

McCauley) argued that perspectives emphasizing inaccuracy in stereotypes are themselves unjustified, exaggerated, and not based on empirical evidence.

However, claiming that stereotypes are not necessarily inaccurate does not mean that all stereotypes are necessarily accurate. Unfortunately, Lee has experience with unjustified negative stereotypes. He lives in an ethnically diverse community with excellent public schools, but those schools have an unjustified negative reputation. That reputation is often presented as grounds for defeating school budgets (in New Jersey, communities vote on school budgets each year—if defeated, the budget is cut). Those opposing school spending dominated his township's politics (five consecutive budgets had been defeated). In 1995, he cofounded a grassroots group to support the schools. Because the schools had become overcrowded, a referendum to construct a new school (which the opposition claimed was not needed) was also on the 1996 ballot. His authority-challenging self joined his social psychological self in developing tactics for winning this election (such as repeatedly publicly hammering the opposition with achievement and enrollment data that exposed the inaccuracy of their views). In 1996, after five consecutive defeats, the school budget (and referendum) passed.

Lee often disregards conventional wisdom in his personal life, too. For example, he and Lisa had children just as he was starting his dissertation (Rachel, 1986), his first job (Kayla, 1988), and coming up for tenure (Josh, 1993).

Lee's accomplishments are tributes to the support he has received from advisors and colleagues and especially from Lisa and her family. Few of those accomplishments started as attempts to challenge received wisdom. However, regardless of whether that received wisdom involves schools in his community or theoretical claims in his discipline, he cannot deny feeling an adolescent admiration for data that keep misbehaving.

Selected Bibliography

- Ashmore, R. D., & Jussim, L. (Eds.). (in press). *Self and identity: Fundamental Issues*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Contrada, R., & Jussim, L. (1992). What does the Cook-Medley Hostility Scale measure? In search of an adequate measurement model. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 22*, 615-627.
- Jussim, L. (1986). Self-fulfilling prophecies: A theoretical and integrative review. *Psychological Review, 93*, 429-445.
- Jussim, L. (1989). Teacher expectations: Self-fulfilling prophecies, perceptual biases, and accuracy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 57*, 469-480.
- Jussim, L. (1990). Social reality and social problems: The role of expectancies. *Journal of Social Issues, 46*, 9-34.
- Jussim, L. (1991). Social perception and social reality: A reflection-construction model. *Psychological Review, 98*, 54-73.
- Jussim, L. (1993). Accuracy in interpersonal expectations: A reflection-construction analysis of current and classic research. *Journal of Personality, 61*, 637-668.
- Jussim, L., Coleman, L., & Lerch, L. (1987). The nature of stereotypes: A comparison and integration of three theories. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52*, 536-546.
- Jussim, L., Coleman, L., & Nassau, S. (1987). The influence of self-esteem on perceptions of performance and feedback. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 50*, 95-99.

- Jussim, L., & Eccles, J. (1992). Teacher expectations II: Reflection and construction of student achievement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 63*, 947-961.
- Jussim, L., & Eccles, J. (1995). Naturalistic studies of interpersonal expectancies. *Review of Personality and Social Psychology, 15*, 74-108.
- Jussim, L., Eccles, J., & Madon, S. J. (1996). Social perception, social stereotypes, and teacher expectations: Accuracy and the quest for the powerful self-fulfilling prophecy. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 29*, 281-388.
- Jussim, L., Fleming, C., Coleman, L., & Kohberger, C. (1996). The nature of stereotypes II: A multiple-process model of evaluations. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 26*, 283-312.
- Jussim, L., Nelson, T., Manis, M., & Soffin, S. (1995). Prejudice, stereotypes, and labeling effects: Sources of bias in person perception. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*, 228-246.
- Jussim, L., & Osgood, D. W. (1989). Influence and similarity among friends: An integrative model applied to incarcerated adolescents. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 52*, 98-112.
- Jussim, L., Soffin, S., Brown, R., Ley, J., & Kohlhepp, K. (1992). Understanding reactions to performance feedback by integrating ideas from symbolic interactionism and cognitive evaluation theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 62*, 402-421.
- Jussim, L., Yen, H., & Aiello, J. (1995). Self-consistency, self-enhancement, and accuracy in reactions to feedback. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 31*, 322-356.
- Krosnick, J., Betz, A. L., Jussim, L., & Lynn, A. (1992). Subliminal conditioning of attitudes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18*, 152-162.
- Lee, Y. T., Jussim, L., & McCauley, C. R. (Eds.). (1995). *Stereotype accuracy: Toward appreciating group differences*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Madon, S. J., Jussim, L., & Eccles, J. (in press). In search of the powerful self-fulfilling prophecy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.

David Lubinski

Citation

“For methodologically and conceptually rigorous contributions to differential psychology. His use of the theory of work adjustment has illuminated critical constellations of personal attributes that promote academic excellence and world-class eminence, especially in the sciences. His framework for identifying early signs (and different kinds) of intellectual distinction also points to ways to facilitate its development. Primarily through longitudinal inquiry, his empiricism highlights the importance of taking a multifaceted (individual-differences) approach for tailoring educational-vocational opportunities for optimal development. His truly outstanding integrative work has solidified interconnections between experimental and differential psychology while underscoring the complementarity of basic and applied research.”

Biography

David was born in Minneapolis, Minnesota, the middle child between two sisters, of Emil and Rose Lubinski. His precollegiate academic record was unimpressive, but on graduation from high school, one full-time year working as an orthopedic orderly at a metropolitan hospital placed him in contact with a different peer group, whereby the importance of academics became quickly



David Lubinski

apparent. Hospital work supported his undergraduate and part of his graduate education (University of Minnesota), but it was also an arena for great learning. Here, his interests in individual differences crystalized. Hospital duties placed him in contact with people from almost every imaginable walk of life. He thrived in discussions (with both patients and staff) about their experiences and personal concerns. Yet, in truth, his interest in human diversity was readily apparent as a young child. Early on, he frequently would be seen observing strangers intensely, sometimes approaching them closely to examine in exquisite detail one of their more distinguishing behavioral or physical characteristics and, much to the chagrin of his parents, frequently announcing, sometimes quite publicly (almost always proudly), the noteworthy feature of individuality that he had just stumbled on.

Over time, his extroverted energy began to slowly turn inward, and studying psychology became a more predominant focus. Just as he knew after his first psychology course (with Henry Borow) that psychology was to be his major, he knew after hearing Kenneth MacCorquodale

lecture once that he wanted him for his undergraduate advisor. It could not have been a better choice. David began studying psychology with (using MacCorquodale's words) "a capital P." Minnesota allowed honors undergraduates to take graduate courses, and he took full advantage of psychology's truly exceptional faculty. He spent hundreds of hours talking to them, consuming literature they recommended, and forming a solid matrix of psychological concepts, history, and methods with which to build an academic career. Their influence has had a lasting impact on him. And it was fun.

On graduating *summa cum laude* (1981) with enough graduate credit for a PhD, it was time to focus on other things. As a graduate student, he concentrated on research and writing. With Travis Thompson, a series of highly developed articles emerged on behavioral units. They addressed questions such as: What are the fundamental units of behavior? How are they combined? Can they be decomposed and resynthesized? With Jim Butcher and Auke Tellegen, a different series emerged. They assessed psychological androgyny as a trait-interactive concept, examined its place in the broader context of other personality dimensions, and composed a widely read exchange with Janet Spence.

Although his graduate program was in counseling, with an internship at Rene Dawis's Vocational Assessment Clinic, Thompson supervised his dissertation. Dawis and Thompson were superb coadvisors—exemplifying the best of differential and experimental psychology. David's dissertation was an experimental synthesis combining behavioral pharmacology and interanimal communication. He constructed an animal model of the interpersonal communication of affective states, training pigeons to interact communicatively by exchanging information on the basis of pharmacologically manipulated states. The experimentation required 10 hours per day (seven days a week) for three months and, then, 30 hours per week for an additional year. But it worked. Laboratory animals were trained to interact through an arbitrary medium as a function of internal stimulation available to only one participant; these performances generalized to novel agents and were maintained without material rewards. Yet this experiment, although he would do it all over again (and it earned him APA's George A. Miller Award for outstanding article in general psychology), taught him that his most dominant area of psychological interest was differential psychology. With this realization, he enrolled in postdoctoral training in quantitative methods at the University of Illinois to expand his knowledge of individual differences and sharpen his methodological sophistication.

Illinois was wonderful. It offered a huge dose of autonomy, superb quantitative training, and, most important, Lloyd G. Humphreys. David and Humphreys hit it off from the start—both were feverishly interested in individual differences and formally trained in learning theory. They began planning large-scale empirical analyses of intellectual talent. For two years, many hours each week were spent discussing individual differences, its

history and current methods, and topics superimposed on their empirical research, which was exciting and intense. With David's sleeping schedule from 3:00 a.m. until mid-morning, and Humphrey's office schedule 7:00–8:00 a.m. through late morning, manuscript revisions and more data were waiting for Humphreys when he arrived. By the time David arrived, Humphreys had processed these products and, together, they would plan the next phase of work. Their almost nonoverlapping schedules articulated like clockwork. Advantageously, they served to create two days out of one! The products of these exchanges (invaluable training) are still surfacing in press.

Following his two-year postdoctoral training, however, the heterogeneity of David's publications made it difficult to secure an appointment. In 1989, there were no offers. But curiously, he recalls little distress over this, perhaps because of a vivid undergraduate experience: Following one of their lengthy conversations, one of his highly esteemed professors, Paul Meehl, numbed him by saying, "You know, you should become a professor." That was a special moment. It inoculated him for more than one ebb in the natural flow of early careers. Meehl's influence surfaced again during the culmination of his postdoctoral training, again succinctly, "Just keep doing what you're doing."

Sure enough, his luck changed in 1990; he secured a tenure-track assistant professorship in the psychology department of Iowa State University (ISU). Around late-1980s, psychology at ISU started picking up momentum, driven by the intellectual leadership of Gary Wells (chair, 1989–1992) and Camilla Persson Benbow (chair, 1992–present). Here, on two fronts, his diversified training was reinforced.

First, his integrative scholarship began to manifest extraordinary synthetic features: He provided tools for landscaping the dimensionality of intellectual talent, using concepts from experimental psychology for evaluating products of factor-analytic research: Kenneth Spence's criterion of scientific significance and topographical versus achievement language accounts of behavioral phenomena. In addition, his treatment of learning principles central to species and individual differences in communication that were based on private states refined our understanding of human behavior through individual-differences dimensions (in ability, personality, psychopathology, and developmental disabilities). Furthermore, linkages between behavior-analytic strategies and defining intelligence phenotypically were brought forth, along with the conceptual power of Meehl's thought experiment (autocerebroscope) and its bearing on Schopenhauer's "world knot" (the mind–body problem).

But most important, what attracted David to ISU, specifically, was the scholarly products of Camilla Benbow. David's empiricism had been moving toward exceptional forms of intellectual talent, and ISU offered him a highly esteemed colleague and a world-class longitudinal study (Study of Mathematically Precocious Youth [SMPY]). SMPY was launched at Johns Hopkins Univer-

sity in 1971 by Julian C. Stanley (now one of David's closest colleagues and friends). Benbow (Stanley's former student and colleague) augmented and brought SMPY to ISU in 1986. This involves a sample of over 5,000 intellectually gifted participants, initially identified before age 13. When David interviewed at ISU, he had working with Benbow in mind. Almost immediately, once together, they frequently found themselves pausing, somewhat amazed, at how well they worked together. David adapted and extended Dawis's theory of work adjustment (TWA) to conceptualizing optimal learning environments for gifted youth, and he attached an overlay of learning theory to this model. The importance of assessing individual differences in abilities and education–vocational preferences was linked to differential learning rates and motivation for contrasting subject matter. This framework provided a tool for constructing optimal learning environments for intellectually talented youth, which was organized around TWA concepts of *satisfactoriness* (competence) and *satisfaction* (fulfillment). It stressed multifaceted assessments and illuminated critical constellations of personal attributes that promote academic excellence and world-class eminence.

On problems and questions in which both held a common background, they tended to agree almost completely on how to proceed, whereas in domains where one was clearly more facile, Camilla's expertise in educational and developmental psychology complemented David's background in differential psychology, learning theory, and psychometrics to generate products that neither could have produced alone. Yet, as if this was not enough, it still seemed as if there was more. They both trusted each other quickly, they both agreed on many things unhesitatingly, and they were both having great fun. Soon, they were committed to much more than careers in understanding the development of exceptional talent. And they were more fully aware of Freud's insightfulness about a meaningful life: to work and to love.

Among other outlets, David's articles have appeared in seven American Psychological Association journals, and his work has resulted in the American Educational Research Association's 1995 Counseling and Human Development Award and four awards for research excellence from the American Mensa Education and Research Foundation. He directs psychology's psychometrics and applied individual differences division, and codirects SMPY. Camilla and he are committed to taking SMPY to its 50th year together.

Selected Bibliography

- Achter, J. A., Lubinski, D., & Benbow, C. P. (1996). Multipotentiality among intellectually gifted: "It was never there and already it's vanishing." *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 43*, 65–76.
- Benbow, C. P., & Lubinski, D. (Eds.). (1996). *Intellectual talent: Psychometric and social issues*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Humphreys, L. G., Lubinski, D., & Yao, G. (1993). Utility of predicting group membership: Exemplified by the role of spatial visualization for becoming an engineer, physical scientist, or artist. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 78*, 250–261.
- Lubinski, D. (1996). Applied individual differences research and its

quantitative methods. *Psychology, Public Policy, and Law*, 2, 187–203.

- Lubinski, D., & Benbow, C. P. (1992). Gender differences in abilities and preferences among the gifted: Implications for the math/science pipeline. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 1, 61–66.
- Lubinski, D., & Benbow, C. P. (1994). The Study of Mathematically Precocious Youth (SMPY): The first three decades of a planned 50-year study of intellectual talent. In R. Subotnik & K. Arnold (Eds.), *Beyond Terman: Longitudinal studies in contemporary gifted education* (pp. 255–281). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Lubinski, D., & Benbow, C. P. (1995). An opportunity for empiricism: Review of Howard Gardner's *Multiple intelligences: The theory in practice*. *Contemporary Psychology*, 40, 935–938.
- Lubinski, D., Benbow, C. P., & Ryan, J. (1995). Stability of vocational interests among the intellectually gifted from adolescence to adulthood: A 15-year longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80, 90–94.
- Lubinski, D., Benbow, C. P., & Sanders, C. E. (1993). Reconceptualizing gender differences in achievement among the gifted. In K. A. Heller, F. J. Monks, & A. H. Passow (Eds.), *International handbook for research on giftedness and talent* (pp. 693–707). Oxford, England: Pergamon Press.
- Lubinski, D., & Dawis, R. V. (1992). Aptitudes, skills, and proficiencies. In M. D. Dunnette & L. M. Hough (Eds.), *The handbook of industrial/organizational psychology* (2nd ed., pp. 1–59). Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Lubinski, D., & Dawis, R. V. (Eds.). (1995). *Assessing individual differences in human behavior: New methods, concepts, and findings*. Palo Alto, CA: Davies-Black.
- Lubinski, D., & Humphreys, L. G. (1990). A broadly based analysis of mathematical giftedness. *Intelligence*, 14, 327–355.
- Lubinski, D., & Humphreys, L. G. (1990). Assessing spurious “moderator effects”: Illustrated substantively with the hypothesized (“synergistic”) relation between spatial visualization and mathematical ability. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, 385–393.
- Lubinski, D., & Humphreys, L. G. (1992). Some bodily and medical correlates of mathematical giftedness and commensurate levels of socioeconomic status. *Intelligence*, 16, 99–115.
- Lubinski, D., & Humphreys, L. G. (1997). Incorporating general intelligence into epidemiology and the social sciences. *Intelligence*, 24, 159–201.
- Lubinski, D., Schmidt, D. B., & Benbow, C. P. (1996). A 20-year stability analysis of the Study of Values for intellectually gifted individuals from adolescence to adulthood. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81, 443–451.
- Lubinski, D., & Thompson, T. (1986). Functional units of human behavior and their integration: A dispositional analysis. In T. Thompson & M. D. Zeiler (Eds.), *Analysis and integration of behavioral units* (pp. 275–314). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Lubinski, D., & Thompson, T. (1993). Species and individual differences in communication based on private states. *Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, 16, 627–642.
- Petrill, S. A., Plomin, R., McClearn, G. E., Smith, D. L., Vignetti, S., Chorney, M. J., Chorney, K., Thompson, L. A., Detterman, D. K., Benbow, C. P., Lubinski, D., Daniels, J., Owen, M., & McGuffin, P. (1996). DNA markers associated with general and specific cognitive abilities. *Intelligence*, 23, 191–203.
- Sanders, C. E., Lubinski, D., & Benbow, C. P. (1995). Does the Defining Issues Test measure psychological phenomena distinct from verbal ability?: An examination of Lykken's query. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 498–504.

Caroline Palmer

Citation

“For pioneering research in music cognition and performance. Her skillful studies on sound patterns produced by musicians extended our understanding of the way

complex sound patterns communicate information and expressive meaning. She has combined technical skills with a knowledge of music, acoustics, and psychology to reveal a previously hidden world of finely crafted dynamic patterns used by musicians to influence listeners. In her careful examinations of intentions–actions of the performer (producer), balanced with assessments of discrimination–judgments of the listener (perceiver), she has provided examples of the best that experimental research on real-world cognition offers.”

Biography

Caroline Palmer was born in New York, New York, in August 1959, to a civil engineer and an artist. Raised in family and school environments that valued music, she had music lessons during early school years that first stimulated her interests in auditory perception and music performance. Her desire to avoid appearing on stage in a costume (or in any other form) spawned an early career as school pianist for stage productions. Palmer's earliest musical impressions at home were of debates with her brother over the use of the piano–television room; according to her brother, she usually won, but he now works in the cable television industry, so neither one was permanently harmed.

Two memorable experiences from childhood prodded her interests in music and movement. Working during high school as pianist at a ballet academy, Palmer's experience launched an interest in the relationship between movement and rhythm and also made her a prolific categorizer of dance moves for someone who could not perform a single step. She first became familiar with transfer of learning issues in motor skills as a member of a high school marching band; assigned to the glockenspiel (for lack of volunteers to push a piano across the football field), she found that the glockenspiel music parts were especially difficult to perform because they were often composed originally for other musical instruments that required different movement patterns. Despite a persistent inability to transfer between keyboards (including piano, glockenspiel, and computer), Palmer decided to pursue a career in music performance, and she obtained a music scholarship from the University of Michigan.

Entering the school of music at Michigan in 1977, Palmer studied psychology and statistics in addition to music. Especially rewarding were courses she took in mathematical psychology and music perception and research experiences in John Jonides's experimental psychology lab. Trying to combine her interests in music, psychology, and math, she obtained a bachelor's degree in 1981 with multiple majors. After working as a research assistant for a year at the University of Michigan hospitals on an endogenous depression project, she decided to follow the undergraduate lemmings' uncritical drive toward clinical psychology and entered the PhD program at Rutgers University. During this period, she was fortunate to work as a research assistant at Bell Labs where she met several influential people. She met her future husband there, Gary Perlman, who worked in software engineering