefit of up to 20 psychotherapy sessions per year (and in some cases up to 52 sessions per year), but therapists were actually pressured to complete therapy in 10 sessions or less. The suit also charges, among other things, that the plan maintained "provider profiles" that penalize therapists who advocated for their patients.

A similar lawsuit had been filed earlier by the California Psychological Association against Aetna U.S. Healthcare, which typically promises outpatient mental health benefits from 20 to 50 sessions per year, but which allegedly imposes undisclosed 4-, 5-, or 8-visit limits on the benefit. Aetna is moving to have the case dismissed and noted that it isn't "aware of anything that occurred" within the context of the lawsuit suggesting that its standards or specific benefit plan were not adhered to. The California lawsuit is notable in that it is making use of a number of test cases that are considered strong by the American Psychological Association.