Looking Forward to the Year Ahead

By Allen M. Omoto, SPSSI President

In writing this, my first column as SPSSI President, I am fresh off two successful SPSSI conferences. The SPSSI stand-alone conference was held in Charlotte, NC, at the end of June (see highlights beginning on p. 14), and SPSSI also offered an outstanding array of programming at the annual APA convention in Orlando, FL. It is inspiring and invigorating to meet SPSSI members at these conferences and to learn about their research, teaching, and policy interests. I am truly honored to be able to serve as SPSSI President this year. Lest I forget, I thank SPSSI staff Susan Dudley, Anila Balkissoon, Alex Ingrams, and Brad Sickels, for all that they do day in and day out for SPSSI, but also the individuals who worked so hard to create intellectually compelling programming in Charlotte—Demis Glasford and David Livert—and in Orlando—Sean Massey and Justin Hackett. The hard work and vision of all of these individuals is much appreciated and makes SPSSI and its members all the richer.

I thought it appropriate in this column to note some of the priorities that I plan to focus on during the coming year and that I hope you will help with. As many of you know, I have served in different SPSSI governance capacities for several years now. Thus, I come to the presidency with what I believe is a good sense of what SPSSI does, and what it does well, as well as what it aspires to do and where there may be areas of opportunity that we can better exploit.

continued on page 3...
Editor’s Note

By Janice R. Adelman, Forward Editor

In North America, summer is finally winding down (at least in California where I write this) and the briskness of fall is beginning to make an appearance. Academic semester sessions are in full-swing, the fiscal year is turning over, and our work and lives and interests keep moving Forward (pardon the pun…!). It is a pleasure to bring this issue to you now, as it is chock-full of information and excitement spilling over from two successful SPSSI convention programming events. The first, of course, is our own biennial convention, held in June. Articles, photos, and highlights of convention activities begin on p. 14. I would be remiss not to point out the incredible list of accomplished award winners who were honored at the convention (starting on p. 20). In addition, I am also delighted to have two fantastic articles that highlight what SPSSI members do best in the field and in the classroom. Stephen Reicher (one of our convention keynote speakers) provides examples of how social psychological research on collective action and crowds is vital to understanding and empowering communities and governments alike (see p. 15). Amanda Clinton (2012 Outstanding Teaching & Mentoring Award Recipient) details the creative ways that she makes a range of psychology topics—even those seemingly far-removed from social domains—relevant to social issues and the students themselves (see p. 29).

The second SPSSI program was held at APA’s annual meeting in August. Check out Allen Omoto’s article (p. 1), Maureen O’Connor’s article (p. 4) and Alex Ingram’s article (p. 10) for highlights from SPSSI in Florida. Then, consider being a part of SPSSI’s programing at next year’s APA convention in Honolulu, HI! The call for proposals (and program reviewers) can be found on pp. 39-40. There is a lot more to read in this issue that I hope you will enjoy (including an interview with President-Elect Dominic Abrams, p. 6; more on SPSSI and APA governance, pp. 8 and 32; updates on SPSSI’s journals, pp. 11-13; and outstanding SPSSI members in the news, pp. 42).

Finally, it is with sadness that we report that M. Brewster Smith, one of our pioneering SPSSI psychologists, has recently passed away. Craig Haney, his colleague at UCSC, has written a lovely tribute to Brewster in his honor that can be found on p. 28. I hope that we are all inspired just a little more after reading about his incredible life.

—Janice R. Adelman
spssinews@gmail.com
One of my priorities is to continue the work that Past-President Maureen O’Connor and I began last year to try to improve SPSSI’s efficiency and effectiveness. SPSSI has a very capable and accomplished staff in its Central Office in Washington, DC, but the vast majority of the Society’s work is performed by volunteers on a wide variety of committees. Some of these committees have a clear charge, operating procedures, and timelines for completing tasks, whereas other committees are looser in organization and functioning. This flexibility across committees in structure and functioning is probably necessary. However, SPSSI may be working below capacity because it lacks clear terms of appointment for committee membership, established practices for leadership development within and across committees, or even a way of matching size of committee to scope of work.

One focus of my own research is on volunteerism, including how best to utilize and engage individuals in helping others and causes. In addition, I have practical experience administering a volunteer service organization and serving in governance bodies of professional societies. Thus, I am well acquainted with the frustration experienced by volunteers when their time and energy is under-utilized or poorly coordinated for the tasks at hand. Dr. O’Connor and I, with assistance from SPSSI Council and staff members, have been working to develop a set of practices and expectations across committees so as to enhance their effectiveness and better serve volunteers and SPSSI as a whole. I plan to continue this work this year with the hopes of developing a stronger and more efficient and predictable organization. As a corollary, I would like to find more ways to actively engage SPSSI members in planning and implementing SPSSI activities and programs. To this end, I recently sent out a call on the SPSSI listserv for volunteers interested in serving on SPSSI committees (reprinted on p. 38). If you have interest in increasing your involvement in SPSSI, I hope that you will let me know. Although I cannot guarantee ideal committee assignments for everyone, I pledge to do my best to find a way for you to contribute.

My second key initiative revolves around SPSSI’s “external” face. SPSSI is without doubt a well-established and venerated professional society, held in especially high regard by social psychologists for its long history of pursuing work on prejudice, peace, and poverty. (If you haven’t explored it already, visit the interactive timeline SPSSI Was There and the SPSSI website for ample evidence of this impressive history.) Founded in 1936, SPSSI is older than most psychological professional societies, and its journals and other publications have high impact ratings in several different bibliometric indices and classification schemes.

At the same time, however, SPSSI is currently a relatively small society and its professional profile is not as great as it could and probably should be, especially among graduate students and early career scholars across a variety of disciplines. Simply put, many individuals who should be members of SPSSI are not. Many of them belong to any of the large number of more specialized identity, social issue, and topical societies that have been established and grown up to meet emerging professional needs. One of my goals, therefore, is to find ways to reach the many latent (or lapsed?) members and potential members and to encourage them to add SPSSI to their list of must-belongs-to societies and professional associations. Moreover, even if they do not belong to SPSSI, I would hope that social scientists interested in social issues would know about SPSSI and the resources it provides, seek to publish in SPSSI journals (see pp. 11–13), and apply for SPSSI grants and awards (see pp. 20–27). To this end, I would like to shine a brighter light on what it is that SPSSI has done and continues to do in support of psychological research on social issues and on the application of knowledge to social policy topics and solutions. I want SPSSI to engage in more aggressive outreach and partnerships with other professional societies, to better inform undergraduate and graduate students about the Society, and also to more fully utilize social media and take advantage of special opportunities and innovation in disseminating its work and programs. Once scholars are reminded or informed about what SPSSI does, as well as the opportunities it affords through its grant programs and journals, I hope that they will come to see SPSSI as a central resource and membership for themselves, their students, and their colleagues (see p. 41 for SPSSI membership details).

My third main initiative is to devise and implement new programs aimed at providing SPSSI members at all career stages with skills and experiences to assist them in engaging in policy work and social advocacy. SPSSI is not as large as some professional organizations and does not have the budgetary heft to powerfully and directly influence state, federal, or international policymakers and processes. However, I strongly believe that SPSSI can—and does—fill a continued next page...
I am writing this column on August 31, the last official day of this incredible year as SPSSI President. I cannot help but reflect on the whirlwind year that it was. I am grateful to SPSSI Central Office staff who provide day-to-day support to SPSSI and especially to those of us in governance throughout the year, to this year’s hard-working and highly-effective Executive Committee (Allen Omoto, our incoming President, Margaret Kovera, our outgoing Secretary/Treasurer, James Jackson, our Past-President, and Kim Case, our SPSSI Council rep), and to all of the SPSSI members who serve on committees and do the core work of this organization.

This year, we held two highly successful conferences—our Biennial Stand-alone conference in Charlotte, NC in June (with thanks to our co-chairs, Demis Glasford and David Livert), and our Division 9/SPSSI programming at the APA Conference in Orlando (with gratitude to Justin Hackett and Sean Massey, Co-Chairs). My own experience, which was reflected in many comments I received about these conferences, is that the intense focus on social justice and policy came at a much needed time for many of us who have faced challenging budgetary situations, challenges to academic freedom...
and faculty governance, challenges to the very idea of institutions of higher learning as EDUCATIONAL as opposed to business operations, and who found in the Occupy Movement renewed energy for renewing the fight for fairness and justice! While it is difficult to select a few moments to highlight, several do stand out for me in terms of the goals I had set for my presidential year.

First, at the Charlotte conference, we were able to bring new energy into SPSSI in three areas—Education, the Environment, and Ethics/Equity. These three E-streams were designed to expand SPSSI’s focus as we head into the last quarter of our first century. This programming brought many panelists and attendees who had not previously attended a SPSSI conference, and who brought interdisciplinary perspectives to these important topics. At the Early Career Scholars pre-conference workshop (see p. 18), the focus on the Environment brought a number of young scholars who had not previously found a professional home for their focused attention on the psychology of the environment AND social justice. At least one of them has become a SPSSI believer and attended all of our APA programming as well! Kudos to Janet Swim and Susan Clayton for bringing exciting speakers and ideas to SPSSI, and we hope it is the first of many collaborations between Divisions 9 and 34! Michelle Fine and Valerie Futch, working with Geoff Maruyama put together a breath-taking series of panels addressing education—looking to our rich past but mostly toward a future in which social justice scholars must bring our tools to bear on the accountability (or, as I called it in my presidential address, “Ability to Count”) culture in which many of us are trying to survive. An action agenda grew out of this work, and I will work as Past-President to move these issues onto SPSSI’s upcoming agenda. And, to address Equity concerns, Yolanda Niemann brought an important initiative to SPSSI—the beginning of a process to reconsider the relationship between our increasingly multi-cultural society and the APA Ethics Code. APA Ethics Officer, Steve Behnke, Chair of the APA Ethics Committee, Linda Forrest, and Liang Tien, representing the Asian American Psychological Association held a roundtable during which they solicited input from the audience about areas in which the current ethical principles and overall ethics approach is inconsistent with cultural practices and experiences.

A second highlight for me was the emphasis that the conference placed on teaching and mentoring. With many thanks to Kim Case, a re-imagined Teaching and Mentoring Committee is now operating within SPSSI governance. On that Committee’s recommendation, SPSSI Council passed a revision to our teaching and mentoring awards such that SPSSI now confers two major awards per year—one for overall excellence in teaching/mentoring, and one for a focused activity or class that targets social justice issues (see p. 26 for recipients). To highlight these new awards, Kim and the Committee put together a number of panels at the conference, but it was especially exciting to attend the panel of ALL recent SPSSI teaching/mentoring award winners talking about what they do in their classrooms (see p. 29 for a description of one award recipient’s efforts in the classroom).

A third area that was in clear focus at both conferences, but which also was present in SPSSI activities throughout the year was the attention to POLICY! With great leadership from Alex Ingrams, SPSSI’s Policy Coordinator, and our Policy Committee, both conferences featured multiple events—from hands-on workshop-type training, such as the truly amazing talk by Chris Mooney at APA on science communication, to press briefings, to simply making sure the policy implications of our speakers’ work were highlighted, it was a banner year for policy activity at SPSSI (see pp. 10 and 19 for examples of this work)!

A fourth area of substantial growth and activity this year was the work of Roberto González, David Livert, and our Internationalization Committee to engage with international scholars. These efforts were on impressive display in Charlotte particularly. As just one example, witnessing the documentary, “One Fine Day,” and the subsequent conversation with Buddhist Monk Kovid, who was featured in the film, was seeing justice in action on vivid display! With eight countries now represented on our internationalization committee, an
How long have you been a SPSSI member?

It’s been so long that I can no longer remember how long, but what I do remember is being recruited as a student (perhaps by a gift subscription) by then president Faye Crosby, so it must be nearly 30 years. Aside from her enthusiasm and passion for social issues I was really impressed by her interest in graduate students’ development and her commitment to seek out and support young social scientists who cared deeply both about their science and their contribution to improving society.

Please describe your current research focus/efforts.

My research focuses on group processes (such as decision making and influence) and intergroup relations (such as prejudice and discrimination) as well as the connection between the two. I’m collaborating with several different groups of people on different projects. Mike Hogg has worked with me for years on social identity theory and its ramifications, as well as co-editing the journal *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, which we launched to embrace the best of both European and North American traditions of research in these areas. With José Marques and others we are developing subjective group dynamics theory, researching how and why groups respond to deviant and non-conformist group members—a topic with interesting ramifications for law, politics, organizations and social change. I’ve been building a developmental model of these processes with Adam Rutland and Melanie Killen. More generally I’ve been researching aspects of prejudice, including quite a lot of work with the UK’s Equality and Human Rights Commission (including a national survey of prejudice, conducted with Diane Houston). Out of that grew a more specific interest in ageism and age-based stereotype threat. For the last eight years or so I’ve worked with the UK’s largest charity for older people, Age UK. Luisa Lima and I set up the Eurage research group which developed a module on age attitudes for the European Social Survey, and we are currently writing up much of that research with Sibila Marques, Hannah Swift, and Melanie Vauclair.

What are some of the social issues that are important in your country/region of the world?

In the UK I think the most pressing social issues are how to respond to inequality, diversity, and collective responsibility. Our current government deploys policies that are highly contradictory on each of these...
fronts. I think that psychology as a whole reinforces strongly individualistic (indeed intra-individual) levels of explanation, and these are used politically to accompany or justify exclusionary social policies. These often draw on the assumption that people are essentially autonomous agents (if rather error prone) whose fate is in their own hands. An effect of the Europe-wide banking crises is that some governments are driving even larger wedges between those individuals or countries that have money and power and those that do not, treating those most in need as if they should suffer ‘austerity’ almost as if it were a moral cure. The social and psychological impacts of these strategies will be important and long-lasting. At least one contribution of social psychology should be to ensure that people do not forget that their own well-being is enhanced by improving the condition of society as a whole.

How do you bring SPSSI's principles and mission to your work/country?

We tend to underestimate how powerful the tools of our trade can be, and how unsystematic, unscientific and value-led many policies can be. I try to employ good psychological science to persuade individuals and groups of policymakers that socially progressive options are also rational and optimal. Often this might simply involve helping them become aware of the perspective that we can offer, or that evidence does not always square with their assumptions. For many policy strategists it is quite a surprise that it is possible to test a causal assumption empirically, using archival evidence, field research, or experimental research.

What do you feel is the best way to advance the psychological study of social issues?

Many ways aside from scientific advances in our theory and methods. For me, it starts with caring about a problem or issue and engaging others (outside of psychology) in the question of ‘why’ that problem exists. This often opens the way for a larger conversation and eventually research and action. I think it is also important to learn how to engage with public communications—TV, radio, and (not that I am any kind of expert) social media. Sometimes a very simple finding, something that we might regard as unexceptional, perhaps insufficient to justify an academic paper, can be a striking finding that grabs public attention and starts to change the way an issue is framed. My guess is that people are able to process ‘main effects’ but our beloved 2-, 3-, or 4-way interactions are not exactly what they want to mull over at breakfast time. Stereotype threat is a good example—the basic phenomenon is very important. Focusing on the many moderators and mediators risks clouding the fundamental point that stereotypes are not just images or perceptions—they can affect performance and thus life chances.

What do you like to do when you are not working to advance the psychological study of social issues?

I enjoy days out with my family; reading stories to our 10-year-old twin daughters; debating with our 21-year-old son; playing guitar or fiddle in a jazz/blues/folk line up; starting a pressure group; reading or watching satirical humor; learning to misspell in what Microsoft Office calls “US English” (surely an oxymoron?); enjoying my students’ successes; repairing things.

What is your favorite psychology book?

Probably Sherif’s The Psychology of Social Norms. I have to thank Rupert Brown for introducing me to Sherif’s ideas when I was his graduate student and I would recommend Sherif’s work to anyone who thinks our salvation is in technical detail and perfection—his clarity and vision are what sets him apart.

What is your favorite non-psychology book?

Too many to choose from, and many brilliant children’s books that I have enjoyed over the years. I guess the best of all is Dr. Seuss’s The Cat in the Hat. It is a true masterpiece. Another favorite is the NFL Handbook 1966. I acquired it after living in Chicago for a year when I was 8. On returning to England I cut out the center—mostly pictures of footballers—and secreted a tooth, my school bus pass, and a photo of my mum and dad inside it. I don’t think I ever read it though and, as a result, I still have no understanding of American Football—a game that seems to involve lots of mystifying pauses, gaps and debates, with occasional small but important steps forwards. A bit like psychology I suppose.

—Dominic Abrams
d.abrams@kent.ac.uk
SPSSI Finances & Outlook
By Margaret Bull Kovera, Secretary/Treasurer

I want to take this opportunity to give you an update on SPSSI’s financial health and some recent changes to the personnel who will oversee the finances of the organization.

Finances

SPSSI’s finances remain in good shape. We discussed a preliminary 2013 budget at the June Council Meeting and have proposed a budget that projects a surplus of about $3000. Because our revenues are heavily based on publication royalties and the volatility of the projections of those royalties over recent years, we cannot yet make solid predictions about future revenues. Therefore, Council will revisit the budget at its Mid-Winter meeting in early 2013 to determine what—if any—adjustments will be needed.

There is good news to report about our financial investments: SPSSI’s investment portfolio continued its upward trend in 2011, with an overall 5.6% increase in our investment account holdings. Our investments did well against the S&P benchmark, which was up only 2.1%. The increase in our stock holdings alone was up 9.6%. As of mid-year, our 2012 investments were performing more poorly (up 0.5% overall, stocks up 1.6%) in comparison to the S&P benchmark (up 6.8% for the same time period). Our advisors tell us this is due to the negative effects of lower energy costs on our energy holdings. They continue to believe that these holdings are good long-term investments and recommend staying the course. As of June 2012, our holdings in our investment accounts were valued at about $2,047,000 and our cash account contained $823,585. Thus, we continue to have a healthy financial reserve.

You may have noticed that in that last sentence I referred to the Secretary/Treasurer in the third-person and that was intentional. My term as S/T ended on August 31st and I am delighted that Council has appointed Blair Johnson as my replacement. There is no question that I am leaving you and SPSSI’s finances in very capable hands. Blair has experience managing large budgets and I am certain that he will bring that expertise, a wealth of new ideas, and fresh enthusiasm to the position. Please give him the support that you gave me during my term.

Finally, I want to thank all of you for granting me this opportunity to serve you these past three years. Given the state of our economy over the last three years, I cannot say that it was always a lot of fun to be overseeing SPSSI’s budget—I am still having flashbacks about receiving the news that Wiley had overprojected our revenue and a painful Council meeting in which we evaluated every budget line for potential cost savings—but I am grateful that I was able to participate in SPSSI’s governance in a meaningful way during a difficult time and to work with so many wonderful and dedicated SPSSI members. I hope that I will have the chance to do so again in the future.

—Margaret Bull Kovera
mkovera@jjay.cuny.edu
The Not-So-Clear-Cut Road from Science to Policy: A Few Lessons Learned
By Angel W. Colón-Rivera, James Marshall Scholar

Translating science into sound public policy is at the core of SPSSI’s mission. At face value, this is a logical cause. If public policy is designed to regulate public behavior, then social scientists who study behavior should be best equipped to inform policymaking. This is a central tenant of my belief system. It’s the reason I got into policy work and affiliated with SPSSI in the first place. Yet, during my tenure as the James Marshall Scholar, I’ve found that defining sound public policy and finding the proper empirical research to inform it can be quite a challenge. So, I will take this opportunity to jot down a few brief lessons out of the many I have learned.

Lesson 1: Not all research is created equally. Just about every debatable piece of legislation is backed by its own brand of partisan research. What research gets used in forming public policy ultimately depends on the Congress Member. Many Members of Congress and their staff rely on the work of the Congressional Research Service (CRS), the non-partisan research branch of the Library of Congress that works exclusively for Congress. CRS expertise encompasses every area of the policy spectrum, and the information they provide is based on academic, scientific, and governmental research. Sometimes, Members and staff do their own brand of desk research by seeking out credible experts and sources to craft their own conclusions based on their legislative agendas and the needs of the people they represent. Others choose not to rely on CRS or other credible sources and instead create policies that reflect their own values and those of their constituencies. Many times these Members rely on information provided by interest groups who either conduct their own biased research or rely on research performed by similar-minded organizations without a great deal of cross-referencing sources or fact-checking. Hence, every topic to be discussed can be backed by its own set of data—empirically-sound or otherwise.

Lesson 2: Quantitative vs. qualitative. We are a numbers-driven society, yet everyone loves a good story. I cannot stress enough how important statistical data is in shaping public policy and public opinion. However, a good story is just as important. As a qualitative researcher I’m interested in people’s histories as they relate to the larger narrative of the topic I’m researching. As it turns out, so are most politicians. The difference of course is that as a social scientist I look for the common themes in people’s stories to puzzle out a solution to the problem at hand. Most politicians just look for that one emblematic story that both reflects the cause they intend to champion and will move people to action, even if that story stands alone. As a social scientist working in the political arena, it’s my job to make sure that the single story championed reflects the needs of many.

Lesson 3: Don’t bring your journal ‘round here. Bring your abstract. A June 6th article by the Washington Times entitled “Congressional staffers, public shortchanged by high turnover, low pay” underscored the sad reality that most congressional staffers are young, overworked, and underpaid. As one of those staffers on a much more livable SPSSI-sponsored fellowship salary, I can attest that most of us won’t be able to take the time to read your journal article because we simply don’t have the time to do it. We will, however, read your short executive summary. Many students and academicians can’t fathom the thought of having to summarize years of research into a single page. We simply don’t have the training, our topics are too complex, and one page is not enough space to explain even the core hypothesis. These are all myths. If you’ve ever presented at a conference or published a paper, odds are that you have had to write an abstract because the selection committee at hand has to read dozens, if not hundreds, of these summaries in order to select the best ones. The life of a Hill staffer can be very similar. Only, instead of evaluating one-page summaries on one topic, they’re reading summaries on ten very different and disparate topics. To give you my personal example, on a typical day I meet with several people pitching their ideas on issues that range from human trafficking to reform of United States Postal Services. What might make your summary stand out from others is how clearly and concisely you deliver your narrative. For now, be aware that a summary will likely be read, and a 25-page journal article may not.

continued next page...
Lesson 4: SPSSI has a greater role to play in shaping the future of public policy. If you’re a SPSSI member reading this article, my personal bet is that you care more about what’s happening in the world than most people around you, and you believe that social science holds some of the clues to solving some of its problems. For 76 years, SPSSI has worked to inform public policy on the latest scientific developments that its membership produces. Now, more than ever, the ideological gap among policymakers has reached a rift of alarming proportions. The intense level of rhetoric in today’s political discourse is driving a wedge between those who trust in the benefits of science as a way forward and those who do not. Social issues are once again gaining prominence in the political discourse. It’s our job to make sure that its content remains informed by the sound science we produce.

—Angel W. Colón-Rivera
aw.colon787@gmail.com

SPSSI Policy Update
By Alex Ingrams, Policy Coordinator

At the APA Convention in Orlando this August, keynote speaker Chris Mooney said that “we are in the age of empowerment for aspiring science communicators.” His message had special relevance to psychologists who he said worked in a field that deserves to have high policy impact for its insights into human behavior, cooperation, and social well-being. The comments resonated with me after several months of policy work that have involved coordinating SPSSI’s efforts to communicate with policy members and the public on several critical areas of social policy in the United States.

The first of these, LGBT rights, was remarkable in that it placed SPSSI in close proximity to a grassroots campaign that it could react to speedily with a science-based advocacy program during the Biennial Convention in Charlotte, North Carolina. The program was in response to the constitutional amendment banning same-sex marriage that had been put to the voters in North Carolina just days before the Convention was due to start. We responded with a letter to the North Carolina Governor that was signed by 280 Convention attendees. During the Convention, attendees wore pins supporting marriage equality and there was a special handout highlighting events on LGBT issues on one side, and providing advocacy resources and ideas on the other (for more, see p. 19).

Communication with legislators at various levels of government is a key part of SPSSI’s policy efforts and a large part of the work that I do in Washington. Last week, SPSSI joined 99 other academic institutions and scientific associations in co-signing a letter from the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA). The letter decried wording in the U.S. House of Representatives bill—the Labor, Health and Human Services and Education Appropriations Act for 2013—that would strip the National Institutes of Health (NIH) of its funding for economic research programs. The letter highlighted that such funding has historically been vital for “research on the linkages between socioeconomic status and health outcomes in the elderly and achievement and health outcomes in children.”

In other work at the APA Convention in August, I chaired a symposium as part of a series of LGBT sessions organized by the APA LGBT Concerns Office. The panel “Dimensions of LGBT Parenting in Florida and Beyond” aimed to address the role of psychological research in the landmark case that struck down Florida’s ban on adoption by Gay and Lesbian parents. The event brought together researcher Henny Bos of the University of Amsterdam, clinical psychologist Shara Sand, and ACLU senior staff attorney Leslie Cooper to discuss Gill vs. Florida and the current issues impacting LGBT parents and their children.

It has been immensely exciting to be part of these policy and communication efforts with SPSSI members and I look forward to continuing these efforts to amplify the findings of SPSSI research for public policymakers. In his talk at the APA Convention, Chris Mooney reminded the audience repeatedly of the potential for psychologists to communicate using all kinds of media tools that are available to us today. There has never been a better time for psychologists to step into the public sphere and find a platform that shares their research in exciting and engaging ways.

—Alex Ingrams
aingrams@spssi.org
Dalmas Taylor Fellow

By Tissyana Camacho, Dalmas Taylor Fellow

My time as the Dalmas Taylor Fellow was a truly great learning experience. As an academic, policy implications of research are often spoken about, but not in great detail. Being able to immerse myself in policy and research in Washington, D.C. proved to be a challenging, yet wonderfully rewarding experience. Throughout my fellowship, I worked with the policy coordinator at SPSSI, Alex Ingrams, and all members of the Government Relations Office at the American Psychological Association. Though I specifically focus on immigration, I was able to work on a variety of social issues such as discrimination, human trafficking, and HIV/AIDS. I attended briefings on Capitol Hill, as well as at the Center for American Progress and the Johns Hopkins School of Advanced International Studies. Several times I was able to meet with legislative aides to discuss social issues and how research helps provide scientific evidence on certain aspects of social issues. The majority of the policymakers I spoke with were enthusiastic about the role of research in policy, which was comforting for the future since there is clearly a gap between research and policy that needs to be bridged.

Working on social issues that differed from my own interests was incredibly helpful in understanding social issues in general, the different ways to address social issues, and how to work on prevention and intervention. Overall, I believe the experience as the Dalmas Taylor Fellow will prove promising in my career as I am now a more well-rounded researcher. It has always been important for me to link research and policy together, and I am now much more confident in being able to address the sensitive, yet necessary, relationship between the two.

—Tissyana Camacho
tissyana.camacho@hotmail.com

Journal of Social Issues Update

By B. Ann Bettencourt, JSI Editor

It is a great honor to have been chosen as the next Editor of JSI. I am sincerely grateful to SPSSI, the Council, and the Publications Committee.

As the incoming Editor, I urge you to consider guest editing a JSI issue. I encourage you to talk to colleagues who conduct research in your area of expertise about putting together a pre-proposal for consideration as a journal issue. You can read the full description of the proposal and editorial process online at SPSSI’s JSI webpage.

The web link has detailed and helpful information, but the following is a brief description of the pre-proposal submission process.

A preliminary proposal is submitted to the JSI Editor for feedback on the general focus of the issue and its feasibility. The preliminary proposal includes a brief vision statement (1–2 pages) that includes a description of the focus of the issue and a tentative table of contents. The table of contents includes a breakdown of the subsections of the issue as well as a list of potential titles and authors. A few members of the Editorial Board will review the preliminary proposal. The reviewers look for important and timely topics that promise to be of considerable interest to the JSI readership as well as for a strong and diverse group of scholars whose collective contributions appear to represent a coherent, compelling theme. The reviewers and the Editor will provide suggestions about the content (revisions, omissions, extensions, reorganizations) and for additional contributors and subtopics.

As you can see, although involving much conceptualization, this first step in the submission process is relatively straightforward. If the idea of submitting a pre-proposal appeals to you, please check the list of recent JSI issues. SPSSI and JSI seek to publish research on a vast array of social-issues topics. Please be sure your ideas for an issue do not overlap substantially with recent topics published in JSI. A list of topics already published can be found at the JSI Archives page with upcoming topics in future issues can be found at the JSI Issues in Progress page.

continued next page...
At the recent SPSSI conference, I met with a variety of researchers to discuss both the submission process as well as ideas for issue topics. I very much enjoyed those conversations, and I would enjoy having a conversation with you. Please contact me if you would like to discuss possibilities for topics or if you have any questions about the publication process.

As a former guest Co-Editor of a JSI volume on grassroots organizing, I can tell you that the process and experience of putting together a thematic issue for JSI is a very rewarding endeavor. Again, I encourage you to consider developing an issue for JSI.

—B. Ann Bettencourt
Bettencourta@Missouri.edu

Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy Update

By Kevin Lanning, ASAP Editor

Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy (ASAP) continues to prosper. A virtual issue on consumption psychology, with target articles by Bowerman & Markowitz and Liu & Sibley, should be live on our Wiley site by the time you read this. Additional collections on Non-normative Romantic Relationships (Conley) and Radicalization of US Muslims (McCauley) are in the pipeline. Papers on same-sex marriage (Duncan), beliefs about ‘birtherism’ (Crawford) and the role of just world beliefs in the courtroom (Dover) have recently appeared in Early View. Finally, we have recently issued two new calls for papers:

Heather Bullock and Joel Nadler will co-edit a new collection on The Future of Women’s Reproductive Health: Evidence, Policy, and Politics. This collection will bring together diverse perspectives on the status of reproductive rights in the 21st century and examine social psychological, political, and cultural dimensions of reproductive rights and social justice. Submissions should be short papers of approximately 10–35 pages. Potential areas of interest include (a) studies of attitudes toward gender roles, reproductive rights, and social policy, (b) comparative analyses and international perspectives on reproductive rights, (c) case studies of grassroots initiatives and political mobilization related to reproductive justice, (d) studies of media, including framing and discourse analyses of reproductive rights, and (e) intersectional analyses of racism, sexism, classism, heterosexism, and other forms of discrimination on access to reproductive health services. We anticipate that commentaries, based on papers published in Early View, will round out the collection. Inquiries should be sent to issue editors Bullock or Nadler To ensure full editorial consideration, manuscripts should be submitted online by February 5, 2013.

In addition, I am welcoming papers on the Social Psychology of the 2012 US Presidential Election. This collection will be the third in ASAP’s series on American Presidential elections, continuing a tradition that began with our collection on the 2004 election and continued with the 2008 campaign. Potential areas of interest include (a) studies of candidates, including content or other analyses of political addresses and debates, using analytic approaches informed by psychological theory and methods, (b) studies of the electorate, or parts of the electorate, including studies of political decision making (e.g., heuristics and biases, functional accounts of voting vs. not voting) as well as studies of personality, values, and political ideology, (c) studies of the roles of implicit as well as explicit racism, sexism, and/or religious intolerance in the campaigns, in advertisements sponsored by political action committees (including Super PACs), in media coverage of the campaigns, and in voting behavior, (d) studies of media effects, including conventional as well as social
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media, direct as well as indirect (e.g., dynamic, viral) effects, and studies of bias in news, talk radio, and satirical programming, (e) studies of policies and programs that affect voter participation, including those which facilitate voting as well as those which appear aimed to inhibit or disenfranchise potential voters, (f) studies of political culture and identity, as these impact or are impacted by the election, and (g) comparative analyses and international perspectives on the election. Manuscripts should be submitted online by March 20, 2013; please contact me if you have questions.

—Kevin Lanning
ASAP.editor@gmail.com
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Affirmative Meritocracy.
  Gregory M. Walton, Steven J. Spence, & Sam Erman

  Michael S. North & Susan Fiske

Rethinking Homelessness Prevention among Persons with Serious Mental Illness.
  Ann Elizabeth Montgomery, Stephen Metraux, & Dennis Culhane

The Cross-Race Effect and Eyewitness Identification: How to Improve Recognition and Reduce Decision Errors in Eyewitness Situations.
  John Paul Wilson, Kurt Hugenberg, & Michael J. Bernstein

More is Not Always Better: Intuitions About Effective Public Policy Can Lead to Unintended Consequences.
  E. Peters, W. M. P. Klein, A. R. Kaufmann, L. R. Meilleur, & A. Dixon

Culturally Motivated Challenges to Innovations in Integrative Research: Theory and Solutions
  Chi-yue Chiu, Letty Y-Y Kwan, & Shyhnan Liou

  Emma F. Thomas & Winnifred R. Louis
Some highlights from the SPSSI convention...

1. David Livert & Demis Glasford, Convention Co-Chairs after a long day’s work.
2. President-Elect Dominic Abrams & Dr. Anja Eller share a laugh at the conference.
3. President Allen Omoto and Past-President Maureen O’Connor light up the hotel lobby.
4. From UCSC, (L-R) Angela Nguyen, Dr. Regina Langhout, Jesica Siham Fernandez (past GSC Chair), Alex Bowen, and Diana Yip smile for the SPSSI camera.
5. Dr. Stephanie Fryberg and others enjoy the coffee break before hitting the next session.
6. Crosby-Spendlove Travel Grant winner Ayse Burcin Erarslan (Koc University, see p. 27) presents her poster.
8. PhD student Patrick Sweeney (Graduate Center, CUNY) presents his poster.
Keynote Recap: Yes We Can!

Social Psychologist Stephen Reicher (University of St Andrews, UK) was among the keynote speakers who inspired SPSSI members with his talk on the social psychology of resistance and collective action. Here, he touches on his conference address and what we can do to continue advancing psychology in the public interest.

You have one tough newsletter editor.

A while back Janice wrote to me asking for a piece which did three things. The first, was to summarize the themes of my keynote in Charlotte. The second was to discuss the ways I have sought to use my work to inform policy. The third was to reflect on how best we can communicate our work both to academic and to broader audiences.

Oh yes, and all that in a couple of pages or so. I was immediately reminded of Mark Twain who was once asked to produce an essay of 300 words in 3 days. His response was effectively, “300 words? 30 days! 3 days? 3,000 words.”

Anyway, as I drove into work this morning, pondering on what to write, I heard a piece on the radio about how “the people’s voice” project—in which famous actors speak the words of famous and less famous folk who sought to change their world—was coming from the US to the UK. The project, which many of you will know, originated in Howard Zinn’s magisterial People’s History of the United States. The book is a compelling example of “history from below”—a history which brings out the contribution of ordinary people from under the accumulated weight of tales concerning kings and queens, the “great” and the “good.” But the unspoken premise is that ordinary people make history to the extent that they act together. It is collectively that the masses can shape their fate and that of others. As the old Trades Union slogan has it, the power of the powerless lies in their combination.

So Zinn’s history, and the people’s voice, is made up of tales of social movements and collective actions, of demonstrations and strikes and boycotts and riots, of people combining to contest oppression and to claim their rights and to refuse their humiliations. It is above all a crowd history.

And that is precisely why, throughout history, those who seek to preserve our unjust and unequal world as it is have sought to discredit crowds, crowd action, and collectivity more generally. Moreover, psychology and psychologists have been a key part of that enterprise. From the work of Gustave Le Bon and his notion of mindless mobs, to the countless ways in which contemporary researchers argue that groups diminish us intellectually and morally, there has always been a raging chorus chanting the refrain that the seat of humanity lies in the lone individual and that the more we get together the less we become.

That was brought home to me in my first year as a student after we occupied the University administration building in order to demand nursery facilities that would improve educational access for women. The Principal came to a meeting and portrayed us in pure Le Bonian terms as an emotional and irrational mass. It was what motivated me to study groups and crowds. In recent times it has motivated me—along with many colleagues, notably Alex Haslam—to challenge the huge “conformity bias” in social psychology which suggests that human beings are somehow programmed to follow orders and that they are particularly prone to do so in the mass.

Our work has sought to show three things. First, even those foundational studies which are used in the textbooks to illustrate our conformist tendencies—the Asch studies, Milgram’s “Obedience” research, Zimbardo’s Stanford Prison Study—when re-examined carefully show remarkable degrees of resistance to influence and to authority. What is more, even when we look at the most oppressive circumstances imaginable—prisons, gulags, death camps—we always find people resisting. And, critically, that resistance is always made possible by being collective.

continued next page...
Second, where we find progressive social change, it is never handed away by the benevolence of the dominant group (as mainstream research on intergroup inequality seems to suggest), but rather it occurs when the subordinate group bands together to challenge their situation. Certainly, in response to their challenge some who have privilege may break away and agitate for change. Certainly also, the privileged party may legislate in recognition of the facts which the oppressed have established on the ground. But slavery was ultimately abolished less because of white reformers than because of slave revolts. Civil Rights was legislated less because of the Kennedys than because of civil rights agitation and urban unrest. If, as psychologists we want to study how to reduce prejudice we should focus our studies on how to increase collective action.

Third, then, by participating in such actions, people’s humanity is not diminished. It is enhanced. Thus, as people come to define themselves in terms of membership of a collective movement, so their concerns shift from petty day-to-day matters to the fate of the group as a whole. Equally, shared membership in a movement leads to a sense of connection and intimacy and mutual support amongst those involved. It leads to organization and coordination and so empowers people to achieve their collective goals. It leads to what we have called “collective self-realization” (a concept which has echoes of Maslow’s self-actualisation) which is the source of much of the passion, the joy, the “effervescence,” of crowds. All in all, it is only in the group that people gain social agency—a far cry from the traditional notion that we lose our agency in the mass.

These various ideas are highly consequential, and over the years we have tried to implement them in various domains. One example concerns the ways that crowds are policed. The notion that people are irrational and always at least potentially violent in large gatherings has long informed policing strategies. It has led to repressive approaches which carry the danger of creating a self-fulfilling prophecy. The notion that crowds are dangerous places increasingly limits participation to those “street fighting men” who relish a good confrontation. Additionally, the increasing limits set on people once they assemble—and the denial of lawful rights—can enrage even the most placid citizen.

Accordingly, along with my colleague Clifford Stott, we have sought to transform the principles and practice of public order policing. Our starting point is that the police should start by asking how they can facilitate, not how they can prevent crowd action. And, if some in the crowd do become violent, they should develop training, tactics, and technologies which allow them to clearly differentiate between those involved and others with more peaceful aims. We do not suggest that this will avoid all conflict, especially where protestors seek to challenge existing laws. But we do claim that in many settings it will make collective participation more attractive for people and police alike, it will enhance a participatory democracy and it will allow more people to hone their sense of what is possible in the world through coming together in the crowd. In Britain and across Europe, our approach is beginning to bear fruit.

Another example concerns the way that mass emergencies are managed. In this domain both the professional and the popular imagination is dominated by the widely diffused notion of panic. What Hollywood disaster movie would be complete without, at one point or another, people (principally women) running around wildly, their hands waving in the air and shrieking at the top of their voices? We all know of stories where the mass stampeded, blocked the exits and so perished when rational thought would have allowed them to get away.

The problem is that these stories (like the film images) are based more in fiction than in fact and that they are highly misleading. What generally happens in emergencies is that shared danger leads to the emergence of a shared sense of collective identity. This then leads to the forms of...
solidarity and mutual support that have been described above. When people die, it is often because they were helping others, even strangers, rather than trampling them.

With another long-time colleague, John Drury, and alongside others besides, we have been drawing on these ideas to rethink the notion of resilience in emergencies. Traditionally, resilience was largely seen as the extent to which emergency services can intervene when tragedy strikes. According to this view, the helpless public, rendered even more helpless by panic, relies upon the help of professionals to save them. The danger is that this leads such professionals to ignore or even disrupt the ways in which victims help themselves and each other. We suggest that, instead, resilience be seen in terms of the self-organization of the public. The role of government and emergency services is to encourage and to facilitate such self-organization rather than substitute for it. The public are not just the victims. They are the first responders. Once again, this type of approach is gaining increasing traction in the UK and also the US.

So far I have sketched out the core ideas of my keynote. I have also outlined some of the ways that we are trying to put our ideas into practice. It remains for me to say just a few words about communication. Often, this is seen as a question of technique—how to design your powerpoint, give your speech or whatever. Well of course it is in part. Mumbling at your shoes never helps. But I think it is much more a question of attitude.

Psychology often feels threatened as a science. As a result we feel we have to prove our credentials, not least by adopting the external signs of scientific rigor. Central to this is a claim to objectivity. We cannot be seen to be enthusiastic or excited by what we are doing because that would show us to be partisan. And so we present ourselves and our work in as cold a manner as possible. The last thing we want to be accused of is being rhetorical. But of course this is a style like any other. It is a rhetoric. A rhetoric of boredom.

I think this is very damaging. Of course we must be rigorous in how we conduct our research and we must be willing to abandon cherished ideas (or accept unwelcome ones) if the evidence requires it. But what we research is very different. There is nothing “objective” about the issues that we choose to address and the topics to which we devote our life’s work. What is more, however rigorous the manner in which we arrive at answers, they will still matter little if the original questions are uninteresting. Equally, others are unlikely to be interested in our answers unless we persuade them that our questions matter.

In this regard, communication depends upon being passionate. It starts from getting people to care about the things we are doing and to want to know the answers. Part of that is inevitably personal. If we can convey both why we care and that we care, we are more likely to carry others with us. And, in the end, if you do truly care about the issues, you are less likely to publish for the sake of publishing. You will care more for the truth. You will be more objective.

In brief, good communication and good science is passionate science. It is science about things that matter to us. And recovering the people’s voice, changing our views of the crowds in which they express it, is something that I think does matter.

That’s it, Janice. I have done what you asked. I may have gone a little overlength, but I hope you won’t be too hard on me.

—Stephen Reicher
sdr@st-andrews.ac.uk
Early Career Scholars

The Early Career Scholars committee was very busy in Charlotte!

Here’s a recap of our two major activities at the conference.

Pre-Conference

We held a pre-conference workshop geared around the “Three E” themes of Maureen O’Connor’s presidency. Heather Bullock spoke about engaging disciplinary organizations toward policy ends in the session on Equity; Michael Vandenberg and June Flora were our mentors for the Environment session; and Scott Plous gave an inspiring talk on Action Teaching for the Education session (see p. 42 for details about the Action Teaching Award). Thank you to all of them, and to SPSSI Council and SPSSI officers for mentoring attendees over lunch.

Highly Effective Junior Faculty

We held a panel on the “Seven Habits of Highly Effective Junior Faculty” (with apologies to Stephen R. Covey for the title). We wish to thank all of the enthusiastic early career scholars who came, and especially to thank those who served as panelists: Diana Sanchez and Adam Fingerhut (the two most recent recipients of SPSSI’s Michele Alexander award) and Shantal Marshall and Amanda Clinton (the recipients of this year’s SPSSI teaching awards, see p. 26). On the SPSSI Early Career Facebook page, which we encourage you to visit and “like,” we have posted the extended lists of top tips from our panelists and links to relevant resources. Here are the highlights and how they link in to the committee’s initiatives for the upcoming year.

A primary focus in our discussion was how to prioritize writing time. Many early career scholars find that they “binge write” on academic breaks and are unable to make slow, steady progress during the semester. Robert Boice (check out his book from our Facebook page) has identified slow, steady writing as a behavior that distinguishes successful academics from non-successful academics. Our panelists also stressed the importance of setting aside “appointments with yourself”—ideally 30-60 minutes on a daily basis—that are dedicated solely to writing. To keep you on track, there are several models of writing accountability groups; see the link on our Facebook page to the National Center for Faculty Diversity and Development for more information about the different models. This year, the ECS committee hopes to “soft-launch” a writing accountability program for interested early career SPSSI members. This may take a simple form at first (e.g., matching writing buddies) or a more complex form (e.g., forming larger groups, or geographically proximate groups). We encourage you to keep an eye out for more information over the next few months.

We had an interesting discussion about two other points. The first was saying yes versus. no to requests from other people. Our panelists productively disagreed in their advice on this point. Although many people would benefit from learning how to politely say no, keep in mind that saying yes to certain kinds of service, training opportunities, and favors can pay dividends down the road. The second point was how to make your career work both for and with you, rather than being a source of misery. Our panelists encouraged attendees to: (1) think carefully about how you can align your passions with the goals and missions of your department and institution; (2) know how you work, and make that work for you; (3) be yourself in the classroom; (4) remember you are forever a student; and (5) enjoy the process of doing what you do. All of this advice shares an underlying message: instead of constantly struggling, do whatever it takes to find the joy and “fit” between you and your job.

—Jessica Salvatore, ECS Chair
jsalvatore@amherst.edu
Equality Advocacy at the Fore in Charlotte, NC

North Carolina’s harsh ban on gay marriage was a disheartening event for civil rights in the US. But attendees at the Biennial Conference in Charlotte had the opportunity to tell the State why SPSSI stands with the LGBT community. Here’s what took place:

- SPSSI Executive Committee moved quickly to write a letter to the North Carolina Governor expressing the position of psychological research on the benefits of marriage equality to society and voiced our opposition to prejudice and restrictions on civil freedoms.

- A special handout for conference attendees highlighted LGBT-themed sessions.

- Conference attendees wore “MARRIAGE EQUALITY” pins at the Conference and around the city.

- We distributed colorful flyers throughout the conference that provide top tips on advocacy for marriage equality. Flyers are available for download on the SPSSI website.

- A panel of local advocates and SPSSI policy staff talked to attendees about the most effective ways to campaign for change at the local, state, and federal levels.

- The SPSSI letter to the governor was available to read and sign at the Conference registration desk. Nearly 300 individuals signed the letter, among them guests from the Conference hotel whose interests were piqued by the visible stand of psychologists voicing their beliefs.

More information is available on the SPSSI website at:

http://www.spssi.org/NCMarriageEquality

THANK YOU TO EVERYONE WHO TOOK PART!
SPSSI 2012 Distinguished Service Awards

At SPSSI’s Biennial Conference in June, we were delighted to recognize Dr. Virginia O’Leary, Dr. Susan Opotow, Dr. Marybeth Shinn, and Dr. Greg Wilmoth with the SPSSI Distinguished Service Award for 2012. As the committee noted, “We recognize these individuals with the SPSSI Distinguished Service Award with gratitude, and with deep appreciation for the scope of their service to our organization and its impact to science, and to public policy at the local and national levels. We are the fortunate recipients of their energy and commitment to the basic tenets of SPSSI.”

The 2012 Distinguished Service Award Selection Committee members were Drs. Dan Perlman (Chair), Barbara Gutek, and Bernice Lott. The following Distinguished Service Award citations were compiled by Dan Pearlman.

Virginia O’Leary

Virginia O’Leary received her Ph.D. at Wayne State University in 1969. She was Assistant and Associate Professor of Psychology at Oakland University, Rochester, Michigan. After that, she held the position of Deputy Executive Officer for Public Affairs at the American Psychological Association, followed by serving as Professor and Chair in the Department of Psychology at Indiana State University, Terre Haute, Indiana. Despite the fact that she had a very difficult time thinking of herself as an Alabaman, she moved to Auburn University in 1994 where she was also professor and chair of the psychology department. She retired and became Professor Emerita in 2006.

Ginny O’Leary was President of SPSSI in 1994-1995 and served on Council from 1978-1980 and again from 1981-1983. Her service for SPSSI started in 1978 when she was elected to Council and served on SPSSI’s Courtwatch Committee. She has variously served on a plethora of SPSSI standing and ad-hoc committees, including: SPSSI Nominations for APA Boards and Committees, the APA Program Committee, the James Marshall Oversight and Search Committee, the SPI (Scientist in the Public Interest) Search Committee, and Ad-Hoc Committee on Public Information, the Committee on Media Coverage of Social Issues, the Elections Committee, and the Expert Bank Oversight Committee. When she was President-Elect in 1993, SPSSI Council approved a motion that the Task Force on International Issues and the UN become a SPSSI Committee of the same name with permanent standing. Even with all of that, I may have missed a few of her activities for SPSSI.

Incidentally, Ginny was President when SPSSI held its first stand-alone convention in Ann Arbor in 1996, the year SPSSI celebrated its 60th birthday.

Ginny is a Fellow in the Association of Psychological Science and in the American Psychological Association, Divisions 9, 35, 45, and 46. She was President of Division 35 in 1986-1987. In 1990, she received the APA’s Committee on Women in Psychology, Leadership Citation Award. In 2004, she received the Auburn University Presidential Award of Excellence.

Though she became Professor Emerita in 2006, Ginny hasn’t really retired. Having directed an East/West Conference on Health and Well-Being in Kathmandu, Nepal in March 2001, she received a Fulbright to go to Tribhuvan University in Kathmandu in 2005. She had found a new love. So she flew to Kathmandu and talked to the Vice Chancellor of Kathmandu University and from 2007-2009, she taught there for six months. She learned Nepali, but also discovered that the Nepali culture has some negative features. She is working on a book tentatively titled, Dancing with Despair: Enchanted, Disappointed and Disillusioned in the Developing World.

Ginny is now back in Massachusetts, doing something else that has pervaded her life: being involved with politics—in this case, the upcoming national election. As a college student she marched for peace in Washington, DC and tutored underprivileged youths in Pittsburgh. As
Susan Opotow

Susan Opotow is a glowing model of a social psychologist whose entire career has been characterized by engagement in the study of social issues and the advancement of social justice. From a BA earned at Antioch College, and a PhD at Columbia, followed by years of committed research, teaching, advocacy, and service, she is now a professor of Sociology at CUNY’s John Jay College of Criminal Justice and a professor in the CUNY Graduate Center’s doctoral program in criminal justice and social and personality psychology.

Susan’s scholarly work has focused on issues relevant to peace, conflict, ethics, and injustice. Within this body of work, her writing on moral exclusion will continue to rank among the truly most significant contributions to the social science literature on inter-group relations and the intersections of conflict, morality, and oppression. There is brilliant simplicity and immense complexity in her thesis that seeing others as outside the ordinary scope of justice (i.e., moral exclusion) is a prime correlate of discrimination, exploitation, hate, and violence directed toward these “others.” She is concerned not only with the antecedents, process, and consequences of moral exclusion but also with those of moral inclusion and the promotion of social justice.

The many honors that Susan has received include three that serve to illustrate the scope of her engagement as a SPSSI exemplar. The University of Massachusetts bestowed on her its President’s Public Service Award in 2003; in 2008 she received the Morton Deutsch Conflict Resolution Award from APA’s Division 48; and John Jay College honored her with a 2009–2010 Faculty Scholarly Excellence Award. She currently serves as the editor of *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology.*

Susan has served SPSSI with grace and intelligence, love and commitment over many years in a wide variety of capacities, each one reflecting different aspects of her interests and skills. Among these specific contributions to SPSSI governance, smooth functioning, and effectiveness are her editorship of the Newsletter for three years in the early 90s and her two terms on SPSSI Council. Her role as liaison to two significant groups illustrate the unique breadth of SPSSI interests and concerns and Susan’s active involvement with them—the United Nations in New York, and the informal but powerful rump APA group, originally called the Committee of Eight, and now the Divisions of Social Justice. And, of course, Susan helped to organize and plan some of the extraordinary events that were part of SPSSI’s 75th anniversary celebration.

Susan Opotow radiates the SPSSI spirit and incorporates SPSSI values and concerns in all she does in her professional life. One important example is her role in organizing a conference at her college in 2008 on The Interrogation and Torture Controversy: Crisis in Psychology, at which APA critics and non-critics presented and interacted. It is clearly an honor and a joy to present to Susan this 2012 SPSSI award for her distinguished service to the organization and to the issues that are as salient today as in SPSSI’s proud history.

Marybeth (Beth) Shinn

Beth Shinn is a distinguished SPSSI member whose contributions have done so much for SPSSI and for the profession of psychology. Her special talents were obvious early in her adulthood when she was chosen as Radcliffe College’s most promising senior. Today, Beth is recognized as an innovative social scientist, an outstanding teacher, a very effective administrator, and a persuasive policy advocate. Throughout her career, she has been a highly principled person with a strong moral compass who—via both her actions and her judicious, clear voice—has fostered social justice and human welfare.

Beth completed her PhD in community and social psychology at Michigan, then joined the faculty at New York University. She remained there until 2008 when she moved to Vanderbilt University. Over the years, Beth has been a Russell Sage Postdoctoral Fellow, and a visiting scholar or faculty member at the Instituto Superior do Psicologia in Portugal, the National Institute for the Study of Demography in France, and the Institute of Personality and Social Research at the University of California, Berkeley.

An overarching theme of Beth’s research is on social settings and the individuals in them: the measurement of settings, how they influence behavior, and how they can be changed. Arguably the centerpiece of her research has been on homelessness. She has tackled the thorny issue of how to measure it, analyzed its antecedents, assessed interventions to alleviate homelessness and recommended ways to help those who are homeless. Beyond her research, she has been an expert witness, a faculty member for Policy Academies to better inform state officials, a member of the Research Advisory Panel for the New York City Department of Homeless Services, author of a report on homeless children for the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, and author of a pamphlet for the National Alliance for Ending Homelessness (a nonprofit, non-partisan organization dedicated to ending homelessness).
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Beth has received numerous awards during her career including teaching awards at the Departmental and College level at NYU, the Ethnic/Minority Mentoring Award from the Society of Community Research and Action, the Award for Distinguished Contributions to Theory and Research from the Society of Community Research and Action, and the Social Policy Edited Book Award from the Society for Research on Adolescence.

Beth has contributed to SPSSI in many ways over many years. Her first major involvement was editing a 1981 *JSI* issue on institutions such as mental hospitals and their alternatives while she was still an assistant professor. A regular flow of *JSI* articles followed. In 1990 she edited her influential *JSI* collection on homelessness. From 1996 through 1999 she served on SPSSI Council. In 2005, she was SPSSI’s President. In 2010 she gave an excellent Biennial Conference keynote address on poverty, social exclusion, and homelessness.

During her Presidency, Beth championed a member survey that showed the high priority SPSSI members assigned to national level policy advocacy. A focal issue during Beth’s Presidency was the APA’s lack of response to the torturous treatment of prisoners at Guantanamo Bay. Beth resigned from APA in 2007 “because the American Psychological Association continues to condone psychologists’ work in detention centers that violate international law and because of actions by APA’s leadership to discourage dissent from its policies in this matter.” SPSSI recognizes Beth Shinn with its Distinguished Service Award with deepest gratitude.

Gregory Wilmeth

Greg Wilmoth is a SPSSI “honest broker” par excellence. Consistent with an earlier phrasing of SPSSI’s mission statement, Greg is a person whose career has been dedicated to obtaining and disseminating factual data regarding social change and other social processes through the promotion of psychological research on significant questions of social life. He has fostered the application of those findings to the problems of society. In doing so, he has been a neutral, objective scientist capable of not taking sides over competing ideologies but providing key information to better inform decision-making.

Greg received his PhD in social psychology from the University of Florida in 1980. From 1980 until 1987, he was an Assistant Professor at the University of Maryland where he taught organizational assessment and evaluation. In 1987 he became SPSSI’s second Public Policy Fellow. He was the first Fellow to be housed in the American Psychological Association offices, where he worked on a number of issues, including fostering a U.S. Peace Academy.

After being SPSSI’s Policy Fellow, Greg moved to the U.S. General Accounting Office (GAO; an independent, nonpartisan agency that works for Congress), where he held senior scientific and administrative roles including Assistant Director.

Within the GAO, Greg has focused on human resources policies and practices, in part developing a unique database of the histories of American workers. Many of his contributions can be clustered under the heading of public policy and public administration. For example, in 2011 he reported on whether the Environmental Protection Agency was living up to its mission, whether lobbyists were following disclosure rules, and the use of key indicator system. A search of the GAO web site shows he has contributed to 109 reports on such SPSSI topics as the gender gap in salaries, fostering the hiring of older workers, increasing the hiring of individuals with disabilities, and protecting the environment.

Within SPSSI, Greg has been a member of Council and held several other roles. These include: co-chairing 1988 Social Issues Conference; chairing SPSSI’s Liaison Committee with the Office of Public Legislation, SPSSI’s Public Interest Psychologists, SPSSI’s Washington D.C. Regional Group, and SPSSI’s Conflict of Interest Task Force; being a member of the *JSI* editorial board, the SPSSI U.N. Non-governmental Organization Representative, and serving on SPSSI’s James Marshall Public Policy Fellow Oversight and Search Committee for nearly 20 years.

Greg has also contributed to SPSSI’s publications, articulating the honest broker role in an *ASAP* article and editing a highly regarded *JSI* issue on abortion. Greg’s introduction to the abortion issue was a tour de force. He insightfully analyzed the research questions associated with pro-life and pro-choice political positions. His methodological acumen shone through in his critique of how well (or poorly) the extant studies of abortion answered those questions. He pointed to the research still needing to be done before women could be accurately given information on the risks of abortion as mandated by some states. Complementing his *JSI* issue, on behalf of SPSSI, Greg prepared and presented testimony on the consequences of abortion to the U. S. Surgeon General’s office.

In addition to his long history with SPSSI, Greg has also been deeply involved in the *Society for Environmental, Population and Conservation Psychology*. He served as president of that group in 2004-05 and was elected for two terms as that Division’s representative to APA Council during which time he partnered with SPSSI in advancing mutual interests. We recognize Greg Wilmoth with the SPSSI Distinguished Service Award with deep appreciation for the scope of his service to our organization, and his exemplary contributions as a social scientist for 25 plus years playing an honest broker role in the formation of U.S. public policy.
Miles Hewstone

2012 Kurt Lewin Award Winner

This year’s Lewin Award was presented at the biennial convention to Miles Hewstone, Professor of Social Psychology at Oxford University, England. Having received his D.Phil from Oxford in 1981, he subsequently worked with such psychology greats as Serge Moscovici and Wolfgang Stroebe. Miles Hewstone has served as editor of the British Journal of Social Psychology and was co-founding editor of the European Review of Social Psychology. Beyond his impressive publications record (over 200 scholarly articles and contributions to edited volumes and over 20 books), he received the British Psychological Society’s (BPS) Spearman Medal (1987), the BPS President’s Award for Distinguished Contributions to Psychological Knowledge (2001), the European Association for Social Psychology’s Kurt Lewin Award for Distinguished Research Achievement (2005), SPSSI’s Gordon Allport Intergroup Relations Prize (2005), and the Society for Personality and Social Psychology’s Robert B. Cialdini Award (2008). Befitting someone who is awarded two different Kurt Lewin awards, Miles Hewstone is actively involved in efforts to improve intergroup relations through public policy in the UK, as well as through non-academic outlets including appearances on BBC Newsnight and the BBC Radio 4 programs Mind Changers and All in the Mind. We applaud Miles Hewstone and his achievements in advancing social psychology to inform modern issues of intergroup conflict throughout the world.

Miles Hewstone’s Lewin address will be published in a future JSI issue. Below is the abstract from his talk.

Intergroup Contact & Its Critics: Four Funerals & a Wedding

Intergroup contact theory (Allport, 1954; Hewstone, 2009) constitutes social psychology’s major weapon in the fight against prejudice. Notwithstanding its impressive meta-analytic support (Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006) critics have attacked theory and research on contact for four major perceived limitations: (1) its avoidance of real group differences, and hence lack of practical significance (McCaughey, 2001); (2) its emphasis on rarefied conditions that are rarely, if ever, found outside the laboratory, and an over-reliance on attitudinal outcomes (Dixon et al., 2005); (3) its emphasis on the individual level, which may reduce prejudice, whereas contact interventions at the societal level may heighten perceived threat, and increase prejudice (Forbes, 1997); (4) its failure to account for the purported negative impact of neighborhood diversity on trust (Putnam, 2007). In response to these critiques I draw on a welter of my own experimental, cross-sectional and longitudinal data, much of it based on large probability surveys, showing how contemporary theory and research on contact have successfully responded to these claims. Intergroup contact theory hence provides a powerful, theoretically-based tool for engaging with conflictual intergroup relations. It can, moreover, play a key role as a powerful theoretical framework at the intersection of multiple social and behavioral sciences—sociology, political science, and social psychology—whose potential to impact policy is still unrealized.
SPSSI 2012 Applied Social Issues Internship Funding

This program encourages and funds research that is conducted in cooperation with a community or government organization, a public interest group, or other non-for-profit entity that will benefit directly from the project. Members of the Applied Social Issues Award Committee included Drs. Ronni Greenwood and Aisling O’Donnell.

For further details and eligibility requirements, please visit the Applied Social Issues Internship page.

Congratulations to the following recipients:

Lauren Dewey, John Jay College of Criminal Justice
Providing care for many in the context of few resources: Consequences for healthcare providers in rural Uganda.

Silvia Fernandez-Campos, The New School for Social Research
Helpful and hurtful empathy in relation to rape survivors.

Alexis Halkovic, The Graduate Center CUNY
The prison-to-college pipeline: Participatory action research as support in the transition of NYC Justice Corps members through higher education.

Alicia Sanchez, Vanderbilt University
Gaining perspective on Community Land Trusts (CLTs): A pilot study to measure the neighborhood effects of a shared equity housing model.

SPSSI 2012 Spring Clara Mayo Grants

The Clara Mayo Grant Program was set up to support master’s theses or pre-dissertation research on aspects of sexism, racism, or prejudice, with preference given to students enrolled in a terminal master’s program. Studies of the application of theory or the design of interventions or treatments to address these problems are welcomed. The 2012 Spring Selection Committee consisted of Drs. Phillip Hammack (Chair), University of California at Santa Cruz, Sara McClelland, University of Michigan, David Frost, San Francisco State University, and Kristin Lane, Bard College. For more details, please visit the Clara Mayo Grants page.

Congratulations to the following Clara Mayo grant recipients:

Lisa Bitacola, Simon Fraser University
The impact of status beliefs and cross-group interactions on collective action.

Ines Jurcevic, University of California at Los Angeles
“They said it, not me”: Whites’ use of racial minorities’ negative evaluations to justify bias.

Jenni Schultz, Tufts University
I-Sharing is caring: Using I-Sharing to improve interracial interactions.

Chadly Stern, New York University
Solidarity or exclusion? Perceptions of community in the fight for same-sex marriage.

SPSSI 2012 Louise Kidder Early Career Award

The award was set up to recognize social issues researchers who have made substantial contributions to the field early in their careers. This award is named for a living person—Louise Kidder—in honor of her own early career accomplishments and contributions to SPSSI. The 2012 Louise Kidder Award Selection Committee consisted of Drs. Tarika Daftary (Chair) and Jennifer Groscup. For further details and eligibility requirements, please visit the Louise Kidder Early Career Award page.

Tessa West, New York University
Tessa West received her Ph.D. from the University of Connecticut in 2008 and has been teaching in NYU’s Department of Psychology since. Her research concerns the nature and dynamics of social perception while addressing both theoretical and methodological issues in the study of interpersonal and intergroup relations. She received an NSF Research Incentive Award in 2010 and currently serves on the editorial boards for Social Psychological & Personality Science and the Journal of Experimental Social Psychology.

Congratulations to Dr. Tessa West for her many accomplishments thus far, and for being selected as this year’s recipient of the Louise Kidder Early Career Award.
SPSSI 2012 Spring & Timely Reviewed Grants-In-Aid

SPSSI's competitive Grants-In-Aid program supports scientific research in social problem areas related to the basic interests and goals of SPSSI and particularly those that are not likely to receive support from traditional sources. The members of the Spring 2012 Selection Committee were Drs. Rachel Annunziato (Chair), Catherine Borshuk, Anthony Marsella and Michelle Tichy.

For further details and eligibility requirements, see p. 42 in this issue.

Kristin Aschbacher, University of California at San Francisco

Ruth Belknap, Marquette University
Sudden deportation: Intersections of immigration status, migration history, and life history of violence in women who have been deported from the U.S. to Mexico.

Erin Cue, University of California at Los Angeles
Let’s YAP about the future: A youth attribution program for African American 6th graders.

Adam Fingerhut, Loyola Marymount University, and David Frost, Columbia University
Election experiences in the lives of LGB individuals and same-sex couples.

Sarah Gaither, Tufts University
Mixed-race perceptions: Fluidity in categorization, racial identity and behavior.

Negin Ghavami, University of California at Los Angeles
Disparities in health and academics of ethnic minority LGBQ students in urban middle schools.

Deborah Hall, Arizona State University
Bridging the political divide: Consequences of outgroup similarity for political polarization.

Lori Kinkler, Clark University
Lesbian, gay, and heterosexual single adoptive parents by choice: Perceived stigma and challenges.

Agostino Mazziotta, Fernuniversitaet in Hagen, and Friederike Feuchte, University Rostock

Andrea Miller, University of Minnesota
The separate spheres ideology: Addressing work-life conflict in the United States from a system justification perspective.

Anjali Rameshbabu, University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee
Self-regulation of saturated fat intake in blue-collar employees.

Deborah Son Holoien, Princeton University
Asymmetries in understanding between Whites and Blacks.

Nhan L. Truong, Tougaloo College
Masculinity and HIV sexual risk behaviors among Gay-identified and non-Gay-identified African American men who have sex with men from the state of Mississippi.

Jojanneke van der Toorn, Leiden University
Re-norming deviance: The influence of homonegativity on evaluations of Gay couples and partners.
SPSSI 2012

Teaching Awards

SPSSI confers annual awards for outstanding teaching in areas related to the psychological study of social issues. These awards recognize teaching excellence in a variety of contexts. The Teaching Award Committee consisted of Drs. Kim A. Case (Chair), Desdamona Rios, and Peony Fhagen-Smith. Please see the Forward Summer 2012 issue for more details about winners and runners-up.

For application details and eligibility requirements, please visit the Outstanding Teaching & Mentoring Award page.

Congratulations to the Teaching Award recipients:

Amanda Clinton, University of Puerto Rico, Mayaguez Campus
Outstanding Teaching and Mentoring

Shantal Marshall, Stanford University and University of California at Los Angeles
Innovative Teaching

SPSSI in the Classroom

By Kim Case, Teaching & Mentoring Committee Chair

On behalf of the SPSSI Teaching and Mentoring Committee, many thanks to Amanda Clinton, 2012 SPSSI Outstanding Teaching and Mentoring Awardee, for contributing this social issues teaching column beginning on p. 28. For more information about the Teaching and Mentoring Committee or if you are interested in writing a teaching column for the newsletter, please feel free to contact me.

—Kim Case
caseki@uhcl.edu

SPSSI 2012 SAGES

Grant Awards

The SAGES Program was set up to encourage our retired members to apply their knowledge to helping solve social problems or to assist policymakers to solve social problems. Proposals are invited that use social science research findings to address social problems through direct action projects, consulting with not-for-profit groups, or through preparing reviews of existing social science literature that could be used by policymakers. The 2012 SAGES Committee was comprised of Drs. Warren Thorngate and Ian Lubek.

For more information, including application and eligibility requirements, please visit the SAGES Program page.

Congratulations to the SAGES grant recipients:

Kathleen Malley-Morrison, Boston University
Engaging peace: Linking academic peace studies and grassroots peace activism.

Sam McFarland, Western Kentucky University
Educating on the influences of science on the advance of human rights.

Gila Kornfeld-Jacobs, Northeastern University
Advancing immigrant psychosocial wellbeing: A counseling program for immigrant students.

Arie Nadler, Tel Aviv University
The social psychology of helping interactions: Research on seeking, giving and receiving help and its applications.
SPSSI 2012 Biennial Conference Travel Grants

SPSSI offers an array of travel grant opportunities for conference attendees, including Graduate Student Travel Awards, International Travel Awards, Diversity Student Travel Awards, and the Crosby-Spendlove Travel Award.

Travel grants are awarded only for SPSSI’s stand-alone biennial convention. Details including deadlines and eligibility requirements are announced in advance of the conference. Please check the SPSSI website for further information.

Congratulations to all Travel Award recipients!

Crosby-Spendlove Travel Award Winner
Ayse Burcin Erarslan, Koc University, Istanbul, Turkey

Diversity Student Travel Award Winners
Nadia Bashir, University of Toronto
Kathryn Boucher, Indiana University–Bloomington
Andrew Case, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign
Jesica Fernandez, University of California, Santa Cruz
David Kille, University of Waterloo, Canada
David Lick, University of Virginia
Veronica Rabelo, University of Michigan
Erin Thomas, Yale University
Crystal Tse, University of Toronto
Leigh Wilton, Rutgers University

Graduate Student Travel Award Winners
Jan Marie Alegre, Princeton University
Sarah Bailey, Southern Illinois University, Edwardsville
Manisha Gupta, University of Massachusetts, Amherst
Danielle Kohfeldt, University of California at Santa Cruz
Natalia Lapshina, University of Western Ontario
Emily Leskinen, University of Michigan
Manyu Li, University of Pittsburgh
Sahana Mukherjee, University of Kansas
Shirley V. Truong, University of California at Santa Cruz
Felecia Webb, Washington University, St. Louis

International Travel Award Winners
Alison Baker, Victoria University, Australia
Mariya Chayinska, University of Milan at Bicocca, Italy
Agostino Mazziotta, University of Hagen, Germany
Chuma Owuamalam, University of Nottingham, Malaysia Campus
Hermann Swart, Stellenbosch University, South Africa

Award recipient lists on pp. 24–27 compiled by Anila Balkissoon, SPSSI Administrative Coordinator.
A Tribute to M. Brewster Smith
By Craig Haney, University of California at Santa Cruz

The discipline of social psychology has lost one of its most esteemed scholars, and the cause of social justice has lost one of its most devoted advocates. M. Brewster Smith passed away on August 4, 2012 in Santa Cruz, at the age of 93. Brewster was perhaps most admired by SPSSI members for his contributions to the landmark U.S. Supreme Court case, *Brown v. Board of Education* (1954), that found school desegregation unconstitutional. His research and testimony played an important role in *Brown* and in the larger fight for racial justice in the United States. Although this work was a pinnacle in Brewster’s long and distinguished career, he made many other truly notable contributions to our profession. Described as the “gentle conscience” of psychology, Brewster took many courageous and iconoclastic intellectual and political stands, matching a formidable, razor sharp mind with a tender heart and gentlemanly demeanor.

Brewster began his undergraduate education, at the age of 16, at Reed College, and completed it at Stanford, where he was awarded his B.A. and M.A. degrees in psychology. His graduate work continued at Harvard, where he came under the influence of both Gordon Allport and Henry Murray. However, it was soon interrupted by World War II. Brewster’s wartime years played a pivotal role in his career. He rose from private to the rank of major and used his psychology training to contribute to the classic study of soldiers in combat, *The American Soldier*. More importantly, as he would often later say, his time in the military showed him the horrors of armed conflict and the physical and psychological toll that war took on all involved. Not surprisingly, Brewster was later very influential in helping to shape what came to be called “peace psychology,” and he also played a central role in selecting the nation’s very first cohort of Peace Corps volunteers, with whom he took several trips to Ghana.

Brewster had a near encyclopedic grasp of the discipline of psychology and its history, and he used his piercing intellect and strong ethical compass to raise critical and sometimes unpopular questions or issues that frequently changed the course of the discipline. For example, at a time when much of academic psychology was narrowly focused on only quantitatively measurable empirical truths, Brewster championed the cause of humanistic psychology, and advanced the argument that the dignity and fulfillment of the whole person needed to be taken more centrally into account. Sometime later, when many in the discipline were striving to achieve a natural science model of complete dispassion and absolute objectivity, Brewster wrote eloquently about the importance of “values” in psychology and extolled the virtues of political engagement.

Over his long and illustrious career, Brewster received many prestigious awards (including the Kurt Lewin Award and the APA Award for Distinguished Contributions to Psychology in the Public Interest) and held numerous key positions (including serving as president of SPSSI in 1958 and of the APA in 1978). He also taught at several distinguished universities, including Vassar, Berkeley, and the University of Chicago.

Brewster spent the last 40 years of his career at the University of California, Santa Cruz, whose faculty he joined in 1970, only a few years after the campus was opened. His Santa Cruz colleagues remember Brewster as an extraordinarily kind, dignified, and dedicated colleague who modeled the very best way to “disagree without being disagreeable.” Despite his many accomplishments and stature in the field, Brewster remained unusually humble and remarkably generous with his time and sage advice, especially to the several cohorts of junior faculty members who had the good fortune to start out in academia with him as a senior colleague (myself included). He functioned in many...
ways as an intellectual and academic visionary at Santa Cruz, spearheading the creation of a new developmental psychology graduate program and laying the intellectual and values-oriented groundwork for the distinctive social justice emphasis that now characterizes our social psychology graduate program.

Throughout his career, Brewster worked tirelessly on behalf of what he called the “third force” in American psychology—those who advocate for “the public interest”—which he saw as positioned between (and certainly sometimes including) the “clinical-practitioners” and the “scientist-academics.” He reminded us that “any attempt to advance the public interest is inherently political,” observed wisely that “advance in justice comes in small packages,” and implored psychologists of all persuasions to engage in “advocacy for the rights of the disadvantaged” and to “stand on the side of justice and human welfare.” Although he will be sorely missed, Brewster Smith was an extraordinary person and a remarkable psychologist who left us all with a wonderful legacy to admire and emulate, and a worthy path to follow.

He is survived by a large and loving family, most notably his wife of 64 years, Deborah, who was in every respect his devoted life partner.

—Craig Haney
psylaw@ucsc.edu

### Even Neuroscience is a Social Issue: Integrating Social Aspects of Psychology Across the Curriculum in Puerto Rico

By Amanda Clinton, University of Puerto Rico

Puerto Rico, a 100 mile-long and 30 mile-wide land mass located approximately 1,000 miles from Miami and 700 miles from Venezuela is, geographically speaking, an island. In spite of modern technology’s many wonders, living in Puerto Rico is, in many ways, physically isolating, as well. As a teacher and mentor to undergraduate students in the Psychology Program at the University of Puerto Rico, Mayagüez (UPRM), I believe my role is to help students build bridges and broaden their understanding of psychology to expand beyond the shores surrounding us.

**Puerto Rico: The Island and its University**

According to the **2010 U.S. Census**, Puerto Rico, whose population is 98.8% Hispanic, is “the poorest state in the nation.” The low socioeconomic conditions impact the public education system, including the University of Puerto Rico (UPR) and its campuses across the island. In the past five years, the UPR has experienced significant financial struggles, much like public institutions of higher education on the mainland United States. The implications at the university, particularly my campus, have included extended strikes by employees and students, years of delays in awarding promotions, the end of sabbaticals and a lack of upkeep of facilities so severe that OSHA closed the campus library for health and safety reasons.

In spite of the financial upheaval, tuition rates have remained steady, providing the most economical place to earn a four-year degree on the island. On average, a credit hour costs $53 and virtually all courses are presented by doctoral-level faculty. Admission is highly competitive as a result of its high quality, low-cost programs. The student body, like the rest of the island, is nearly 100% Hispanic, and the majority of students indicate Spanish as their native language (**www.uprm.edu**). It is not uncommon for students to have had few to zero opportunities to travel outside of Puerto Rico prior to reaching university.

**From a Small Island to the Broader World**

The study of psychology pertains, in effect, to all we do and who we are, from cellular level influence on behavior to social interaction and social institutions. As a teacher of psychology, I encourage my students to think about the field thought this broad lens. Serving students in ‘the poorest state in the nation’ who are classified as ethnic and linguistic minorities by the government that grants them citizenship, and yet identify as uniquely Puerto Rican and form the

*continued next page...*
majority in their own country, presents unique pedagogical challenges. The poverty and political instability of Puerto Rico’s government and the university administration (which is appointed by the party in governance and changes practically every four years) leads students to believe their own futures are of limited significance. Most graduates understand that, even in the best economic times, earning a livable wage means leaving the island and moving to the mainland which means leaving family and home for opportunity.

Social Awareness in Biopsychology

In an effort to increase awareness of the broader implications of psychology, I incorporate social issues in every course I teach. I focus on my Biopsychology course for this particular essay since it may seem, on the face of things, to be the least likely course in the curriculum for emphasizing social aspects of psychology. The course draws students from several departments, including psychology, biology, chemistry, and nursing.

Teaching social issues to my students at the University of Puerto Rico in Mayagüez is critically important since many students are marginalized and, as a result, may perceive a tenuous connection between effort and outcome, particularly since the unique nature of the context makes many examples seem less relevant. Using the example of biopsychology, I will explore two pedagogical areas of focus that I utilize to connect biological bases of behavior with social issues: 1) context and 2) social implications and applications. Each of these will be explained briefly below and subsequently integrated in order to show the importance of these teaching strategies.

Context. The Puerto Rican context is complicated by the history, the relatively impoverished socioeconomic conditions, the political situation (from corruption to the being caught in the “middle ground” of being a “territory,” and ethnic and linguistic considerations. A course that includes a significant amount of passive listening during PowerPoint presentations draws ire rather than interest and inspired thinking. Active learning, from drawing to singing to dissecting sheep brains to presenting research and making videos, forms the biopsychology course. Furthermore, students’ social inclinations result in a tendency to elect to work in pairs or small groups. Many of the aforementioned activities are, therefore, designed to promote working with peers rather than individually. The result is a class designed to be mindful of student preferences and, in particular, their culture. However, this is done methodically rather than in a haphazard manner.

In the following paragraphs, I will explain how anatomy is addressed. Next, I will explore the way in which social issues and applications are considered in my biopsychology class.

Is this all there is? Prior to beginning with key aspects of anatomy, discussion is dedicated to “the mind” and neuro-philosophy. This once highly Catholic island continues to be very religious, although many faiths are currently observed. For this reason, a theme such as the biological basis of behavior might be an uncomfortable one. However, we begin with a debate, and students vote on whether we are “just biological material” or “there is something greater than us that makes our biology so amazing.” This vote is revisited at the end of the term to assess student changes. The aim is to incorporate and welcome all perspectives, even those that seemingly contradict the nature of the class.

“Homero Simpson.” A subsequent activity to increase personal relevance of the class is that of drawing one’s “mind” and comparing it to his or her “brain.” A cartoon of Homer Simpson that shows his head is full of topics such as beer, TV, a desire to nap, and so on provides a reference point for students who develop their own “mind-brain” design, attaching their interests, dreams, time-drains, responsibilities, etc. to space in their heads. Later, they must respond to questions such as, “Where is ‘family’ actually located in your brain?” That is, what is important to them must be identified not just as key in their minds, but as a function of their brain.

Neuroanatomy. In order to learn anatomy, several activities are incorporated into our class:

- Students are gifted boxes of crayons or markers and paper on which they draw an outline of their brain to which key structures are added as we discuss them in class. We refer to this project as “habichuelas,” the typical Puerto Rican bean, given its similar structure.
- Once students possess basic structure-function knowledge, we sing and dance (it is the Caribbean, after all)! First, students learn “Brainstem” from Pinky and the Brain. A friendly competition over a

continued next page...
few bonus points ensues as each group is video-taped singing and the videos are posted online.

- Next, when the cranial nerves are memorized, students create their own music videos using their preferred rhythms and language (English, Spanish or Spanglish), effectively extending and personalizing the techniques utilized for general anatomy. One of my favorites is a video titled, “The Macarena of the 12 Cranial Nerves.”

In sum, this approach takes into account the importance of students’ personal experiences, cultural context, and learning preferences in order to enhance outcomes and expand understanding.

**Social Implications & Applications.** Although biopsychology requires a significant amount of content acquisition in order to arrive at the point where social implications of the brain and human behavior can be analyzed, this social analysis is the broader aim of the course. Indeed, in my mind, the purpose of education is to make students aware of the applications of learning and consider meaning within a particular context and across situations. In my biopsychology course, social implications begin locally with a focus on individual students, their families, and their communities. Subsequently, the societal implications of neuroscience and behavior are explored through social issues topics.

**So What?!** The ultimate goal of the class is not to memorize anatomical structures nor name neurotransmitters, but to put neuroscience in the context of their own lives, those of people they care about, and their community. Thus, activities and assignments subsequent to the aforementioned basic topics address meaningful applications of neuroscience. Themes include: memory and the brain, multi-tasking, the brain and love, the brain and depression, the brain and “Aha! moments,” the criminal brain, the brain and exercise, and more. I teach fundamentals on these subjects in order to provide background. Students then read original research on these topics and, in small groups, prepare an oral presentation and a video on a topic of their choice. The presentation requires summarizing research findings with an emphasis on their meaning for their lives and those of their peers and loved ones, the Puerto Rican community, and beyond. Examples follow.

- The day we talk about exercise and the brain we actually exercise (students are advised to dress comfortably!). After a few minutes of Zumba!, we discuss research findings that neurogenesis occurs in the hippocampus as a result of moderate exercise. This leads to discussions not just about the brain structures and systems involved, but their implications. Can students consider exercise a luxury (“I don’t have time...”) or should it be a necessity? How can neuroscience inform the education system in Puerto Rico? What does it tell us as future policymakers about the benefits of public transportation in terms of general health, neuro-health, and the environment?

- In their music videos on neuroscience, students write lyrics about neuroscience so that it is meaningful to peers. For example, a student created a reggaeton (music of Puerto Rican origins) video depicting him “going crazy” as a result of his feelings for a girl. Later, he understands he’s not insane, just experiencing a biochemical process we call love. This process is detailed in the video, showing how our brains change when we are attracted to someone. The language, the rhythm, and the scenes are all within the student’s context. This experience dovetails into discussions regarding the nature of marriage in the U.S. and Latin America. If love is biological, should marriage be defined by the state? How does the neuroscience of human love inform us in terms of policy, such as gay marriage rights?

- A student favorite is the neuroscience of multi-tasking. This activity allows them time to make calls on their cell phones during class. Students are instructed to call mom, grandmother, friend, or even the person sitting next to them and chat. However, at the same time, they must write a paragraph detailing their activities of the prior weekend. Just as neuroscience shows, composition of a thoughtful paragraph is virtually impossible while distracted by conversation. The inability to adequately engage in two tasks, particularly if they are similar, could potentially tell us something about studying and using Facebook at the same time. The benefits and consequences of modern life are debated in verbal form briefly. Later in the course, students write a position paper on the topic.

- A final example is an analysis of the criminal brain and neuroscience. If we know that many violent criminals have biological differences, how does this information enlighten the prosecution or defense continued next page...
teams in court? Once students debate this in pairs and small groups, they engage in a larger group role play activity. This role play involves an expert (neuroscience) witness and additional research showing that some persons with ‘the criminal brain’ do not act pathologically. The role play allows for review of the bio-psycho-social implications, and students develop a treatment plan for the individual with a criminal brain for avoiding a criminal life. By connecting brain function and human biology to the larger social world, students gain a new lens through which to see themselves and others. Course attendance is nearly 100% throughout the term, suggesting that students respond well to a class known as unpopular among psychology majors. Class evaluation forms often offer comments like, “Uno aprende porque aprende” [Meaning: “You learn in spite of yourself!”]. In terms of day-to-day outcomes, students who understood biopsychology as a torturous requirement begin to change their language after we discussed stress as “increases in cortisol combined by a need for more dopamine and serotonin.” They come to class and report that their parents have agreed to walk 30 minutes a day to improve their memory or that they are turning off Facebook to study. In broader terms, however, many students decide to continue to expand their awareness of the social implications of psychology, science, and, in particular, neuroscience. As per the letters, emails, and text messages I’ve received from my former students, the class helps them look at the world differently. Furthermore, as they overcome the intimidation that once was neuroanatomy and it becomes “real” to them, they become more empowered. Several students report feeling inspired to pursue graduate or medical school. Most of them continue to be interested in the “real world implications” of neuroscience whether they are researchers, teachers, lawyers, or psychologists.

**Conclusion.** Biopsychology, bogged down as it may be in anatomy and physiology, has a natural propensity to distance students from their interest in human behavior. The methods discussed in this essay, however, bring students who may have received the message from the world that they are less capable, less knowledgeable or less important into the fold of psychology. These pedagogical strategies “make sense” and communicate to students that they themselves have something to offer, and therefore motivate learning during the semester.

—Amanda Clinton
amanda.clinton@gmail.com

---

**APA Council Meeting Update**

By Wendy R. Williams & Richard Suinn, APA Div 9 Council Representatives

APA Council of Representatives (COR) had its summer meeting on August 1st and 3rd, 2012 in Orlando, FL at the APA Convention. There are a lot of exciting things happening at APA, however, because of some time-sensitive issues, we are focusing our column on two main issues before APA governance and the membership of APA.

First, there are several bylaw amendments that will need to be voted on this fall by members of APA. Of particular importance is the bylaws amendment to seat the representatives from the Ethnic Minority Associations (EMPAs). Currently, one representative from each of the four associations (Asian American Psychological Association, Association of Black Psychologists, National Latina/o Psychological Association, and Society of Indian Psychologists) is granted “observer status” to attend the Council meetings; however they are not allowed to vote on APA governance issues. The bylaws amendment would give each association the opportunity to elect a representative who would be granted full rights and responsibilities equivalent to all other representatives to Council, including voting rights. The Council overwhelmingly supported sending this amendment to the membership for approval (82% to 18%). If you are a member of APA, you will be receiving a ballot to vote in this election. The amendment will allow those voices which
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have previously been excluded from voting in APA business to be represented and will continue to ensure that APA has a diverse representation of its members on Council. Voting in favor of the amendment will NOT affect SPSSI’s or any other division or state associations’ representation—these are seats that already exist, but would change their status from “observer” into full voting members. Both your representatives and SPSSI Council endorse the approval of this amendment (see p. 34 for SPSSI’s statement), so please take a moment to vote in favor of this bylaws amendment. We also ask your help in spreading information in support of this important amendment benefiting other fellow APA members.

Second, as you may recall from our previous columns, APA has been engaging in a number of activities to make APA an effective 21st Century organization. Among these activities is the issue of how to make APA governance more efficient. At the last Council meeting in February, Council agreed to look at the potential restructuring of both Council composition and function. At this meeting, Council was presented with three skeleton options for these potential changes.

The first, which was labeled Incremental Change, is an option that would rededicate Council to working on “big” issues and delegate corporate decisions to the Board of Directors. Although Council would be spending its time on different issues (hopefully, more important policy-related issues), this option would not change the way in which delegates are elected to Council. In other words, SPSSI would keep its current representation on Council.

The second option, labeled Moderate Change, would transfer most decisions to a somewhat larger Board of Directors and change Council to an assembly based on “communities of interest” who would work on issues related to the “communities” they represent. In this scenario, neither Divisions nor State Associations would be guaranteed proportional representation, but rather would have to put forth candidates under “communities of interest” slates (e.g., education, policy, research, practice). In other words, SPSSI would lose its guaranteed seats, but might be able to place more members in governance if it can successfully put forth candidates to represent these “communities.” However, these delegates would represent their slate (e.g., policy) not SPSSI as an organization, per se.

The third option, which was labeled Clean Slate Change, would get rid of an assembly (i.e., Council as it currently stands) and would replace it with a somewhat larger Board of Trustees who would be elected to represent “communities of interest” and who could seek advice from ad hoc committees. This would allow for the governing body to be nimble in its decision-making, but it would mean that the power to govern APA is concentrated in the hands of a much smaller group of people. As such, SPSSI would not have guaranteed representation, and there would be fewer slots for SPSSI members to be elected compared with the Moderate Change proposal.

Council carefully considered and reflected on the pros and cons of the three skeleton options. As a result of the half-day discussion of these options, 85% of Council voted to move forward with developing a more concrete and detailed model for governance options that are somewhere between the “Moderate” and “Clean Slate” scenarios. At our next meeting in February 2013, the Council will be presented with options to flesh out the still undefined areas of these proposals. For example, what is the composition and selection process for all proposed competency-based groups (i.e., “communities of interest”, Board of Trustees, or ad hoc advisories). What are the decision management processes going to look like (i.e., how issues will be triaged, what is the system of checks and balances)? What will be the role of technology in these proposals (i.e., can it be used to increase direct member input, streamline governance functions, and increase involvement from key stakeholder groups)?

Council plans to have a final vote on a full proposal by Summer 2013. Then, any changes Council approves would need to be voted on by the membership. However, because the proposals before Council could represent a significant change to how SPSSI will be represented (or won’t be represented) at APA, we would like to hear your thoughts on these proposals. Please contact either of us with your thoughts on these very important changes.

—Wendy Williams & Dick Suinn
Wendy_Williams@berea.edu & suinn@lamar.colostate.edu
SPSSI in New York: Spring 2012
By Harold Takooshian, SPSSI-NY Chair

Once again in spring of 2012, many of the 400 members of New York SPSSI (SPSSI-NY) joined some of a dozen fellowship activities, arranged in concert with other groups, and kindly hosted by local institutions. Some scenes appear at www.spssi.org/ny

March 2012

Student Publishing Workshop at Fordham University.

April 2012

Psychology & Law Forum and Film-Screening. On April 27 at Fordham, fifty people joined a lively law-psychology forum and film screening on “child custody and parental abduction,” featuring attorney Nancy Erickson, and Jennifer Collins, Executive Director of Courageous Kids Network.

May 2012

20th Pace University Psychology Conference. On May 5 at the 20th Pace University Psychology Conference, thirty people heard a symposium on “International exchanges for psychology students and faculty,” with presenters Ivana Petrovic (Belgrade), Maryam Zoma (Lebanese American University), Harold Takooshian (Fordham), Samvel Jeshmaridian (TCI), and Mercedes McCormick (Pace). All were invited to receive a free guide on applying for student Fulbright Fellowships by contacting: rstarkgendrano@fordham.edu

Fall 2012

Looking ahead to fall of 2012, SPSSI-NY plans more activities on diverse topics: workplace bullies, ethnopsychology, history of psychology.

The 24th Greater New York Conference on Behavioral Research is set for Sunday, October 21, 2012. Members are also preparing for the November 1 deadline for proposals to the 2013 meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association on March 1-4, the first EPA meeting in Manhattan in 32 years.

The SPSSI-NY Planning Committee for Spring 2012 is: Florence Denmark (Pace), Joseph Giardino (Fordham), Uwe Gielen (St Francis), Samvel Jeshmaridian (TCI), Mark Mattson (Fordham), Mercedes McCormick (Pace), Ivana Petrovic (Belgrade), Richard Velayo (Pace), Jason R. Young (Hunter). Please direct any questions or comments to me, the SPSSI-NY Chairperson.

—Harold Takooshian
takoosh@aol.com
An important amendment to the American Psychological Association (APA) bylaws will be sent to the APA membership for vote in November. This bylaws change proposes to seat one representative each from four different national ethnic minority psychological associations (EMPAs) on the APA's main decision-making body, its Council of Representatives. At the present time, one representative from each of the four associations (Asian American Psychological Association, Association of Black Psychologists, National Latina/o Psychological Association, and Society of Indian Psychologists) is granted “observer status” to attend the APA Council meetings; however they are not allowed to vote. The bylaws change, overwhelmingly supported by APA Council at its August 2012 meeting, would give each association the opportunity to elect a representative who would be granted full rights and responsibilities equivalent to all other representatives on APA Council, including voting rights.

This is actually the third time that this proposed bylaws change will be brought to APA membership for vote. The EMPAs were originally accorded observer status as an attempt to increase the number of ethnic minority psychologists in APA and in the profession but also to improve the historically tense relationships between APA and members from marginalized groups. The move to voting rights and full responsibilities for the observers is part of a larger set of joint initiatives involving the EMPAs and APA. The last time that this bylaws amendment went to the APA membership it was defeated by a narrow margin (63.29% of the members approved; just less than the required two-thirds). SPSSI adopted an official statement in support of the bylaws change at that time.

After consultation with its current representatives to the APA Council, SPSSI Council unanimously adopted a statement supporting this proposed bylaws change. As noted in the statement, SPSSI Council supports this change based on the results of research and also because it is consistent with SPSSI’s values and commitments. Therefore, on behalf of SPSSI Council, we urge all members of SPSSI who are also members of APA to read the SPSSI statement and to vote in favor of this change. The statement adopted by SPSSI Council is below:

Division 9/SPSSI supports changing the APA bylaws to permit one voting seat each on the APA Council of Representatives (COR) for the Asian American Psychological Association, Association of Black Psychologists, National Latina/o Psychological Association, and the Society of Indian Psychologists. These ethnic minority psychological associations have had observer status on APA COR; it is now time to accord them voting rights and responsibilities. SPSSI’s support for the bylaws change is based on the results of research demonstrating the positive effects of diversity on individuals and organizations, and also on SPSSI’s longstanding commitments to social justice and inclusion. SPSSI believes that the work of APA will be enhanced, and that the field of psychology will be better served, by close collaboration between psychological associations and by including a range of perspectives in cooperative work.

Thank you for taking time to review this important issue and to cast your vote. SPSSI’s current representatives to APA Council, Richard Suinn and Wendy Williams, can answer any questions that you have about this issue. If you are so inclined, they can also find ways for you to be involved in getting out the vote or advocating for this bylaws change. You can contact Dick at suinn@lamar.colostate.edu and Wendy at Wendy_Williams@berea.edu.
This unofficial narrative is an attempt to retrieve a piece of history many of us have forgotten or never knew. I take full responsibility for all errors attributable to unintentional lapses in memory. Responses are welcome to make the record more accurate or to add related threads.

The story begins in 1996, when Cheryl Travis, then-president of Division 35 (Society for the Psychology of Women, SPW), initiated a Task Force with Joy Rice and Karen Wyche as co-chairs, on Women, Poverty, and Public Assistance. There were 12 members, and I was one of them. Communicating primarily by e-mail, the TF produced “a position paper summarizing research and policy recommendations for state interpretation and implementation of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996 (PRWORA).” Our document was published as a special report on May 16, 1997 by APA, under the sponsorship of what was then the Public Service Directorate. As noted in the Introduction, the goal of the TF was “to provide information on key areas of welfare reform” and to advocate, from a human capital perspective, for investments in the education, training, and productive skills of poor women (APA, 1997). The areas covered in the report included: myths and facts about welfare; education; work and training issues; child care; healthcare; domestic violence; homelessness; and service delivery.

A second, revised, glossy-covered version (Making “Welfare to Work” Really Work) was published a year later (APA, 1998). It was widely distributed, including to members of the U.S. Congress and state offices. This report was written in collaboration with APA’s Women’s Program Office, Urban Initiatives Program, and Public Policy Office.

As a result of the positive responses to the TF’s reports, the Division 35 TF was re-appointed in 1999 by the next SPW president (Melba Vasquez), this time with Heather Bullock and me as co-chairs. This second TF changed its focus and name in acknowledgement of the belief that the problem was NOT welfare, but poverty, and recognized the need to move beyond middle-class assumptions and middle-class issues, and to provide visibility to poor women and to their expressed values and concerns. One objective of this TF was development of a resolution on poverty and socioeconomic status (SES) that was to be brought to APA’s Council of Representatives (COR). To realize this objective, members of the TF worked together with APA’s Committee on Urban Initiatives, directed by Leslie Cameron, who was also the director of the Women’s Program Office. This Committee drafted a formal resolution that included supportive evidence from a wide variety of sources, and made recommendations for research, education and practice (APA, 2000). The Resolution frames “poverty as an outcome of inequities that render certain demographic groups more vulnerable” (O’Connor, 2001). The Resolution on Poverty and Socioeconomic Status was adopted by COR in 2000.

The work of the second TF culminated in a Journal of Social Issues publication (Lott & Bullock, 2001) titled Listening to the Voices of Poor Women. Included were papers on: identification of the poor; attitudes and attributions for poverty; media images; low-income parents and the public schools; welfare mothers’ reflections of personal responsibility; housing; experiences with public assistance; clothing; applied research with underserved communities; partnerships with community agencies; and social policy implications.

The establishment of these two task forces marked a formal recognition by SPW of the relationship between gender, social class, and poverty. For APA, passage of the 2000 Resolution signified acceptance of the importance of social class as a variable in human behavior. We need to honor the ground-breaking work of the members of these task forces, some of whom participated as graduate students: Diane Bowker-Turner, Ann Brodsky, Heather Bullock, Catherine...

A further development began when I was elected by SPSSI to represent it on APA Council (where I served for 6 years). Shortly after I began on Council in 2002, it decided, after a not-too-lengthy discussion, to sunset the Urban Affairs Committee (author of the 2000 Resolution on Poverty and SES). I found this decision, supported by the Public Interest Directorate (as a cost reduction measure), very disturbing. It seemed to be a clear sign of APA’s low level of interest in social class issues, despite the Resolution it had approved two years earlier. My co-SPSSI representative, Irma Serrano-Garcia, and I then drafted a new business item for COR asking for a permanent committee on SES to be part of the Public Interest Directorate. We presented this to Council at its August 2003 meeting. Such a committee seemed to be a clear follow-up to the earlier Resolution on Poverty and SES that had included recommendations for research, education, advocacy, and public policy. The proposed committee would function as the primary coordinator of SES issues, examine disparities between social classes in access to resources, their impact on human welfare, and propose inequity-reducing strategies. This call for a new permanent committee on social class was met with some positive reactions but a greater number and variety of negative responses or indifference. Some saw little need for another “committee;” some feared diluting APA’s attention to ethnic minorities.

The Board for the Advancement of Psychology in the Public Interest (BAPPI) reviewed the initiative and did not approve it, offering instead a substitute motion that called on its committees to review the extent to which SES issues were addressed in their work. After reviewing the responses, BAPPI formulated a revised substitute motion that requested the establishment of a six-member APA Task Force on SES. The substitute motion was approved by Council in February 2005.

This APA TF was chaired by Susan Saegert and included Nancy Adler, Heather Bullock, Ana Mari Cauce, William Lui, and Karen Wyche as members. Its final report and recommendations (APA, 2006) were approved during a fateful COR meeting in New Orleans in August 2006, a year after the Katrina tragedy. It was no accident that the events of Katrina influenced the decision and prompted some impassioned vocal support from those who saw the clear relationship between social class, poverty, and the suffering of so many in the aftermath of Katrina. At the same time, this meeting in New Orleans, a high-ranking member of APA governance urged opposition, commenting that social class was a subject in (and for) sociology, not psychology! But the Committee was approved (CSES), as well as a new APA Office on Socioeconomic Status (OSES) to be housed in the Public Interest Directorate. The first CSES meeting was held in 2007; Heather Bullock was the first chairperson and served in this capacity for three years.

A third chapter in this history of leadership by SPW and SPSSI began in 2006 when the two division presidents (Joan Chrisler and Irene Frieze, respectively) asked Heather Bullock and me to chair a task force that would study the question of how courses in psychology could incorporate issues of social class. Out of this work came a report on Resources for the Inclusion of Social Class in Psychology Curricula (APA, 2008) that is now online as a living document maintained by OSES. Members of this group, faculty and graduate students, included Martha Bergen, Hal Bertilson, Crystal Blount, Lina Chhun, Larry Gainor, Keri Gregory, Katharine Hahn, Mary Hill, Jessica Johnson, Julie Philllips, Faye Remers, Harmony Repond, Christine Smith, and Shirley Truong. The extensive and detailed list of resources covers classroom exercises, course syllabi, fiction, legislation on relevant social policy, popular media, scholarly books and articles, and websites.

Both SPW and SPSSI should be proud of the indispensable role they have played in raising the consciousness of APA about the significance of social class in understanding human behavior and in recognizing the vital place of class issues in our education, theory, research, and practice (see also Bullock, Lott, & Truong, 2011). As birth parents of APA’s OSES and CSES, both divisions should continue to observe their achievements and look for opportunities to work together to further critical class scholarship, applications and progressive social policy.

continued next page...
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Postscript
OSES publishes an online newsletter The SES Indicator that is available at www.apa.org/pi/ses/resources/indicator. Those interested in SES issues can join the network by emailing Ilhaynie@apa.org.

—Bernice Lott
blott@mail.uri.edu

Volunteer for SPSSI!
As we move into the fall, new SPSSI officers take office and new appointments to SPSSI committees are made; the typical term of appointment runs from September to August.

I would like to encourage you to consider increasing your involvement with SPSSI, and especially by serving on one of SPSSI’s many committees.

Currently, SPSSI Central Office is building a list of individuals who are interested in being appointed to a SPSSI position or committee for 2012–2013 or 2013–2014. Please look over the partial list of committees below, and then email Brad at the SPSSI Central Office indicating which committees you are interested in or with nominations of colleagues for different committees. Most committees do not require any special expertise or prior experience, and we will follow up as committee vacancies occur. Thank you in advance for your interest and for your active support of SPSSI!

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Membership Committee</th>
<th>Development/Fund Raising Committee</th>
<th>Louise Kidder Award</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Diversity Committee</td>
<td>Communications Committee</td>
<td>Otto Klineberg Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Early Career Scholars Committee</td>
<td>Conferences Committee</td>
<td>Lewin Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate Students Committee</td>
<td>Teaching &amp; Mentoring Committee</td>
<td>Social Issues Dissertation Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internationalization Committee</td>
<td>Gordon Allport Award</td>
<td>Grants-in Aid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Publications Committee</td>
<td>Distinguished Service to SPSSI Award</td>
<td>Applied Social Issues Internships</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fellows Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>Clara Mayo Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td>SAGES Awards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audit &amp; Finance Committee</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Still not sure? You can learn more about SPSSI and its committees by visiting the SPSSI website. While you are on the website, be sure to check out SPSSI initiatives and activities that are in progress or recently completed or take a walk through history by clicking on the SPSSI Was There Interactive Timeline.

—Allen M. Omoto, SPSSI President
allen.omoto@cgul.edu
Although the presence of social diversity in the world is a global community asset, this benefit is overshadowed by the reality that disparities and disadvantages persist in many individuals’ lives across the globe. Ethnic-racial segregation, unequal education and career opportunities, poor access to quality health care and affordable nutritious foods, physical and mental health disparities, and unfair civil rights are among the social injustice themes that persist in many contemporary societies. In light of these issues, the SPSSI theme at the 2013 APA Annual Convention in Honolulu will be: Diversity, Disparity, and Disadvantage: Implications for Research, Public Policy, and Social Justice. Consistent with this theme, invited speakers, special symposia and posters will focus on: (a) basic and applied research on the development and maintenance of disparities and disadvantage; (b) interventions that effectively reduce disparities and disadvantage; and (c) how research and interventions have been, and can be, transformed into effective public policy that benefits individuals and groups. It is vital to understand and communicate the phenomenon of disparities and disadvantages because it is a social justice issue—that is, disparities and disadvantages are unnecessary, avoidable, and unfair. This notion is based on the principles that all individuals should be valued and treated equally, that equal opportunities have particular significance for individuals, and that individuals should have the right to a standard of living adequate for physical and psychological well-being.

Call for Proposals

We are accepting proposals for symposia, single-speaker papers, and posters in ALL areas of psychology relevant to social issues; however, we extend a special call for proposals that are consistent with our conference theme (see above). In recent years, we have had excellent programs at APA, and we hope to have even more representation from our division at APA 2013 in Honolulu. Early career faculty and graduate students are especially encouraged to organize a symposium in their area of study relevant to social justice or to submit a poster proposal of their work. Additional information on the SPSSI Division 9 Conference theme can be found at SPSSI’s website.

Submissions should be made online by midnight EST on Friday, November 16, 2012 at http://www.apa.org/convention/proposals.aspx. If you are submitting a proposal to be considered as part of the conference theme, be sure to select “Disparities and Disadvantage” as your primary index term. APA non-members may submit proposals if an APA-member is a co-author or sponsors the proposal. Full details about the procedures for submitting proposals can be found at APA’s website.

Please feel free to contact us with questions or ideas for programming that you would like to see at the next APA convention.

—Bettina J. Casad & Luis M. Rivera
APA Div 9 Program Co-Chairs
bjcasad@csupomona.edu & luis@psychology.rutgers.edu
Aloha!

We are the Program Chairs of The Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI), Division 9 of the American Psychological Association (APA), and would like to invite you to serve as a reviewer for SPSSI’s Program Committee for the 2013 APA Annual Convention in Honolulu, Hawaii, July 31–August 4, 2013.

As a reviewer, you will review poster, individual paper, and/or symposia proposals. By serving as a reviewer, you will provide a valuable service to SPSSI and contribute to the divisional programming at the APA Convention.

We will receive proposals in all areas of psychology relevant to social issues; however we also will receive proposals on our conference theme, “Diversity, Disparity, and Disadvantage: Implications for Research, Public Policy, and Social Justice.”

Reviewers will receive their assignments shortly after the submission deadline (November 16th) with instructions, and have approximately 2 weeks to submit the reviews online using a structured form. It is our hope that each program committee member will receive approximately 12 proposals. Anonymous reviews will be used. If you are willing to serve as a reviewer, please click on the link below, which will ask you to submit information such as your title, institution, area of interests/expertise, etc. Note that we welcome and encourage advanced doctoral students to serve as reviewers as well.

Please complete the online form by October 30, 2012.

Thank you in advance for your contributions and service to SPSSI, APA Division 9, and please do not hesitate to contact us if you have any questions.

—Bettina J. Casad & Luis M. Rivera
APA Div 9 Program Co-Chairs
bjcasad@csumoneda.edu & luis@psychology.rutgers.edu
CONSIDER A SPSSI INTERNSHIP

SPSSI has year round opportunities for graduate student and undergraduate student internships at the SPSSI Central Office in Washington DC!

Interns assist SPSSI staff on various projects. Depending on the intern’s training and skills, the time of the year and what projects are on the "front burner," interns may work with us on a range of communications, or administrative projects, such as:

- providing research or editorial assistance needed to prepare materials for publication
- representing SPSSI at Washington-area seminars and other events
- researching or writing new content to be posted on the SPSSI website
- posting and editing content on SPSSI website
- preparing SPSSI's e-newsletters
- assisting with planning for SPSSI conventions
- communicating with SPSSI members
- assisting association management and administration tasks

Interns can count on being given substantive assignments at least 50% of their time at SPSSI, but they must also willingly help with clerical work—answering phones, mailings, copying documents, etc.

Internship Information and Application Guidelines

- SPSSI internships are normally unpaid positions.
- Intern applicants must have completed at least one year of college.
- The usual internship is for about 10 to 12 weeks (i.e., roughly corresponding to the academic semester or summer vacation period.)
- The internship is considered part-time and we will work with the ideal intern to secure time commitment and work schedule.
- We consider interns to be members of SPSSI’s staff while they are here, and we include them in virtually all our activities.

SPSSI is located on Capitol Hill, just east of Union Station, and walking distance from the U.S. Capitol, the Library of Congress, and the Supreme Court.

To apply, applicants are asked to send a brief letter of interest and to specify approximate dates of availability, along with a resume, to spssi@spssi.org with “Internship Application” in the subject line of your email.

Click here to read comments from past SPSSI interns!
Announcements

CONGRATULATIONS SPSSI MEMBERS!

The American Psychological Fund (APF) announced that **Rezarta Bilali**, PhD, of the University of Massachusetts—Boston, received $5,000 from the Drs. Rosalee G. and Raymond A. Weiss Research and Program Innovation Fund and $19,000 from the Visionary Fund to develop and test strategies to target the denial and justification of harm-doing by a group of individuals against another (such as mass violence), while at the same time fostering the conditions that lead to acknowledgment of the injustices done to the victim group and the restitution of harm.

**Lindsay Phillips**, PsyD, was presented the 2012 National Register’s Judy E. Hall, PhD, Early Career Psychologist Award. The award is named for the National Register’s current Executive Officer, Judy E. Hall, PhD, and recognizes excellence in a nationally credentialed psychologist with less than ten years of postdoctoral experience.

**Fall Deadline for Grants-in-Aid Program**

You saw the current list of grant winners on p. 24—why not apply yourself? Funding up to $1000 is available for graduate student research if proposals are accompanied by evidence of a request for appropriate university official agreement to match the amount requested. Strong preference is given to applications from students at the dissertation stage of the graduate career. Such proposals must be accompanied by an appropriate official university agreement to match the amount requested. This matching requirement will not be waived for institutions that have adopted a policy of not providing matching funds to support graduate student research. Funding up to $2000 is available for research by SPSSI members who already have a Ph.D. Documentation of submission to the applicant’s Institution IRB must accompany every submission.

Deadline for submission is **October 25, 2012**. For application instructions, please see the [Grants-in-Aid](#) webpage.

---

**DO A GOOD DEED AND WIN $1,000**

**Deadline: January 15, 2013**


Start the new year by winning $1,000 from Social Psychology Network for its 2013 Action Teaching Award. If you’re a current or former teacher, simply submit an example of creative teaching that makes a positive social difference (a student assignment, classroom activity, field experience, or web demonstration). The submission process is easy and open to graduate student teachers as well as classroom veterans.
About the American Psychological Foundation

APF provides financial support for innovative research and programs that enhance the power of psychology to elevate the human condition and advance human potential both now and in generations to come. Since 1953, APF has supported a broad range of scholarships and grants for students and early career psychologists as well as research and program grants that use psychology to improve people’s lives. APF encourages applications from individuals who represent diversity in race, ethnicity, gender, age, disability, and sexual orientation.

CALL FOR NOMINATIONS

APF Gold Medal Awards

The Gold Medal Awards recognize life achievement in and enduring contributions to psychology for those who are 65 years or older residing in North America. Awards are conferred in four categories:

- Gold Medal Award for Life Achievement in the Science of Psychology
- Gold Medal Award for Life Achievement in the Application of Psychology
- Gold Medal Award for Life Achievement by a Psychologist in the Public Interest
- Gold Medal Award for Life Achievement in the Practice of Psychology

Details

APF Gold Medalists receive a mounted gold medal, and an all-expense paid trip to the APA annual convention, where the award is presented.

For eligibility and nomination requirements, as well as specific application instructions, please see the APF page for the Gold Medal Awards.

Deadline for receipt of materials is December 1, 2012.

Charles L. Brewer Distinguished Teaching of Psychology

The Charles L. Brewer Distinguished Teaching of Psychology Award recognizes significant career contributions of a psychologist who has a proven track record as an exceptional teacher of psychology.

Details

The awardee receives a plaque, a $2,000 award, and an all-expense paid round trip to the APA convention, where the award is presented. Awardees are also invited to give a special address. For eligibility and nomination requirements, as well as specific application instructions, please see the APF page for the Brewer Award.

Deadline for receipt of materials is December 1, 2012.

Please be advised that APF does not provide feedback to grant applicants or award nominees on their proposals or nominations. Questions about either award program should be directed to Parie Kadir, Program Officer, at pkadir@apa.org.
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