Introduction

In this issue of *The Bulletin* we are pleased to include part I of a two part series exploring the controversy of Empirically Supported Treatments (ESTs). By now, it is well known among students and practitioners involved in the field of psychotherapy research that ESTs, also known as Empirically Validated Treatments (EVTs) or Evidence-Based Practices, has become a source of critical debate. Since its first endorsement by the American Psychological Association ten years ago, the EST movement has gained considerable support for identifying treatments that are found to be efficacious based on randomized controlled trials. However, critics have argued that the EST movements, and the treatments that are considered effective by its standards, are overly restrictive and their findings fail to support nuanced views on therapy and treatment effectiveness. We felt that this topic is particularly relevant as the outcome of this debate will likely influence the ways in which psychotherapy is conducted and taught in clinical graduate school programs.

Part I of the EST series focuses on the controversy surrounding ESTs for Post Traumatic Stress Disorder (PTSD). In light of a number of large-scale traumatic events (e.g., terrorism, warfare, and natural disasters) researchers and clinicians have developed new methods to assess and treat victims to stave off chronic PTSD. These efforts have lead to the development of a number of

treatments, two of which have been at the center of the controversy: Eye Movement Desensitization and Reprocessing (EMDR) and Critical Incidence Stress Debriefing (CISD). In this issue Rafferty discusses the origins of EMDR, the research that lead EMDR to be one of three treatments to be considered "probably efficacious" for the treatment of PTSD, and the controversy that has been generated by the status this method has received. Similarly, Barboza and Choe each review the mixed results associated with CISD, in an attempt to clarify the contradictory findings.

We hope that addressing ESTs and the complexities of conducting research within this framework will promote critical discourse among students and faculty surrounding these issues. The editors would like to thank Dr. Kaplan at The New School for all his help gathering material on this topic.

This issue of *The Bulletin* also includes research reports on visual perception, emotions related to body posture, and the use of research findings in clinical practice. In addition, The New School history series continues with an article on Sándor Ferenczi. Tsuruta discusses how the Hungarian born psychiatrist and prominent psychoanalyst, who was known for his close collaborations with Freud and his controversial techniques of *mutual analysis* infuriated the New York psychoanalytic community by teaching courses at the New School for Social Research to lay analysts and not adhering to the traditions of formally trained analysts.

As some readers might have noticed, *The Bulletin* has undergone several "cosmetic" changes since the last issue was published. First, and foremost, the name has changed. Secondly, the front cover no longer carries the characteristic New School shield, which symbolized the different colleges that made up the university. The decision to change the title of *The Bulletin* was made

after the Graduate Faculty changed its name to The New School for Social Research. Although various titles were proposed, we decided that the new name of the journal should represent the university as a whole, thus the new title: The New School Psychology Bulletin. The changes to the journal's front cover came as a necessary result of the journal's title-change, the university's name-change, and the university's subsequent removal of its' characteristic shield in the school logo.

Another important development that has taken place is that *The Bulletin* now accepts submissions from graduate students in the field of psychology across the country. By introducing *The Bulletin* to a larger audience of graduate students, we expect to increase the readership and impact of the articles. By making the submission process more inclusive we expect to increase the quality of articles published in the journal as well as the diversity of topics and perspectives to consider. In addition, through the expansion we hope to provide to other graduate students, and university departments, the value and benefits of a student-operated journal. Additional information for both readers and authors can be found on *The Bulletin*'s website: www.nspb.net.

Lastly, we will like to take this opportunity to present the readers with excerpts from a self-analysis that The New School's psychology department conducted in preparation for APA accreditation that takes place this spring. Accreditation by the APA is important for many programs in clinical/applied psychology. In particular, many students find it important that their graduate program of choice is APA accredited. Accreditation of a program is not permanent and psychology departments, and the students, have to go through this accreditation process in 6 years intervals. If a program is unsuccessful in meeting the standards of the APA, the program might be placed on probation or, in a worst-case scenario, loose the accreditation. This spring, the clinical psychology program at The New School is under the APA's "magnifying

glass" to see whether the program meets the APA standards. Among the issues that the self-analysis report discusses is the scientist-practitioner model and the emphasis The New School's clinical psychology program puts on this model. This is also the model that *The Bulletin* adopts, and the main reason the journal initially was developed.

We are grateful to Dr. Safran, Director of Clinical Training at The New School, for providing *The Bulletin* with the self-study, since it presents a model of how to approach scientific and didactic issues involved in the integration of research into the clinical training of graduate students. Rather than summarize his points, what follows are various excerpts from the self-analysis report.

From reading the self-study analysis it is apparent that the psychology department at The New School acknowledges the hard work required to train psychologists that are to become successful in the professional world. The psychology department identifies three important goals in its graduate training:

1. Educate psychologists who are competent in scholarship in clinical psychology.

2. Educate psychologists who are competent in the practice of clinical psychology.

3. Educate psychologists who integrate science and practice, demonstrating competence in critical thinking about issues related to both scholarship and clinical work.

Moreover, the self-analysis provides a thorough overview of the New School psychology department's conceptualization of training and what is expected from its students.

> In general terms the program adheres to a scientist-practitioner model of training. We are committed to teaching our students to integrate research and practice in a meaningful way. We teach them to view the activities of conducting research and engaging in clinical practice as mutually enhancing in nature - to understand that clinical practice generates important questions and insights that can have a valuable influence on the conceptualization and execution of research; and that both research findings and the process of conducting research can have an important impact on clinical practice.
>
> …the hallmark of the scientist-practitioner model is thus not just publishing in scientific journals, but rather bringing the integrative perspective of the scientific-practitioner model to all professional activities. Many of our graduates choose to work in clinical settings, and when they do so we expect them to approach their work with the critical sensibility that is the hallmark of science, to value and seek out up-to-date information, including expertise in both clinical techniques and empirical findings regarding assessment, psychopathology and therapeutic methods, and to evaluate this information critically. When they do research we expect them to be attuned to real world clinical concerns, and to use their clinical experience to generate meaningful hypotheses.
>
> We also believe it is important for students, from the outset, to struggle with the fact that the practice of clinical psychology often falls short of the ideals of the scientist-practitioner model, and that there is an increasing recognition in the field that there is often a gap between researchers and clinicians. Research can fail to take into account the realities of real world clinical practice, and as surveys indicate, many practitioners are uninterested in research findings. An important goal is thus to train students to think critically about the factors leading to the researcher/practitioner gap and to explore various ways of reducing it.
>
> Another important element of our educational philosophy is an emphasis on the integration of clinical and general psychology. This emphasis reflects our desire for graduates to have a solid grounding in the breadth of scientific psychology and is also consistent with the

general New School ethos of interdisciplinary dialogue. We believe our students should be familiar with state of the art developments in areas such as cognitive, developmental, social and biological psychology and to be able to think meaningfully about the integration of general and clinical psychology in their research and practice. Our concern is that there is a general tendency in the field for clinical psychology to become segregated from general psychology in the same way as there is a tendency for clinical practice to become isolated from research. This can lead to the impoverishment of both clinical and general fields in that developments in clinical psychology fail to be informed by the latest advances in general psychology, and research in general psychology can be isolated from real world concerns and lack ecological validity.

The emphasis in our training is on regarding psychology as an ever-evolving body of knowledge. Students learn about empirically supported treatments, but at the same time they learn about controversies surrounding the EST movement and about alternative approaches to evidence-based treatment that have been proposed. They are taught to value the process of scholarly inquiry itself rather than to commit themselves in a dogmatic fashion to a particular perspective (whether empirically supported or not). Consistent with a scientific-practitioner model, an important goal of ours is to help our students develop scientifically minded values. These include curiosity, flexibility, conceptual rigor, skepticism and humility. Whether they are conducting research or engaging in clinical practice, our aim is for them to be guided by these values. We train them to make creative use of research skills to explore important practical and theoretical issues and we train them to draw upon their experience as clinicians in training to ask meaningful research questions. Our objectives are for students to: 1) approach their clinical experience with the kind of open minded curiosity and humility associated with scientific practice at its best, 2) approach all theory with skepticism, and with an eye toward revising it in light of clinical experience and new research findings, and 3) approach the research literature with a critical eye, to raise ongoing questions about the soundness of the methodology that is employed and about its clinical relevance and generalizability. We also train students to begin thinking about what clinical questions are and are not answered by the research, and how one might go about designing research to answer questions that are not currently answered in the available research.

In its clinical training, the program is pluralistic, with an emphasis on

psychoanalytically informed practice. This emphasis on pluralism is consistent with the general ethos of the clinical program, the department, The New School for Social Research and the university as a whole. Some of the basic clinical skills courses have a broadly based psychodynamic emphasis. Others have a cognitive-behavioral emphasis. Students are also exposed to other therapeutic orientations (e.g., humanistic, existential approaches). Students are encouraged to approach clinical practice with an open, inquiring mind and an absence of doctrinarianism. Critical inquiry and debate are encouraged and students are encouraged to seek out training experiences in a range of different orientations during externship placements.

The Editors