

predictors of compliance with appointments for chemotherapy regimens, and another with self-administered chemotherapy. Unfortunately, the authors committed another serious error of omission by neglecting to even mention the very relevant literature on delay in seeking treatment for cancer symptoms, a dysfunctional behavior that countermands early detection and, thus, obstructs prompt management of cancer (e.g., Temoshok, DiClemente, Sweet, Blois, & Sagebiel, 1984).

If Andersen et al. (1994) were going to discuss relevant animal studies to support links between stress and immune suppression or tumor development, as they began to do on p. 395, then they either should have thoroughly reviewed the evidence or stated that they were being noncomprehensive and merely illustrative by citing only one study. As it is, they give the impression that only one such study exists when, in fact, there are dozens, including several that explicitly link behavior and tumor growth (e.g., Temoshok, Peeke, & Mehard, 1988).

Finally, it is relevant to point out that the model presented in Andersen et al.'s (1994) Figure 1 is very similar to one that I proposed (see Figures 1 and 2; Temoshok, 1993), a model that also featured simultaneous psychosocial-behavioral and biological pathways that are hypothesized to influence cancer outcome. I would think it would be a constructive exercise to compare similarities and differences across the two models, particularly as this would suggest elaboration, specification, or both, of empirical strategies to test the model or models.

That Andersen et al. (1994) were apparently unaware of my model or of its genetically related predecessors (e.g., Temoshok, 1987) underscores the central problem with their article: a lack of appreciation for a field of research that has considerable history and substantial science. For a theoretical article that purports to draw from the available evidence in the field, these cumulative omissions do a disservice to the readers of the *American Psychologist*. It is as if the authors had sailed to, say, Los Angeles, declared that they had discovered America, and then defined America as comprised solely of southern California.

REFERENCES

- Andersen, B. L., Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K., & Glaser, R. (1994). A biobehavioral model of cancer stress and disease course. *American Psychologist, 49*, 389-404.
- Spiegel, D., Bloom, H. C., Kraemer, J. R., & Gottheil, E. (1989). Effect of psychosocial treatment on survival of patients with metastatic breast cancer. *Lancet, 2*, 888-901.
- Temoshok, L. (1985). Biopsychosocial studies on cutaneous malignant melanoma: Psychosocial factors associated with prognostic indicators, progression, psychophysiology, and tumor-host response. *Social Science and Medicine, 20*, 833-840.
- Temoshok, L. (1987). Personality, coping style, emotion and cancer: Toward an integrative model. *Cancer Surveys, 6*, 837-857.
- Temoshok, L. (1993). Emotions and health outcomes: Some theoretical and methodological considerations. In H. C. Traue & J. W. Pennebaker (Eds.), *Emotion, inhibition, and health* (pp. 247-256). Toronto, Ontario, Canada: Hogrefe & Huber.
- Temoshok, L., DiClemente, R. J., Sweet, D. M., Blois, M. S., & Sagebiel, R. W. (1984). Factors related to patient delay in seeking medical attention for cutaneous malignant melanoma. *Cancer, 54*, 3048-3053.
- Temoshok, L., & Dreher, H. (1992). *The Type C Connection: The behavioral links to cancer and your health*. New York: Random House.
- Temoshok, L., Peeke, H. V. S., & Mehard, C. W. (1988). Individual behavioral differences related to induced tumor growth in the female Syrian hamster: Two studies. *International Journal of Neuroscience, 38*, 199-209.
- Temoshok, L., Sagebiel, R. W., Blois, M. S., Heller, B. W., Sweet, D. M., DiClemente, R. J., & Gold, M. L. (1985). The relationship of psychosocial factors to prognostic indicators in cutaneous malignant melanoma. *Journal of Psychosomatic Research, 29*, 139-153.
- ing System series on the mind and body. We cited Temoshok's book along with others as general indications of the interest in the area. There was no attempt to indicate that her prior efforts were derivative of Spiegel's work. However, it is the case that reports on the original intervention study appeared in the 1970s and early 1980s (e.g., Spiegel, Bloom, & Yalom, 1981) and, in fact, their intervention efforts predate the work of many individuals currently in the psychosocial oncology area.

The View From Here: Rejoinder to Temoshok

Barbara L. Andersen
Department of Psychology,
The Ohio State University

Janice Kiecolt-Glaser
Department of Psychiatry,
The Ohio State University

Ronald Glaser
Department of Medical Microbiology
and Immunology,
The Ohio State University

Having been offered by the *American Psychologist* the opportunity to respond to Temoshok's commentary, we wish to do so. Our remarks are brief and are enumerated below roughly in the order of their presentation by Temoshok.

1. We stand by our observation that the response of academia and the media to the Spiegel study was quite remarkable. For example, Spiegel was part of the centerpiece in Bill Moyer's successful Public Broadcast-

2. We apologize for the incorrect listing of the book title of Temoshok and Dreher. We have published books before (e.g., Glaser & Kiecolt-Glaser, 1995), even with Random House, and are aware of the two to four year lag that often occurs.

3. Temoshok charges us with "the failure . . . to cite critical references pertaining to cancer stress and disease course." However, the model focuses on the psychological and behavioral responses following diagnosis, treatment, or both. For example, we (e.g., Andersen, Cacioppo, & Roberts, 1995), like Temoshok, have done research on delay, but we did not cite her work or our own as it was not relevant. From another perspective, we note that the article was written for the scholarly agenda and format of the *American Psychologist*; comprehensive reviews are the domain of the *Psychological Bulletin*.

4. We have read the Eysenck and Grossarth-Maticek work and continue to follow their reports with interest. We did not, however, reference the work in the *American Psychologist* article or in related pieces (e.g., Andersen, 1992) because we have concerns regarding the methodological and interpretive aspects of the work. Our caution is neither isolated nor regional, as related perspectives have been offered by many other scholars, including Europeans, his own collaborators (Vetter, 1991), and Temoshok herself (Temoshok, 1991; see also Fox, 1991, and many others in *Psychological Inquiry, Vol. 2*). In the case of Greer and colleagues, their work was judged less appropriate for this occasion, whereas other such efforts by Europeans (e.g., Peter Maquire) have been discussed elsewhere (e.g., see Andersen, 1992). In short, we do not accept the implications of Temoshok's statement, because we regularly publish in European and international journals and books and, for example, have Dutch collaborators and students (Andersen & van der Does, 1994).

5. It was our hope that the model might provide a useful heuristic for scholars and

scientists studying questions of stress and immunity in the context of cancer. It was helpful that Temoshok provided a figure of her model. It would seem that the models differ considerably in their specificity and complexity, but now the comparison is all the more clear for the scientific community.

6. We certainly meant no personal slight of Temoshok or her work. There are too few scholars in the cancer area (see our joint discussion on p. 758 in Andersen, Beck, Ouellette-Kobasa, Revenson, & Temoshok, 1989); there is little to be gained by alienating one another.

In conclusion, we regret the author's disappointment in the article. For us, the thrust of the article was conceptual and integrative, and it was offered to facilitate research in this complex area. Indeed, many of the topics found in the article could be products for single qualitative or quantitative reviews. Lastly, we borrow from the author's

geographic metaphor. On reading the commentary, Temoshok's perspective felt a bit like the famous *New Yorker* magazine cover that portrays a map of the United States—of which 90% is New York City. Columbus (and the entire midwest for that matter) is nowhere to be found, and there is a single palm tree for Los Angeles. From our vantage, we have always liked the midwest and thought that it too had a place in the viewing of the bigger picture.

REFERENCES

- Andersen, B. L. (1992). Psychological interventions for cancer patients to enhance the quality of life. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 60*, 552-568.
- Andersen, B. L., Beck, G., Ouellette-Kobasa, S., Revenson, T. A., & Temoshok, L. (1989). Working Group Report: Directions for a Psychology Research Agenda in Cancer. *Health Psychology, 8*, 753-760.
- Andersen, B. L., Cacioppo, J. T., & Roberts, D. (1995). Delay in seeking a cancer diagnosis: Delay stages and psychophysiological comparison processes. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 34*, 33-52.
- Andersen, B. L., & van der Does, J. (1994). Sexual morbidity following gynecologic cancer: An international problem. *International Journal of Gynecologic Cancer, 4*, 225-240.
- Fox, B. H. (1991). Quandaries created by unlikely numbers in some of Grossarth-Maticek's studies. *Psychological Inquiry, 2*, 242-247.
- Glaser, R., & Kiecolt-Glaser, J. K. (Eds.). (1995). *Handbook of human stress and immunity*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Spiegel, D., Bloom, J. R., & Yalem, I. (1981). Group support for patients with metastatic cancer: A randomized outcome study. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 38*, 527-533.
- Temoshok, L. (1991). Assessing the assessment of psychosocial factors. *Psychological Inquiry, 2*, 276-280.
- Vetter, H. (1991). Some observations on Grossarth-Maticek's data base. *Psychological Inquiry, 2*, 286-287.