Can SPSSI Serve as an Honest Broker in a Politically Polarized Environment?

By Alice Eagly, PhD, SPSSI President

For the November 1967 edition of this newsletter, Thomas Pettigrew, then-President of SPSSI, wrote a column titled “SPSSI as Honest Broker.” I sought out this statement in our archives mainly because I had seen it cited as expressing SPSSI’s policy aspirations. Also, Tom Pettigrew has earned widespread respect as having exemplified SPSSI values throughout his long career. And—to add a personal note—he taught the first college course that I took in social psychology. At the time, he was a young professor at Harvard, much involved in studying the civil rights movement as it was emerging in the American South. In this extraordinary course, he blended his stories from the front lines of racial integration with intelligent social psychological analysis.

As SPSSI president more than a decade later, Pettigrew analyzed the organization’s role in relation to racial inequality and other social issues of the day. SPSSI’s focus on the civil rights movement in 1967 is apparent in the newsletter’s printing of a report on Martin Luther King’s address to the APA Convention in the same issue as Pettigrew’s column on SPSSI’s social policy role.

continued on page 3...
Editor’s Note

By Janice R. Adelman, Forward Editor

Welcome to the Fall issue of Forward! It is filled to the brim with content that we think you will enjoy reading. We have the Biennial Convention highlights from Portland (pp. 18–31), and excellent articles from the next generation of applied psychologists in the GSC’s Rookie newsletter (pp. 32–39). But, don’t miss the news from our colleagues around the world: Roberto González in Chile (p. 13), Alexander Voronov in Russia (p. 44), and Corann Okorodudu celebrating the 20th anniversary of the Fourth World Conference on Women (p. 15)—not to mention the efforts of the internationalization committee (p. 42). SPSSI’s extraordinary members are everywhere throughout this issue, as you will see. Erin Thomas advocates gender diversity in business (p. 22), Cindy Frantz applies outstanding teaching methods in the classroom (p. 24), and multiple members are making waves in all sorts of media outlets (p. 54). Kudos to everyone who makes SPSSI great!

—Janice R. Adelman
spssinews@gmail.com
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In this historical context, Pettigrew proposed that SPSSI serve as an honest broker that would offer social science knowledge to guide policy makers. The specifics of this proposal involved SPSSI (then based in Ann Arbor, Michigan) opening up a satellite office in Washington, DC. He described this undertaking as “definitely not a lobbying office.” Instead, the office would help SPSSI to serve as a conduit between government and social science. Its representatives would work to inform relevant parts of the government about the expertise that SPSSI members could offer on policy issues and alert SPSSI members to governmental interests and needs for information.

SPSSI did not open a satellite Washington office at that time. Instead, it eventually moved its entire office to Washington. In doing so, has SPSSI fostered the honest broker role that Tom Pettigrew hoped that the organization would adopt? To answer that question, I offer some background on the honest broker concept and some reflections about the challenges of fulfilling such a role in our politically polarized contemporary environment.

The honest broker concept has attracted attention well beyond SPSSI. In particular, in The Honest Broker: Making Sense of Science in Policy and Politics (Cambridge University Press, 2007), Roger Pielke, Jr., a political scientist and policy expert, contrasted scientists’ honest broker role with three other roles that they might play in relation to policy: the pure scientist, the science arbiter, and the policy advocate.

The pure scientist sticks to doing science and avoids policy involvement. Such scientists leave it to policy makers to read the scientific literature if they choose to do so. Alternatively, the science arbiter offers information to policy makers only on questions that are clearly scientifically testable, providing results but offering no policy suggestions. Neither of these two roles is consistent with SPSSI’s mission, which involves joining science and public policy.

More relevant to SPSSI are the two other roles that Pielke discussed, the issue advocate and Pettigrew’s favorite, the honest broker. The issue advocate takes a definite stand and argues for a particular result by invoking supportive scientific findings. In contrast, the honest broker offers scientific information relevant to a range of policy options. Honest brokers work to expand policy makers’ thinking and do not advocate for a particular policy. Issue advocates do the opposite by working to narrow policy makers’ thinking to favor of a particular policy. In recommending the honest broker role, Pielke argued that issue advocacy tends to politicize science. Thus, as advocates, scientists’ values are usually important (albeit not necessarily acknowledged), and they may deploy science in a biased manner by (knowingly or unknowingly) favoring findings that support their advocacy and ignoring counter-evidence. Often, scientific advocacy produces contending factions of scientists, as has occurred in economists’ advising government policy makers. Some economists offer evidence that large government deficits are dangerous, and others offer evidence that, to the contrary, deficits spur economic activity. Pielke argued that such scientific discord lowers the public trust in scientists, who then may be viewed as mere “hired guns” for ideologically driven public policy—rather like lobbyists.

The politicization of science certainly can compromise the scientific voice in setting policy. An organization that becomes viewed as taking predictable positions and supporting them with a selective reading of scientific evidence diminishes its influence. Moreover, social scientists have reason to be cautious about their findings because of the many discoveries of methodological pitfalls in research and at least sometimes the difficulty of replicating findings that are confidently presented in our textbooks.

Serving as an honest broker is challenging, especially in the current political context. At least in the United States, most office holders and political pundits adhere to ideologies of the political right or left, and centrists are rare. The resulting political partisanship stands in the way of obtaining consensus agreements on urgent issues such as immigration and tax reform. Can social scientists guide policy makers toward evidence-based policy in these partisan environments?

Under these circumstances, the honest broker stance is very difficult to maintain—far more difficult today, I think, than it was when Pettigrew wrote his column in...
1967. An honest broker on immigration, for example, could spell out options ranging from deporting all undocumented persons to welcoming all immigrants and supporting their integration into society and would consider nuanced positions that lie between these extremes. The consequences of policy options would be spelled out, based at least in part on relevant social scientific research. This type of work is already being carried out in congressional and other governmental offices and in think tanks, but most of these entities have a clear political stance and operate mainly as policy advocates. If scientists themselves also frame their analyses to fit liberal or conservative agendas, it may be difficult for them to contribute to a workable consensus on issues such as immigration.

On this point, journalist and policy expert Thomas Edsall wrote recently in the New York Times that “all public policy set in the political arena is determined more by the balance of power than by evidence-based analysis or by humanitarian concerns.”

Given these considerations, how should we understand SPSSI? Certainly SPSSI engages in an expanding set of outreach efforts through its three journals, its congressional briefings, its books, its conferences and small group meetings, and numerous policy statements and reports. Across these many activities, does SPSSI act mainly as an honest broker or as an advocate of favored political positions? As I see it, SPSSI plays both roles. In the service of both of these roles, SPSSI members attempt to raise awareness by providing evidence of the seriousness of social problems—for example, by displaying the negative consequences of poverty or the dangers of environmental degradation.

Beyond this consciousness-raising mission, SPSSI members sometimes advocate for selected positions on policy issues, and SPSSI offers workshops that train interested persons for advocacy work.

Beyond fostering issue advocacy, SPSSI also serves as an honest broker by creating fact sheets and reports in policy-relevant areas such as the effects of media violence.

Do our advocacy stances compromise our honest broker role? Surely there are tensions between the two roles. This tension came to my attention at an APA Leadership Conference that I attended soon after becoming President-Elect of SPSSI. Casual conversation with a friendly APA staffer revealed her view that SPSSI is populated by “lefties.” Does such a label, if widely shared, compromise our mission?

I ask SPSSI members to think about our policy mission and invite comment. When we offer honest broker analyses, is the evidence we offer balanced rather than selective? Do we expand policy makers’ thinking or attempt to narrow it to our favored policy initiatives? When engaging in advocacy, do we consider crafting integrative policy positions that take into account views on the left and right of issues and therefore may have a better chance of being heard? Might SPSSI join its honest broker and policy advocate functions to help defuse political conflict in favor of integrative solutions that work?

The blending of honest broker and advocacy missions makes sense in terms of the dual purposes that are primary in SPSSI’s 2009 strategic plan: (a) A commitment to social justice and changing the world in positive ways, and (b) The premise that science should guide policy and practice. The first purpose puts SPSSI squarely in the camp of progressive politics, but the second purpose of guiding policy and practice should encourage us to analyze the political landscape with great care. If we advocate with awareness of what might be possible in the current political context, we may have a chance of appealing to policy makers on both sides of the left-right divide. I suggest that our voice would be stronger if we took this approach. Please let me hear from you on these important issues.

—Alice Eagly

eagly@northwestern.edu
SPSSI’s Increasingly Critical Place in an Increasingly Institutional World

By Blair T. Johnson, PhD, SPSSI Secretary/Treasurer

Writing during the early years of the Great Depression, Floyd H. Allport, advocated isolation from institutions as enhancing individual freedom. Without the trappings and illusions that come from such groups (e.g., pluralistic ignorance), he argued, one can be more empowered to do what he or she wishes to do. He promoted this view in his 1933 book Institutional Behavior, which he hoped might sell as well as his popular 1924, Social Psychology. Although the concept of pluralistic ignorance has become rooted in social and other sub-disciplines of psychology, his view that people are better off without institutions gained few adherents, and the book sold in underwhelming numbers (under 1,000 copies).

During the Great Depression, traditional practices of hiring in academia quickly became a social issue: Jobs should no longer be decided through letters to professors who might have a student finishing his doctorate (in those days, female students were an exception); positions were filled without many potential applicants even hearing about them. It was through exactly these processes that Floyd Allport had been appointed first an assistant professor at the University of North Carolina and then a professor at Syracuse University. Better off than many of his peers and not suffering as badly as them, in 1936, Floyd joined with brother Gordon and a few dozen other aspiring academicians to create a new institution that would help to lobby for fairness in job hiring and promote the psychological study of social issues, the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI). Thus, only 3 years after Institutional Behavior appeared, Floyd publicly contradicted his position. Perhaps, after all, there is a role for institutions, if in fact the institutions help to make the world a better place.

Although SPSSI may have been alone in taking this perspective in the 1930s, it certainly is not alone today. Human rights organizations usually care about the same issues that SPSSI does. If there is a right to health, then public health organizations also are aligned with SPSSI values. Indeed, a bit of thought suggests that numerous other organizations pursue similar goals. There is the American Psychological Association, which often lobbies Capitol Hill; its Board for the Advancement of Psychology in the Public Interest overlaps significantly with SPSSI’s mission. The Association for Psychological Science publishes research focused on law and policy. Just this year, the Behavioral Science & Policy Association was formed, launching a new journal focused on these themes. One can even identify how most academic institutions pursue SPSSI’s central value of studying social issues with a psychological lens. Looking more broadly still, non-governmental organizations (NGOs) have proliferated in recent decades. One can belong to dozens of organizations that vie for your membership fees and involvement.

SPSSI still exists, and, nearly 80 years later, it is still strong. Indeed, SPSSI has many wonderful new developments that point to this conclusion: Its financials are still quite strong. The policy wing of SPSSI is prominent, with a policy workshop in June that was a swimming success, and a very productive policy advocacy day on Capitol Hill in August. We have added a new staff member, David Aronson, to manage SPSSI’s myriad communication issues.

Our Portland conference was a strong success; indeed, in 2015 we will be trying our first series of annual conferences (I predict SPSSI will stick with this format). Our August-September 2014 membership survey (N=185) showed fairly strong support for this move, validating decisions Council made at its summer meeting. I believe the conferences are a great investment because it increases members’ ties to other members and it helps people to realize all of the good things that SPSSI does; it can make it more likely that Lewin Awardees’ and SPSSI Presidents’ addresses are well attended. And because the conference moves around the U.S., it helps to improve the geographical diversity of SPSSI’s membership; potential costs to the
environment are mitigated by the fact that attendees to conferences tend to be local: Attendees at SPSSI’s 2012 meeting in Charlotte differed quite a bit from those attending this year’s meeting in Portland.

In the membership survey, it was clear that career status matters for some reactions to the idea of an annual meeting. Professors, students, and others show similar levels of support for the annual conference concept, but for different reasons. Students value the presentations somewhat more than professors as a means to learn new research. Students more than professors value the possibility of learning about job opportunities at conferences, although it was a secondary goal for conference attendance for most respondents.

Between SPSSI’s conferences, publications, and awards, it is undeniable that SPSSI is a positive force. These are good times for SPSSI, and it should be increasingly indispensable to anyone who admires the central value of studying social issues with a psychological lens.

Why not make SPSSI even stronger and invest your own time and resources in it? Keep an active membership in SPSSI and make it better. If you answered the survey, thank you! SPSSI has many committees: Why not volunteer for service or run for Council?

Institutions like SPSSI matter more and more.

—Blair T. Johnson
blair.t.johnson@uconn.edu

Executive Director’s Report

By Susan Dudley, PhD, SPSSI Executive Director

At the Annual SPSSI Membership & Business Meeting, held this year during our biennial convention in Portland, I had an opportunity to share an overview of SPSSI’s administrative, financial, and programmatic health, and it seems worthwhile to review some of the financial information from that report here for interested members who were not able to attend the meeting.

**Assets.** SPSSI is now holding assets on our balance sheet—including cash, investments, and property—in excess of $4.5 million. The corresponding figures at the end of 2000 were $1.9 million, and $2.8 million in 2006 when I came to SPSSI. I believe this strong and steady growth should give our members confidence that our Council and staff are providing sound stewardship over our organizational resources.

**Operating Budget.** Even with the recent expansions of our staff and programs, we expect to maintain a now long-term trend of finishing our fiscal year firmly in the black. The annual operating expenses budgeted for 2014 are $870,000, with $760,000 in the preliminary budget for 2015. The apparent year-over-year decrease is a function of the expenses associated with our biennial conference, and not a significant change in our projected administrative costs or program offerings. This cyclic fluctuation can be expected to disappear as we embark, in 2015, on a trial series of three annual SPSSI conferences, which Council approved at its June meeting.

**Revenue.** Our primary revenue source continues to be the royalties earned from our journals and books, which now account for about 80% of our total income. Although we’ve seen some minor fluctuations, and have twice had to adjust our budgets in the (thankfully unfulfilled) expectation of major shortfalls in these revenues, our royalties income has remained relatively stable (greater than $600,000 each year) since at least 2007. Partnering with our journals publisher, Wiley Blackwell, we seem to have successfully made it through the transition from print to digital, and the challenge on the horizon will be how we fare in the growing open-access environment.

**Membership Dues.** A small portion (about 7%) of SPSSI’s total income is derived from membership dues – the cost of which has not increased in many years. While free subscription to our journals was once a principal membership benefit, most students and faculty now enjoy universal desk-top access to our journal content through
their institutional libraries. This means that we share with other scholarly societies the challenge of finding new ways to add value to membership, especially in the face of the retirement of our baby-boom generation members and the emergence of functional online research communities that compete to offer networking and other support and services to potential members.

**Expenses.** Over the last eight years, our fixed costs for maintenance of our Washington, DC office have been trimmed wherever possible, but savings on vendor-provided services ranging from cleaning to accounting have generally been offset by IT requirements for more sophisticated hardware, software, equipment, and monitoring. Overall, our expenses break down roughly at 90% to program— including our research grants, recognition awards, conference, website, policy projects, and editorial costs—and 10% to facilities and administration.

**Prospects.** Looking forward, all indications are that SPSSI is in a good financial position to move forward with the new initiatives that Council has approved, and I think we can be optimistic about the continued growth, visibility, and effectiveness of our expanding programmatic offerings. We will certainly need the ideas and efforts of our members to meet the challenges that lie ahead, and to continue our growth into the years ahead. Please write to me with your feedback.

—Susan Dudley
sdudley@spssi.org

---

**SPSSI Policy Update**

By Gabriel Twose,
SPSSI Policy Director

Summer 2014, has been an exciting time for SPSSI’s public policy work. In addition to our congressional Seminar Series, taking prominent psychological researchers onto Capitol Hill, we have organized several events exposing our members to the public policy arena. First, before the SPSSI biennial conference in Portland (see p. 18), we hosted our second Policy Workshop. Second, before the APA convention in Washington DC, we hosted an Advocacy Training Day.

**Policy Workshop.** On June 26, approximately 50 psychologists and students attended the second SPSSI Policy Workshop (the first was held in 2013 in DC). Attendees participated in a one day training in which they learned about the intersections of academia and public policy, policy related internships and fellowships, international policy work, policy-related grant writing, and federal advocacy and influence.

SPSSI policy committee chair Jack Glaser started the day by providing an overview of the links between academia and public policy. Dr. Glaser provided a succinct overview of what public policy actually is (a surprisingly challenging topic), before explaining to participants how we, as psychologists, can have an impact in both affecting and effecting it. Katya Migacheva drew on her experience as SPSSI’s James Marshall Fellow to provide participants a thorough list of policy-related fellowship opportunities in DC, and Michele Kaufman explained how she works to affect policy and practice at an international level, advising Ministries of Health on how to implement behavioral interventions in sub-Saharan Africa. The afternoon featured talks by Linda Silka, chair of the University of Maine’s Margaret Chase Smith Policy Center, who discussed how to tie in policy implications to grant proposals, and by APA’s Roberta Downing, who explained to participants how psychologists can take action to affect public policy, particularly working through membership organizations.

**Advocacy Training Day.** On August 6, SPSSI—along with the Society for Community Research and Action and the American Psychological Association—invited about 50 psychologists and students to continued next page...
participate in an Advocacy Training Day, during which participants advocated on Capitol Hill for the Family and Medical Insurance Leave (FAMILY) Act (S. 1810/H.R. 3712). Shockingly, the U.S. is one of two countries in the world (along with Papa New Guinea), that does not guarantee its citizens paid medical leave after the birth of a child.

This legislation would provide all employees (regardless of company size) up to 12 weeks of partial income (66% of monthly wages) for time off following the birth or adoption of a new baby or because of their own or a family member’s serious medical condition. In addition to the economic arguments, this is important for a number of psychological reasons. Workers who take unpaid leave often experience serious financial strain. This can lead to economic hardship, which is associated with reduced physical and psychological well-being within the family, including marital stress and conflict, parental depression, and parenting challenges, as well as emotional, social, and behavioral issues among children. Moreover, mothers who do not have to return to work immediately are more likely to breastfeed, which can increase bonding between the child and nursing mother and reduce the risk of health problems across the life span, including sudden infant death syndrome, respiratory illnesses, asthma, obesity, Type 2 diabetes, and leukemia. Returning to work with less than 12 weeks leave is associated with increases in mothers’ depressive symptoms and reductions in self-reported overall health, as well as children’s later aggressiveness, defiance, and impulsivity.

The Advocacy Training Day participants spent the morning learning about the FAMILY Act and the psychological research findings mentioned above, and about how to advocate effectively on Capitol Hill. In the afternoon, they visited the offices of their Representatives and Senators, and asked them to co-sponsor the Act, arguing that it is unconscionable that the U.S. is the only industrialized nation in the world that does not provide paid family and medical leave.

This event was important for SPSSI not only because we believe in the importance of the legislation, but also because we were able to provide so many psychologists a chance to advocate on Capitol Hill, encouraging them to continue to engage the legislative process. See p. 40 for more about this event from a participant’s perspective.

Conclusion. SPSSI aims to educate policy-makers about psychology, and psychologists about public policy. With these events – the Policy Workshop and the Advocacy Training Day – I hope it is apparent how we are trying to achieve these aims. The Policy Workshop exposed our members, many of them students, to the overlaps between their research and the policy realm, and provided them real, practical examples of how to get further involved in policy work. The Advocacy Training Day, on the other hand, brought psychologists and students directly onto Capitol Hill, and allowed them to use their expertise to educate policy-makers. This was the first time that SPSSI has been able to facilitate such an experience, but we plan to continue such offerings in the years to come. If you have other suggestions to advance the integration of psychology and public policy, please contact me via email. I look forward to hearing from you as we continue to develop SPSSI’s policy agenda.

—Gabriel Twose
gtwose@spssi.org

Reflections: We Need to Talk More, We Need to Talk Better
By Katya Migacheva, SPSSI James Marshall Fellow

Writing this entry is bittersweet, as my time as SPSSI’s James Marshall Fellow has come to an end. What an incredible journey it was! This fellowship has helped me grow professionally and personally and provided me with a unique opportunity to learn a great deal about the policy world. Importantly, working at the intersection of science and policy has helped me understand better where lies the

continued next page...
disconnect between social psychology and policy and how we can possibly bridge it.

My position as the lead fellow of the Tom Lantos Human Rights Commission afforded me an inside view of policy making and policy implementation. I was trusted with great responsibility, which forced me to learn very quickly about the main stakeholders in international human rights decision-making in the United States and abroad. In my position, I met with numerous human rights activists and defenders from around the world, advised Members of Congress on the issues of human rights in foreign policy, international conflict and reconciliation, and led a team of human rights professionals in identifying effective strategies for the U.S. Congress to address human rights violations. I wrote numerous speeches, op-eds, and statements, organized multiple hearings and briefings, and liaised with the U.S. and foreign government officials. During my service, the Commission grew in its reach and membership, expanded and diversified the scope of its activities, and increased its visibility within the U.S. Congress.

SPSSI’s mission for bringing social science research into political decision-making was one of my main objectives during my time in Congress. As the lead of the Commission, I had power to decide whom to invite to present at hearings and briefings, or to advise Members of Congress in individual meetings. I made a great effort to include academics from a variety of fields into relevant conversations. Yet, involving social psychologists in particular has proven to be a challenge. Even though social psychologists and policy makers seem to deal with similar topics, it has been rather difficult to match the questions that policy makers ask with the answers/information that social psychologists are able provide.

Part of the problem is that policy is generally solution oriented, aimed to fix problems, whereas social psychology is better equipped to address the roots of the problems. Put differently, while policy-makers grapple with a question of “how,” social psychologists generally work to understand “why.” This difference is not purely semantic and the gap it creates is hard (though necessary) to overcome.

Further, while social psychologists and policy makers may be driven to fulfill similar broad ideals (e.g., to make the world a better place), via the tools available to them, the sources of their questions and specific pursuits do not align. Social psychologists generally draw questions from gaps in existing theory, whereas policy makers are faced with the need to deal with the daily realities. While both are very important, this may make it difficult for social psychologists to contribute to a discussion on the immediate societal challenges and crises.

Relatedly, disconnect between social psychology and policy also lies in the level of granularity of questions with which both grapple and in the answers they seek and produce. Policy often deals with broad and complex problems (e.g., how do we stop ethnic cleansing of the Rohingya Muslims in Burma), while scientists break problems down into very small pieces and study them. I sometimes visualize this as a very large puzzle, where the problem with which policy-makers have to deal is the puzzle itself, and the information that social psychologists have to provide are small puzzle pieces. These small pieces are very important and without them a puzzle cannot be complete, but it is often challenging to see where and how the pieces fit.

So, who needs to change to make this social psychology-policy union a possibility? While I am yet to formulate specific steps, I think that neither really needs to change, but both need to adjust. Policy makers need to recognize that painting with a broad stroke creates general and ineffective solutions, whereas psychologists need to work on putting the small puzzle pieces together, which would ensure that they will find an easier fit in the big puzzle. Or, we need a bigger field of science communicators, who would do this for living. Some of this disconnect may be bridged by strengthening the field of applied social psychology and by ensuring that scientists have opportunities to step out of the academic walls to better see how their research may benefit from and contribute to policy issues of the day. Further, it has become absolutely clear to me that only by joining efforts with...
other disciplines can we make meaningful contributions to solving complex societal problems.

Another important way to make policy makers aware of social psychological knowledge is—drum roll—to present it to them. Policy makers constantly receive information from a variety of sources through briefings, hearings, presentations, letters—why shouldn’t social psychologists have their ear at least some of the time? To facilitate this information flow, I proposed an idea of congressional seminar series—similar to academic brown bags—in which social psychologists would brief policy makers on psychological aspects of some of the pressing topics of the day. Thus far we held several very well attended seminars and Members of Congress and their staffers heard from the leading social psychologists on the topics of poverty and inequality, intergroup prejudice and discrimination, women in STEM, and human rights. I am grateful for SPSSI’s support of this idea and a crucial collaboration with SPSSI’s Policy Director, Gabe Twose, in its implementation. I hope this series continues long beyond my tenure as a James Marshall Fellow.

After two years as a Marshall fellow I recognize even more how important it is to push academic boundaries and to encourage rigorous research that reflects the complexities of the problems the global society faces today. Social psychologists must seek a place at the table with policy makers. Equipped with our understanding of the interaction between societal and individual factors, we can provide unique insight into how policies affect people. Policy makers have great questions and we have tools, skills, and scientific method to help answer them. We just need to talk more; we just need to talk better.

—Katya Migacheva
katyamig@gmail.com

SPSSI Communications
By David Aronson, SPSSI Communications Director

I’ve had a few months to settle into my position as communications director here at SPSSI. It has been a pleasure getting to know many of the people who help make SPSSI what it is, from my fellow central office staffers to our members pursuing cutting-edge research on urgent public policy matters.

This is the best and worst of times to be a communications director for a policy-focused organization. A large part of my work involves disseminating our “intellectual products” to a broader audience through the media. And the truth is that the press is in serious decline. A dwindling number of Americans follow the news; of those who do, fewer than before have a tolerance for complexity and nuance. More importantly, the media itself has not yet found a viable business model in the Internet Age. This is especially true of print journalism. As an example, in 2013, The New York Times sold off its controlling share in the Boston Globe for six percent of what it paid for it 20 years earlier.

The good news is that in the past few years a new sort of journalism has emerged, more attuned to the sort of work we do. Sometimes referred to as “explanatory journalism,” the aim is to provide the contextual information necessary for readers to make sense of ongoing developments or policy debates. At its best, it draws heavily on the relevant academic literature, including social science. Two prominent examples are Nate Silver's "538" blog and Ezra Klein’s Wonkblog.

The other major development is the rise of social media: websites, blogs, listservs, Facebook, and Twitter. The upside of social media is that we can distribute our material directly to readers, without having to rely on intermediaries. The downside is that we have to "grow" our own audience: The op-ed we publish on our own website and publicize through Facebook and Twitter is unlikely to reach more than a few hundred viewers. The same op-ed
published in the average metropolitan newspaper can reach an audience in the tens of thousands.

Given that context, in the past few months the SPSSI Central Office has undertaken several initiatives to help members’ research gain greater visibility. First, we’re becoming more responsive to the news cycle. I like to compare the media spotlight to small children playing soccer. Everybody surrounds the ball, taking ineffectual whacks at it, until someone hits it flush and the ball squirts off in some random direction. In the few months I’ve been at SPSSI, for example, the media spotlight has shifted from LGBT parenting to women in positions of leadership to racist basketball owners to racist police to intimate partner violence—to mention only those topics of immediate relevance to SPSSI. I want us to become increasingly opportunistic about elbowing our way into this spotlight. I think it’s important to bring our expertise to bear on issues as they arise and to make our research and experts available to the media during that small window of time when both the media and the public are actually paying attention.

After the developments in Ferguson, Mo., for example, we identified four SPSSI members who have done ground-breaking research on police-minority community relations and dispatched a media advisory to several hundred outlets with their names, contact information, and a short description of their work. We also solicited statements from five SPSSI members for a discussion forum published on SPSSI’s website. Notices for this discussion went out on Facebook and Twitter. Finally, we helped edit and place an op-ed by SPSSI member Jack Glaser in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch empirically discussing the controversy with the local prosecutor on the case.

To help us reach traditional media, we have hired the services of a media database firm, Cision, which tracks and stores the names and contact information of hundreds of thousands of journalists. From that database, we are able to target journalists based on their previous work and stated interests. For example, one week we send a press release to political journalists who write about affirmative action; the next, we send one to science writers who might be interested in a reevaluation of Milgram’s (in)famous experiments on authority and obedience.

We have also begun soliciting and editing op-eds from SPSSI members. For example, Alice Eagly wrote an op-ed on women and leadership, in the likely event that this topic becomes particularly salient sometime soon after the election. Craig Anderson and Brad Bushman have provided an op-ed on the influence of media on violent behavior. We hope to build a library of materials covering the wide range of topics that our members work on.

In social media we are working on several fronts. First, to keep and grow our following, we’re regularly posting relevant items to our Facebook and Twitter accounts, including publicizing our own events, highlighting recent research by our members, and other germane articles. The number of “friends” and “followers” has grown considerably. Last week, for example, we gained 18 new followers on Twitter. But building our audience is still a work in progress.

One of the more enjoyable tasks we’ve worked on recently was the production of a very short video about SPSSI. Scott Plous, of the Social Psychology Network and a recent SPSSI Council member, asked us to produce a video introducing SPSSI to his MOOC (Massive Open Online Course) students this semester. We gathered new and archival photographs, developed a script thematically organized around our historical interventions on public policy issues, and solicited noted voice actor Gabe Twose (who slums as our policy director) to narrate for us. The initial result was a disaster: we simply didn’t have the technical skill to produce anything resembling competence. We then found an inexpensive videographer who transformed it into something we are now quite proud of. We also now have a Flickr account to house our growing library of SPSSI photos showcasing our events.

We are currently producing our inaugural series of podcasts, with the working title of “Sound Science, Sound Policy.” The series will consist of interviews with leading SPSSI members. So far, we have interviewed Dominic Abrams, Alice Eagly, Susan Fiske, Jack Glaser and our own former James
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Marshall Fellow, Katya Migacheva. These podcasts are still in production; posting to an online venue near you soon.

Finally, I am pleased to announce that we have developed a partnership with Psychology Today (PT) to host a SPSSI blog—Sound Science, Sound Policy. We hope it will be a productive and mutually beneficial relationship. PT is keen to develop their capacity to provide informed commentary on political and social issues. And PT, in return, provides us with an enormous readership, far beyond anything we would have reached blogging under our own shingle.

They also promise minimal editorial intervention. This blog will offer an opportunity for SPSSI members to talk about their work and its relation to important social issues in new ways. Ideally, we will develop a cadre of interested writers who will contribute articles on a regular basis. Until then, I will prompt members to contribute posts based on their current research, often—but not always—in response to developments in the news. I will then edit and format these pieces before posting them online.

The foundations are set for a solid communications program. Each of these efforts on its own might have a limited reach, but together they should have a cumulative impact. A blog post, for example, might lead to a glance at our Facebook page and a visit to our website (which we hope to re-vamp and modernize soon). That visit in turn might lead a state or national legislator to invite a SPSSI member to testify on a matter of concern. It’s these slow, incremental steps that add up.

In the meantime, I encourage SPSSI members to “like” us on Facebook and follow us on Twitter.

—David Aronson
daronson@spssi.org

---

As a doctoral student in Clinical Psychology, I was concerned with the large-scale inequities that affected many vulnerable populations I was working closely with. I found myself, in effect, supporting clients to cope with the macro system disparities that continued to disempower minority populations and infringe upon basic civil and human rights. I realized that if I was going to be part of social change, I needed to learn how to influence policy and societal systems that continue to perpetuate social injustices. Through the Dalmas A. Taylor Summer Minority Policy Fellowship, I gained such training, insight, and understanding of a world that I never believed was within my reach. This opportunity helped me re-evaluate my developing career and future trajectory. I felt very inspired, intellectually stimulated, and invigorated within the new terrain in Washington, D.C.

Bridging the worlds of science and policy at a glance seems quite disparate, but of course they are not! I learned this invaluable lesson of how the intersections of psychology and policy can serve a greater humanitarian good with an inherent commitment to social justice and human rights principles that are rooted in psychological and philosophical bases.

The Dalmas A. Taylor fellowship taught me about the complexities and intricacies that exist within the political arena. I developed an appreciation for the multiple layers surrounding relevant social issues that expand across NGOs, think tanks, public and private sectors, policy and government, and psychology and research. I observed and gained understanding for ways to be most effective in advancing social change and progress. The nuances involved in being both strategic and collaborative are integral components of the complex processes.

---

SPSSI’s 2014 Dalmas A. Taylor Fellow:
Emily T. Bashah, Arizona School of Professional Psychology at Argosy University, Phoenix

---
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involved, as policy level work is truly an art form. This fellowship provided me the advocacy training and a greater appreciation of how the psychological community serves an important social justice role. This can be embedded in essentially all that we do – from publications, multi-media outlets, and public presentations, within and even more importantly outside of our psychological communities.

I was deeply honored to represent SPSSI and commemorating the life, work, and contributions to bettering humanity provided by Dalmas A. Taylor and his dedication towards eliminating systemic racism. I continue to feel very humbled by the experiences I have gained and do feel a commitment to represent SPSSI and Dalmas Taylor even now back in Arizona while on my pre-doctoral internship. I am extremely grateful for having been awarded this fellowship. The invaluable experience I had attained has not only fulfilled, but also far exceeded what the fellowship aimed to accomplish. This was such an enriching experience and I am forever grateful to SPSSI and extremely appreciative to be connected to a community purposefully committed to advancing social change, justice, and societal progress. The SPSSI home is truly a family of dedicated individuals and it was an absolute honor and pleasure to become a member of the family. This is a relationship that I will undoubtedly continue to embrace, value, and be committed to into the future. THANK YOU SPSSI!!!

—Emily T. Bashah
emily.bashah@gmail.com

SPSSI Around the World
Spotlight on Roberto González, Ph.D.

We are delighted to shine our spotlight on former SPSSI Council Member, Roberto González, Ph.D. Roberto is Professor of Social Psychology at Pontificia Universidad Católica in Santiago, Chile. A Chilean native, he completed his PhD at the University of Kent in the UK. His research efforts cross multiple international borders, as he has been a visiting scholar at several institutions in England, Germany, and the U.S. In addition, he also hosts foreign students in Chile. Roberto is the co-founder and co-editor of the Inter-American Journal of Education for Democracy (published in Spanish and English). Thank you, Roberto, for taking the time to answer our questions!

How long have you been a SPSSI member?

I became a SPSSI member back in 1998 when I was a Ph.D. student at the University of Kent in the UK, working with Rupert Brown; my mentor who stimulated me to become a member of SPSSI. In 2008, I was invited to join the International Academic Committee of SPSSI. Afterwards, I was elected as a member of the executive board (Council) of SPSSI (from 2009 to 2012). During this period of time I was the chair of SPSSI’s Internationalization Committee.

Please describe your current research focus.

Since I started as a social psychologist, my research agenda has been focused on understanding the factors that might contribute to mitigating social inequality. In particular, I have focused my attention on the study of intergroup relations, prejudice, discrimination, acculturation processes, and inter-group emotions in both real life and experimental settings. This includes the study of attitude change as a consequence of positive intergroup contact involving different groups in Chile and elsewhere (e.g., indigenous, immigrants, political, mentally disabled and religious groups), as well as the moderators and mediators of the contact-attitude link. I have also conducted research in the domain of political psychology related to issues such as political identity, coalition dynamics, political attitudes, and participation. Most recently, I have started a new research agenda that involves intergroup helping, solidarity, intergroup forgiveness, reparation, and reconciliation processes.
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What are some of the social issues that are important in your region of the world?

In South America, social inequality has been a major social issue for a long time. This is mainly because the history of the region has been one of colonization, in which clear differences have been made between indigenous people and the settlers. Hence, discrimination, prejudice and intergroup processes in general are important phenomena that are present in our daily life. Now, with the increasing levels of immigration throughout the region, I believe intergroup processes have become an even more relevant issue for public policies. On the other hand, the political history of coups and subsequent dictatorships in South America have deepened feelings of resentment and lack of trust among the different political parties and people in general, which has attracted my attention to forgiveness, reparation, and reconciliation processes.

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

I am completely convinced about the value of fostering international and interdisciplinary collaboration, because it can contribute to increasing psychology’s influence on the discussion of public issues and policy development across different social realities. It impacts the academic productivity and development of research groups, as well as the training of new generation of researchers. That is why I have been actively participating as an associated researcher at the Center for Intercultural and Indigenous Studies (ICIIS) and the Center for Social Conflict and Cohesion Studies (COES) in my country with researchers from different national, cultural, and disciplinary backgrounds. I do believe it is possible to share and learn from experience with others and to produce even more comprehensive knowledge in relevant areas that can have an effective impact in public policy development. These rather new centers will become the base for impacting academic development and public policy guidelines in the matters they address, considering an international perspective (there are more than 30 international research Centers associated with them from different regions of the world!).

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

I think that international and interdisciplinary collaboration is the key to advancing the study of social issues because it gives the possibility of bringing together different experiences in a range of cultures, which may strengthen our comprehension of these complex processes. I believe that connecting with other researchers in different regions of the world and fostering successful international collaboration (via research and professional networks) in not only psychological, but in other behavioral sciences as well, may further contribute to increasing the impact that psychology has as a disciplinary area in the development of public policy across different social realities.

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

I enjoy working with NGOs that deal with social change as well as mentoring new generations of social scientists to deal with the development of their academic careers.

What is your favorite psychology book?

The Nature of Prejudice (1954) by Gordon Allport.

What is your favorite non-psychology book?

War and Peace by Leo Tolstoy.

—Roberto González
rgonzale@uc.cl

For more on SPSSI’s efforts outside of North America, see the report provided by the Internationalization Committee on p. 42 of this issue. —Editor
SPSSI at the UN
Empowering Women—Empowering Humanity: 20th Anniversary of the Fourth UN World Conference on Women in 2015
By Corann Okorodudu, UN/SPSSI Representative

On June 26, 2014, the Executive Director and Under Secretary-General of the United Nations Entity for Gender Equality and Women’s Empowerment (UN Women), Phumzile Mlambo-Ngcuka of South Africa, hosted a celebratory evening at the Apollo Theatre in Harlem, New York City. Featuring top-level UN officials, renowned feminists and performers, the purpose of the celebration was to launch a yearlong campaign in commemoration of the 20th Anniversary of the Fourth UN World Conference on Women, entitled Empowering Women – Empowering Humanity – Picture It.

Background. Four UN World Conferences have marked the journey of the international movement for women’s equality. The journey began at the First World Conference in Mexico City in 1975 followed by the adoption of the UN Convention on the Elimination for All Forms of Discrimination against Women in 1979. The journey continued with the Second World Conference in Copenhagen, Denmark in 1980, and successfully moved its agenda forward at the Third World Conference in Nairobi, Kenya in 1985. The movement became a global force for a comprehensive agenda for gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls at the Fourth World Conference on Women held in Beijing, China in September 1995.

The Beijing Conference attracted more than 17,000 participants, including delegates from 189 UN member states, more than 4000 representatives of Non-Governmental Organizations and other civil society organizations, 4000 journalists, and representatives of all UN organs, agencies, and programs. The Beijing Declaration and Platform for Action (DPFA), unanimously adopted by all 189 Member States in attendance, articulated a visionary and path-breaking plan for protecting and fulfilling the human rights of all women everywhere throughout their life cycle. It reaffirmed as a fundamental principle that the human rights of women and girls are “an inalienable, integral and indivisible part of universal human rights” (DPFA, p. 19). It identified a range of strategies for Member States, UN organs, agencies, and programs, and civil society groups to undertake to promote the empowerment and advancement of women.

The DPFA called for strategic actions in the following 12 critical areas of concern: (1) the persistent burden of poverty on women; (2) inequalities in, and unequal access to, education and training; (3) inequalities and inadequacies in, and unequal access to, health care and related services; (4) violence against women; (5) effects of armed or other conflict on women; (6) inequality in economic structures and policies, in all forms of productive activities and in access to resources; (7) inequality between men and women in the sharing of power and decision-making at all levels; (8) insufficient mechanisms at all levels to promote the advancement of women; (9) lack of respect for, and inadequate promotion and protection of, the human rights of women; (10) stereotyping of women and inequality in women’s access to, and participation in, all communication systems, especially in the media; (11) gender inequalities in the management of natural resources and in the safeguarding of the environment; and (12) persistent discrimination against and violation of the rights of girls.

Review of Progress. In preparation for the 20th Anniversary of the Fourth World Conference on Women in 2015, the UN is calling on Member States, UN entities, and NGOs and other civil society organizations to review progress, obstacles, and remaining challenges in the implementation of the
Beijing Platform for action over the course of the past two decades. The review will take place on national, regional, and global levels. These national and regional reviews will feed into the global review to be conducted at the 59th annual session of the UN Commission on the Status of Women (CSW) on March 9-20, 2015, culminating in a high-level commemorative event in the UN General Assembly. The global review will provide a well-timed opportunity to ensure that the Post-2015 Sustainable Development Agenda of the UN, to be adopted by the General Assembly in the Fall of 2015, will focus and integrate forward-looking goals for the further protection and fulfillment of gender equality and the empowerment of women and girls of the world.

Calling Psychologists to Action. As accredited Non-Governmental Organizations and members of civil society, the Beijing+20 Campaign provides an opportunity for psychologists to contribute to the review of progress in the implementation of the Beijing DPFA. Our reviews could assess psychological contributions to the 12 critical areas in our research, policy and advocacy initiatives, publications, education and training, practice and other professional activities. Psychological Associations and their divisions could also assess their strategic objectives, programs, and operational procedures to determine the extent to which they have succeeded in promoting the empowerment and advancement of women and girls within the discipline of psychology, within the wider society, and within the global community.

—Corann Okorodudu
okorodudu@rowan.edu

References
http://beijing20.unwomen.org


Two-Tiered Academic Labor Task Force

By Gretchen M. Reevy, SPSSI Task Force Chair

In a previous newsletter I promised that I would report on a study that fellow task-force member, Grace Deason, and I conducted on the well-being of non-tenure-track (NTT) faculty. I am happy to report that our study, “Predictors of depression, stress, and anxiety among non-tenure-track faculty”, was published in the peer-reviewed journal, Frontiers in Psychology, in July 2014. However, the results of our study saddened me. We found that some NTT faculty appear to be suffering and that their suffering is related to employment conditions. Specifically, those NTT faculty with lower family incomes, who desire a tenure-track position, and/or who are more committed to the universities where they work suffer higher levels of depression, stress, and anxiety. The last finding was particularly distressing to me. In most employee samples, those who are more committed to their institutions experience relatively high well-being. Grace and I reasoned that this result may have occurred because it is particularly depressing, stressful, and anxiety-producing to be committed to someone or something that is not committed to you.

Right now, according to the American Association of University Professors (AAUP), about 76% of faculty in higher education hold NTT positions. According to a recent report by Adjunct Action, the average NTT faculty member in the United States earns $3000 per course. If the faculty member teaches three courses a semester for two semesters, their annual income is $18,000 per year. And if he or she teaches more than that, it is nearly impossible to have the time to do other work for which he/she was trained (i.e., research). Additionally, many NTT faculty in the United States do not have health insurance or retirement benefits. Many do not have access to an office or computer while at work and are not allowed to participate in governance in their colleges or universities. It is no wonder that some of these individuals are depressed, stressed, and anxious.
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Right now, in the United States, there are at least 1.4 million NTT faculty (Curtis, 2014). It is admirable that SPSSI has created the Task Force on Two-Tiered Academic Labor, of which Grace and I are members (the only members at present). However, SPSSI needs to do more to address the NTT faculty issue, which is a real, and growing, social issue in the United States and other countries. As individual SPSSI members we can educate ourselves about NTT faculty. Two good places to start are the New Faculty Majority, and a report produced by the Coalition on the Academic Workforce. Additionally, more of us could conduct research on psychological issues surrounding NTT faculty. As an organization, SPSSI could speak out publicly against exploitative working conditions which many NTT faculty face.

Issues surrounding NTT faculty are “hot.” The article that Grace and I just published has received a very high number of views. In the history of the journal, Frontiers in Psychology, our article ranks #7 (out of 1899 articles) in terms of the “buzz” surrounding the article. Several media outlets, including Inside Higher Education and Academe, have featured articles about our study. This “buzz” shows that research on NTT faculty is welcome and needed.

Please contact me if you would like to discuss any issue regarding contingent faculty or would like to assist with our work on the task force.

—Gretchen M. Reevy
gretchen.reevy@csueastbay.edu

References
American Association of University Professors (AAUP). (2014). Background Facts on Contingent Faculty.

Early Career Scholars (ECS) Update
By Nicola Curtin & Heather Bullock, ECS Co-Chairs

We hope that everyone had a wonderful summer and is ready for fall. With our brief update, we encourage you to read Stephenie Chaudoir’s and Brett Stoudt’s article on Envisioning SPSSI’s Future from the Portland convention (see p. 19).

The 2014 SPSSI Conference in Portland was fantastic, and we are especially grateful to everyone who attended our ECS (and ECS co-sponsored) events! The ECS co-sponsored (with the Policy Committee) pre-conference policy workshop was a highlight of the conference. We want to especially acknowledge Gabe Twose, SPSSI’s Policy Director, who did all the heavy-lifting on the organization of the workshop and who was instrumental to its success. Both the Early Career Scholar Roundtable Discussions and the Symposium, Envisioning SPSSI’s Future: A Community Conversation, were also very well attended. The Symposium was especially useful to the committee in getting us thinking about the role of academic activism, as Stephenie and Brett reflect on in their review of the event (see p. 19). And finally, the Happy Hour was also a success—we are very grateful to all who attended, as well as the Diversity and Graduate Student committees for co-sponsoring with us.

Looking forward to the year ahead, the committee is convening soon to discuss how to continue to build a network of junior scholars, with a particular focus on building our online presence and networking opportunities. We always welcome your ideas and questions—please contact Nicola or Heather!

—Nicola Curtin & Heather Bullock
ncurtin@clarku.edu & hbullock@ucsc.edu
SPSSI’S Biennial Conference: Exploring the Psychological Bases of Social Change

If you weren’t in Portland from June 27–29, you missed out on SPSSI’s 10th biennial conference. We had an amazing schedule with over 90 talks, including new discussion format sessions, specialized lunch meetings for graduate students, early career scholars, and international folk, and happy hours—not to mention four fabulous keynote speakers, outstanding award winners and talks, and the Presidential Address. The conference covered the far-ranging topics of homelessness; women’s participation in STEM fields; violence against teachers; new research on how to reduce intergroup prejudice; and implicit racial attitudes in patient-doctor interactions. Whether you were there or not, we hope you enjoy this brief round-up on the next few pages. This is just a sampling of activities that took place over the 3-day event. And, be on the lookout for information about our next SPSSI conference - coming up sooner than you think in 2015! We look forward to seeing you at the next SPSSI conference!
Envisioning SPSSI’s future: Meditations on How to Build “ Academic Activists”

By Stephenie Chaudoir and Brett Stoudt, ECS Committee Members

What happens when you bring together an intergenerational panel of some of SPSSI’s most thoughtful and innovative leaders, add an engaged group of conference attendees, and ask them to envision the future of our organization, our discipline, and our society? The Early Career Scholars Committee (of which we are members) wanted to find out. At this year’s biennial conference in Portland, OR, our committee organized an interactive discussion with Dominic Abrams, Susan Dudley, Maureen O’Connor, Allen Omoto, and Brett Stoudt. Along with a few dozen conference attendees, we discussed the complexities of doing socially relevant research in a discipline where the definition of “good science” has narrowed and researchers are expected to do more with less. How can SPSSI evolve to help its members continue to meet these significant challenges? From our conversation emerged a number of exciting possibilities, most of which centered on SPSSI’s ability to empower its members to become “academic activists”—scholars who are committed to using psychological science to improve the human condition.

In order to enact change, academic activists must cultivate a diverse array of skills beyond those acquired in traditional academic training. For psychologists, this means developing strong research skills and a deep knowledge of the social systems, institutions, and policies where their research can be implemented. It often means learning how to write for a variety of audiences, think across multiple academic disciplines or industry sectors, and build partnerships with community organizations.

So, how can SPSSI continue to help its members become academic activists? In our conversation, we noted that SPSSI already does a considerable amount to support advocacy efforts. During the inaugural Policy Workshop in 2013, SPSSI leaders taught researchers how to communicate research findings to the public and policy makers and provided information about policy careers, fellowships, and other opportunities for policy involvement. And, on the 2014 Advocacy Training Day, SPSSI trainers focused on the Family and Medical Insurance Leave Act—an example of a bill whose aims and outcomes would be consistent with social science data—to teach psychologists the nuts and bolts about how to advocate with their congressional representatives on specific legislation. But, while SPSSI already does a fair amount of advocacy work, we realized that these efforts should be better publicized. For example, did you know that since 1987, SPSSI has supported a specialized committee whose members participate regularly in official UN forums and activities with the goal of spotlighting social science research across a wide range of international concerns? (We didn’t.) Or did you know that SPSSI has a Policy Hub of fact sheets which outline the state-of-the-science findings about issues such as interpersonal violence, climate change, and international human rights? (We didn’t.) Therefore, SPSSI’s future efforts could focus on disseminating these resources and skills-building opportunities more widely, especially among early career scholars who are less likely to be familiar with them.

Our discussion also generated many new ways in which SPSSI can cultivate academic activists. What if we were to build funding mechanisms for researchers to conduct coordinated, multi-site research projects examining a specific research question? Imagine, for example, how much more...
powerful our work could be if multiple investigators at diverse research sites examined the individual and structural factors that contribute to sexual violence or the efficacy of interventions designed to mitigate these deleterious effects. Multi-site projects would increase the number and diversity of participants enrolled in our studies which would allow us to ask more precise questions about individual and contextual moderators of our effects and increase generalizability of findings. Our colleagues in medicine have been using multi-site science for years, primarily to develop an evidence base for drug treatments. Is it time that we adopt a similar approach to advance our knowledge about and find solutions to pressing social issues?

Beyond creative methodological innovations, SPSSI could also help our membership bring an interdisciplinary mindset to their research questions. The reality is that no social issue can be solved from any single disciplinary approach. As such, our research requires that we think multi-disciplinarily as we interface with a wide range of scholars across disciplines such as economics, political science, philosophy, and medicine. Yet, few of us have the sort of time and energy required to bridge these disciplinary boundaries well. What if SPSSI did more to help us bridge this gap? Imagine, for a moment, that you study economic inequality. You can’t turn on *The Colbert Report*, flip through an issue of *The Economist*, or walk by an airport bookstore without being bombarded with the French economist Thomas Piketty’s new book, *Capital in the Twenty-First Century*, which details the evolution of economic inequality over the last 300 years. At almost 600 pages, however, *Capital* is an intimidating tome. What if SPSSI’s next conference included a break-out session where members could learn about the central thesis of the book and the methodology of Piketty’s impressive research? Essentially, SPSSI could host something akin to “Cliff’s Notes” sessions that would help our members engage with emerging research and conceptual frameworks in other disciplines. Such a platform could also easily be adopted to disseminate information about innovative methodological and activist approaches.

Moreover, SPSSI could do more to help its members articulate how academic activists add value to their scientific, academic, and general communities. Here, we might follow the American Psychological Association’s lead and assemble a task force to write a report outlining the appointment, tenure, promotion, and merit review considerations for psychologists who study socially relevant issues and those who engage in advocacy work, broadly construed. Such a report could help hiring, tenure, and promotion committees develop more nuanced thinking about how to evaluate professional activities of the academic activist (e.g., developing community based participatory research methodologies, maintaining research-related blogs) that may not easily fit into the traditional research-teaching-service paradigm. Additionally, SPSSI’s
policy briefs and fact sheets could take on topics that are more relevant to academic settings (e.g., diversity and inclusion) where our collective research findings can improve course content, pedagogy, student life, and inform university strategic planning.

We belong to SPSSI because it is one of the few professional organizations where psychologists can come together to create and sustain spaces for the “academic activist” to emerge in all of us. Our conversation in Portland generated a number of interesting possibilities that could help SPSSI continue to bolster our scholars’ abilities to conduct sound science and advocate for sound policy. As members of the Early Career Scholars committee, we plan to spend the next year determining which of these initiatives we would like to push forward. But, before we do that, we’d like to hear from you. Which of these ideas has captured your attention? Which would most enhance your own ability to be an academic activist? We invite you to email us with your comments and ideas, as we reimagine the future of SPSSI and the future of academic activism in the academy, industry, and beyond.

— Stephenie Chaudoir & Brett Stoudt
schaudoi@holycross.edu & bstoudt@jjay.cuny.edu
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Meet the SPSSI Editors

We had a successful, well-attended “Meet the Editors” session at Portland. On hand to describe SPSSI opportunities for publishing were Dan Perlman, editor of SPSSI’s book series, Ann Bettencourt, editor of the Journal of Social Issues (JSI), Rupert Brown, current co-editor of Social Issues and Policy Review (SIPR) and incoming SIPR co-editor Louis Penner, and editor of Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy (ASAP) Heather Bullock. Chris Crandall, co-chair of SPSSI’s Publication Committee moderated the meeting.

The informal session provided potential authors with the opportunity to learn more about SPSSI’s different publications, hear about the review process at each venue, and gather tips for submitting a strong manuscript. Questions ranged from nuts-and-bolts issues concerning manuscript length and writing style to broader queries about multidisciplinary and applied work. A dominant theme of the discussion was the openness of the editors to discussing articles prior to submission, and flexibility in seeking worthwhile contributions. We look forward to holding similar sessions at future conferences but in the meantime, please don’t hesitate to contact us with any questions you may have about SPSSI’s publishing opportunities.

We look forward to receiving you manuscripts!
Dr. Thomas was a speaker on the GSC’s “PhDs for Hire” panel. —Editor

Portland 2014 > SPSSI Outside Academia

The Business of Diversity: Getting Down to Brass Tacks to Affect Organizational Change

By Erin L. Thomas, Gender Diversity Specialist at the US Department of Energy National Laboratory Complex and Argonne National Laboratory

As an intergroup relations researcher and SPSSI member, I value diversity and inclusion (D&I) as normatively good. However, as a D&I practitioner, I relish in the challenge of outlining the business case for diversity and inclusion to science, technology, engineering, and mathematics (STEM) professionals.

I devise structural interventions that enable Argonne National Laboratory to disrupt antiquated workplace practices that were not designed to accommodate today’s diverse workforce. I also develop toolkits that acquaint employees with the actions they can and should take to foster a diverse and inclusive workplace. In a typical work week, I collaborate with senior leaders, consult with employee resource groups, and dialogue with employees from a variety of social, educational, and occupational backgrounds. My position requires me to bridge the gap between D&I scholarship and D&I execution. Remaining nimble in my communications is essential for gaining trust, commitment, and ultimately traction within an organization of 3500+ employees.

As social scientists, we must take the time to understand our populations before we attempt to intervene within them. Understanding enables perspective-taking, which is essential for making inroads with those outside of our line of work. I employed a D&I education strategy at Argonne that brought me together with senior leaders and internal advisory groups to workshop approaches for effectively communicating the value of diversity throughout all levels of the organization. We have been successful in meeting employees where they are via a multipronged campaign that outlines the empirically documented benefits of D&I to the STEM enterprise, to the Argonne community at large, and to them as individual contributors. We put moral prescriptions aside and present the facts:

**D&I benefits the STEM enterprise.** A wealth of research shows that diversity positively predicts organizations’ abilities to innovate and problem solve. These correlational data become even more compelling when coupled with causal findings from social psychology, sociology, organizational science, economics, and other research-based disciplines. *Scientific American* recently published an article by Katherine Phillips that provides an accessible and thoughtful summary of the various studies that I regularly debrief to senior leaders and middle managers. These experiments show that diversity isn’t just a minority issue. They demonstrate that the very future of scientific discovery is contingent on the exchange of ideas across lines of difference.

**D&I benefits STEM organizations.** Attracting and retaining diversity are beneficial for the growth of scientific ideas but diversity also affords STEM organizations with more direct benefits to their bottom line. As the STEM talent pool becomes increasingly diverse, employers must reflect this diversity to be attractive and remain relevant to potential employees. This attractiveness is critical when compounded by the fact that the nation is
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facing an estimated STEM workforce deficit of one million workers over the next decade.

Argonne’s Laboratory Director Peter Littlewood said it best during one of his first public interviews upon being appointed in March: “…if we don’t look like the rest of the world, we go extinct.”

A lack of workforce diversity also forces organizations to take a cold hard look in the mirror. If an organization fails to reflect the diversity of its available talent pool, it is virtually impossible to believe that hiring and promotions processes are entirely meritocratic. In the absence of merit-based decision-making, organizations’ can hardly claim to be excellent.

**D&I benefits to individuals.** Individual STEM professionals also benefit directly from working in diverse teams. Gender, ethnic, and geographical diversity in co-authorship teams all positively predict citation rates. This may occur because diverse teams produce better quality work or simply because diverse teams have broader professional networks to consume their research. Regardless of the mechanism, h-indices are the bread and butter of many STEM researchers and these findings resonate with them, especially with female and minority employees when they realize that they too benefit from working with colleagues from diverse walks of life. Moreover, as Dr. Phillips’ article aptly depicts, the mere anticipation of working in diverse teams also primes people to roll up their sleeves and approach the task at hand with focus, determination, and an open mind.

By appealing to our employees’ brilliant minds, we have begun to capture their hearts. More importantly, we are influencing behaviors. In the past 16 months, our hiring, mentoring, professional development, and communications practices have become more thoughtful, deliberative, and rigorous. Our culture has progressed from one of advocacy to one of action in large part because my collaborators and I constantly step outside of ourselves and into the shoes of those we’re trying to affect. We listen and respond to what matters to them. Only then can we expect our colleagues to do the same.

— Erin L. Thomas ethomas@anl.gov
Feeding Two Birds With One Crust: Teaching Research Skills and Serving the Community Through Community Based Social Marketing Research

By Cindy McPherson Frantz, Oberlin College

Dr. Frantz is the 2014 recipient of the Outstanding Teaching and Mentoring award, and was a speaker in the Teaching Award Symposium in Portland. —Editor

The pitcher cries for water to carry and a person for work that is real.

-- Marge Piercy

Teaching research skills to students is a core goal of most psychology departments. It is not simply because the scientific method is a cornerstone of psychological science; it’s because research skills are useful. Most of our students will not go on to graduate school, but if we can teach them to think critically, design assessments, and evaluate hypotheses with empirical data we have given them important life skills. (I am thinking of my sister-in-law, who used her experimental training to design controlled trials to identify the perfect chile rellenos recipe; you never know when experimental design and quantitative methods will come in handy.)

The typical psychology major does not love research methods, however. Who can blame them? They payoff is not obvious (they have not yet thought about chile rellenos), and often they are learning research and statistical skills through canned projects and fake data sets. The work is not real, and they know it.

Yet we know as educators that contextualizing learning results in better outcomes; that connecting core concepts to real world problems increases student motivation and improves retention. Can we teach research methods in a way that makes the work real? After all, there are countless problems in every community that would be more effectively solved with solid empirical assessment.

Over the past 2 years, I have experimented with teaching research skills while also meeting genuine needs in our community. My students and I are developing the behavioral component of Oberlin College’s Climate Action Plan—targeted to eliminate 10–15% of the College’s carbon emissions. We are using Community Based Social Marketing, an empirically grounded approach to behavior change developed by environmental psychologist Doug McKenzie-Mohr (2013). The work began by analyzing the College’s carbon inventory and identifying every place where a human behavior has a carbon impact. After roughly prioritizing these behaviors in terms of potential impact, students conducted focus groups and surveys to determine how widespread these behaviors were, how malleable, and what the barriers and benefits were to each behavior. Based on these results we prioritized a short list of high-impact highly malleable behaviors to focus on.

continued next page...
Next, students developed behavior change strategies (based on their survey work and current research in social and environmental psychology) and designed pilot studies to test their efficacy. So far, students have developed successful strategies for increasing the use of cold water for doing laundry and decreasing the frequency with which lights get left on in unused classrooms.

In addition to saving the College money and reducing carbon emissions, students have gained experience with a wide range of research skills, including: literature reviews, conducting interviews, recruiting representative samples, running focus groups, minimizing response bias, collecting observational data, designing and deploying surveys, data analysis, report writing, and presenting at conferences.

Carbon reduction is only one of many important real life issues that require behavior change, and Community Based Social Marketing can be used to increase all kinds of behaviors. Every community has organizations that would benefit from empirically grounded program design and assessment, and every college and university has students who would benefit from learning research skills in a real life context. The possibilities are literally endless. It takes more effort (especially in the beginning) to design research projects that are grounded in a real world context, but the payoff for students, community members, and the instructor are huge.

— Cindy McPherson Frantz

cindy.frantz@oberlin.edu
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SPSSI Poster Awards
By Rhiannon Turner, Queen’s University Belfast, Northern Ireland, UK

At the SPSSI conference in Portland, Oregon in June 2014, David Aronson and I were tasked with judging the posters submitted for the SPSSI Postgraduate Poster Presentation Award. Our aim was to find the best posters on groups, group processes, intragroup or intergroup relations. We looked at many excellent posters, and had the opportunity to speak to postgraduate researchers about the interesting and important research they are doing. Overall we were very impressed by the high standard of the research, the visual appeal of the posters, and the verbal presentation of those posters. We awarded three prizes, one for each day of the conference.

**Day One Recipient.** Shannon Callahan, University of California at Davis. “The reifying effect of symbols: How group symbols affect social perception”, co-authored with Alison Ledgerwood. Across four studies, using known groups (e.g., an Islamic group) and novel groups created for the purpose of the study, Shannon demonstrated that the presence of symbols affect how a group is perceived in both positive and negative ways. Symbols can, for example, make a group seem more effective, motivated, and legitimate, but also, at times, more hostile.

**Day Two Recipient.** Katharina Block, University of British Columbia. “Do communal and competitive values explain men’s avoidance of female-stereotypic roles?”, co-authored with Toni Schmader. Katharina found that female participants were more likely to have an interest in female roles (e.g., more likely to be interested in female-dominated jobs like nursing and more likely to prioritise family over career) because they held stronger communal values (e.g., perceiving helping others as being an important value).

**Day Three Recipient.** Adam Hoffman, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill. “The stability and bidirectional influence of race centrality in black youth and their parents”, co-authored with Elizabeth Adams, Katherine Perkins, and Beth Kurtz-Costes. This ambitious study, which tracked youth and their parents from Grade 5 to 12, revealed that parents and children may influence changes in each other’s race centrality, and that the direction of influence changes across time. Specifically, parents’ race centrality when youth were in Grade 5 predicted youths’ race centrality two years later, while youths’ Grade 10 race centrality predicted parents’ later race centrality, when youth were in Grade 12.

All three recipients of the poster award presented exciting and valuable work, and were able to eloquently explain their methods and findings with energy and enthusiasm. Recipients of the prize, which was sponsored by the Sage journal, *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations*, received a certificate, copies of the journal, and a check for $50. Congratulations to all!
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2014 Kurt Lewin Award

Named for the late Kurt Lewin, a pioneer in the science of group dynamics and a founder of SPSSI, this award is presented annually for “outstanding contributions to the development and integration of psychological research and social action.”

Susan T. Fiske, Ph.D.

Dr. Fiske presented the topic of “Talking Up and Talking Down: The Power of Positive Speaking.” She described the ways in which people talk up (conveying competence while downplaying warmth) or talk down (conveying warmth while downplaying competence) across roles and in inter-racial interactions. The Eugene Higgins Professor of Psychology and Public Affairs at Princeton University, Fiske received her Ph.D. from Harvard University, and has received honorary doctorates from Université Catholique de Louvain-la-Neuve, Belgium; Universiteit Leiden, Netherlands; Universität Basel, Switzerland. Congratulations Dr. Fiske!

2014 SPSSI Distinguished Service Awards

These awards recognize SPSSI members for the scope of their service to the organization and its impact to science, and to public policy at the local and national levels. Awards were presented at the SPSSI Business Meeting in Portland, open to all attendees.

Margaret Bull Kovera, Ph.D.

Professor of Psychology, Department of Psychology, John Jay College of Criminal Justice, City University of New York

We are extremely pleased to recognize Margaret Bull Kovera’s contributions to SPSSI, social justice, and the law with the 2014 SPSSI Distinguished Service Award. Margaret is a dedicated criminal justice researcher, an effective and accomplished teacher, and has contributed important service to SPSSI in a variety of roles. A member of SPSSI since her graduate school days at the University of Minnesota, she has made consistent and important contributions to SPSSI’s mission. Her scholarship has contributed directly to SPSSI’s core value of applying psychological research to social issues.

Margaret served SPSSI as secretary-treasurer from 2009-12, during a period of financial threat from the recession that saw SPSSI’s publication revenue drop precipitously. Margaret guided...
Council through some difficult decisions to effect responsive and responsible budget cuts. Her term also included an extensive due-diligence process. Her SPSSI colleagues speak very highly of her, noting that she was “generous with her time and supportive in her role as liaison between Central Office and Council”; as well as “efficient and careful, and helped Council to get a clearer grasp of the bigger budget picture”. Margaret not only helped SPSSI with financial decision-making, she also strived to align those decisions with SPSSI values (e.g., in considering whether potential conference sites support the death penalty). The secretary-treasurer position is one of the most important roles in SPSSI governance, and Margaret accomplished it with great energy, effectiveness and dedication. She has also served SPSSI as a member of the Executive Committee (2009-2012), Audit and Finance Committee (Chair, 2009-2012), Nominations and Elections Committee (2009-2012), Fellows Committee (Chair, 2008-2010), and Court Watch Committee (1996-2005; Chair, 1997-2005). In her role as Court Watch chair, she expertly brought psychological research to bear on a wide array of legal issues and shared that analysis with the public. As Chair, Margaret produced the extremely valuable Judicial Notebook, a regular feature in the APA Monitor, that educated the SPSSI and APA membership about critical issues for which there was conflicting legal opinions and substantial psychological research, itself at times conflicting.

For her strategic and dedicated service to SPSSI over the last twenty years, and her consistent attention to and support of SPSSI’s core values and commitment to social justice, it is our great pleasure to award the 2014 Distinguished Service Award to Margaret Bull Kovera.

**Amy Marcus-Newhall, Ph.D.**
Vice President for Academic Affairs, Dean of the Faculty, Professor of Psychology, Scripps College

We are delighted to recognize Amy Marcus-Newhall with the SPSSI Distinguished Service Award.

Her scholarship, which she has contributed to the *Journal of Social Issues* and *Analysis of Social Issue and Public Policy*, among many other outlets, concerns stereotypes and intergroup relations with a focus on work and family balance, hate crimes, aggressive and hostile behavior, and genocide. Her edited book *The Changing Realities of Work and Family* brings together an extraordinary multidisciplinary group of contributors to help understand the intersection of work and family life from the perspective of families, employers, culture and community, politics, and law.

Amy’s scholarship and professional work radiate SPSSI values. She is a founding faculty member of Scripps College Academy, a year-long academic enrichment program which prepares underserved middle and high school students in the greater Los Angeles area for college. The innovative program received the National Arts and Humanities Youth Program Award in 2010, presented in a White House ceremony by First Lady Michelle Obama.

Amy is dedicated to SPSSI, having served the organization in many roles over more than two decades. She has stepped up year after year for labor-intensive assignments that don’t always garner glory, and carried them out with energy and enthusiasm.
Amy co-chaired the Convention program in 1995 (60th Anniversary year) and returned to chair the program in 1996;
• Edited the SPSSI newsletter from 1996 to 1999, the major form of communication between the organization and its members during this time;
• Served on and chaired the Finnish/Elonen Pamphlet Publishing Task Force 1998–1999;
• Served as Teaching Materials Program Chair from 1999-2002;
• Was twice elected to SPSSI Council (1998-1999 and again 2008-2011);
• And, she continues to serve as a member of the Outstanding Teaching Award Committee.

We recognize Amy Marcus-Newhall with the SPSSI Distinguished Service Award with gratitude, and deep appreciation for the scope of her service to our organization. We have benefitted greatly from her dedication and commitment over the years.

Maureen O’Connor, Ph.D., J.D.
Executive Officer of the Doctoral Program in Psychology at the Graduate Center, Professor of Psychology at John Jay College of Criminal Justice, City University of New York

Maureen O’Connor is a gracious, dedicated and committed scholar, administrator and leader who has occupied many different roles within SPSSI over the last decade. A member of SPSSI since her graduate school days at the University of Arizona, she has been steadfast in her enthusiastic and effective contributions to SPSSI’s mission. Dr. O’Connor is a stalwart in the scholarly connection of psychology and law and public policy and has led SPSSI forward in this arena. For her important scholarly contributions to law and social policy, and her illuminating analyses of how gender moderates our thinking and practice of law, and her wide-ranging leadership roles within SPSSI, she is a most deserving recipient of the 2014 Distinguished Service to SPSSI Award.

Maureen’s many leadership positions within SPSSI include serving as President in 2011-12. During that year, she continued the work she began when she was appointed by SPSSI President Kay Deaux to co-chair (with Meg Bond) the Policy Task Force, that articulated how SPSSI might more effectively incorporate a policy focus into the core of its activities. She also made a point of increasing SPSSI’s focus on teaching, mentoring, and professional development of graduate students and early career scholars. Her presidency was vigorous, expansive and effective. However, beyond her effectiveness and service as president, Maureen has done much more for SPSSI, including leading the policy programming for the 2006 biennial convention and helping to plan a Town Hall on Scientific Integrity and Symposium on Using Science to Inform Policy. Other service includes being a SPSSI Council Member (2004-2006), APA Council Representative (2007-2010), Co-chair of the Policy Committee (2005-2009), and Member and Chair of the Applied Social Issues Award Committee (2002-2004).
For her engaged dedicated service to SPSSI over the years, her leadership and major contributions to SPSSI’s core values and impact on social justice, she is an exemplar of distinguished service to SPSSI. It is with great pride and pleasure that we award the 2014 Distinguished Service Award to Maureen O’Connor.

Mark Snyder, Ph.D.
McKnight Presidential Chair in Psychology, Director of the Center for the Study of the Individual and Society, University of Minnesota

We are extremely pleased to recognize Mark Snyder’s contributions to SPSSI and to understanding social action and volunteerism with the 2014 SPSSI Distinguished Service Award.

Mark Snyder is a leading scholar of his generation at the intersection of personality and social psychology. Since joining the faculty at the University of Minnesota, where he has been his entire career, his contributions have cut across core areas within psychological science, and much of his work has been interdisciplinary and multi-method. Mark’s research over the past two decades has involved research collaborations with political scientists, organizational and management scientists, and computer scientists. His work on the psychology of individual and collective action is the scientific standard bearer in psychology and the social sciences. Mark’s elegant and sophisticated research has contributed to our understanding of (1) why people become involved in pro-social action, (2) what sustains their engagement over time, and (3) the consequences of such actions for individuals and society. His work on social action and volunteerism has reinvigorated the field and had foundational influences on applications within social psychology. Mark’s research on volunteerism, in collaboration with past-SPSSI President Allen Omoto, has not only had tremendous impact on the scientific literature, but this body of work has also fostered the public good in exceptionally important ways, both through its direct impact and through the ways it has inspired other translational work of societal significance in North America, in western Europe, and in Latin and South America.

Mark has been a member of SPSSI since his graduate school years, contributing his time and wisdom to the SPSSI community throughout his career, and picking up various accolades. For his outstanding research efforts, he received the Gordon Allport Intergroup Relations Prize (2005) and the Kurt Lewin Memorial Award (2008). In 2002 he served on the SAGES Committee, he served a three year term on SPSSI Council (2001-2004), and from 2011-2013, he served on the Kurt Lewin Memorial Award Committee, and was its chair in 2012-13. Most significantly for SPSSI, Mark served as the inaugural editor of the SPSSI Book Series in 2006-2013. His savvy about the publishing world and his keen, experienced eye for outstanding scholarly contributions were crucial to the early and continued success of SPSSI books.

We recognize Mark Snyder with the SPSSI Distinguished Service Award for 2014, with appreciation for his contributions to SPSSI’s mission as a scholar, and an editor, and for service to the governance of the Society, and his continuing embodiment of SPSSI’s core values.
2014 SPSSI Travel Awards

SPSSI offers a wide array of travel grant opportunities for conference attendees. Details including deadlines and eligibility requirements are announced in advance of each SPSSI stand-alone conference. Please check the SPSSI Conference Travel Award page for further information.

Congratulations to the following travel award recipients who made it to Portland!

**Undergraduate Student Conference Registration Fee Scholarship**
Marina Castro, University of California, Santa Cruz

**Crosby-Spendlove Travel Award**
Katherine Honeyman, La Trobe University, Australia

**Diversity Student Travel Award**
Malik Boykin, University of California, Berkeley
Avery Mitchell, George Washington University
Carlie Trott, Colorado State University
Christin Bowman, The Graduate Center, City University of New York
Clarissa Cortland, University of California, Los Angeles
Jeffrey Hunger, University of California, Santa Barbara
Justina Grayman, New York University
Katie Van Loo, Indiana University
Shelly Zhou, University of Toronto
Sheri LaDuke (Chandler), East Tennessee State University

**Graduate Student Travel Award**
Ariana Bell, University of California, Los Angeles
Jennifer Chmielewski, The Graduate Center, City University of New York
Juan Del Toro, New York University
Jesica Fernández, University of California, Santa Cruz
Janell Fetterolf, Rutgers University
David Lick, University of California, Los Angeles
Veronica Rabelo, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor
Stacey Rieck, Texas A&M University
Victoria Springer, University of Nevada, Reno
Julie Van de Vyver, University of Kent

**International Travel Award**
Agostino Mazziotta, FernUniversität in Hagen
Reysa Aretha Nasroen, University of Indonesia
Stefania Paolini, Newcastle University
From the GSC Chair
By Manisha Gupta, UMass Amherst

It has been a rewarding experience to work with the SPSSI GSC over the past three years, particularly in my opportunity to serve as Chair over the past year. I would like to thank the other outgoing GSC committee members for their work over the past year, including Justine Calcagno (Graduate Center CUNY), Rachael Suffrin (DePaul University), Erin Ellison (UCSC), and Sonia Mairos Ferreira (University of Coimbra, Portugal), and officially welcome the new SPSSI GSC graduate student committees for the 2014-2015 year:

Chair: Joanna Weill (University of California at Santa Cruz)
Chair-Elect: Carlie D. Trott (Colorado State University)
Member at Large Academic Focus: Anjali Dutt, (University of California at Santa Cruz)
Member at Large Policy and Applied Work Focus: Laura Bogardus (Clemson University)
Member at Large Communications Focus: Caitlyn Yantis (University of Illinois at Chicago)
Member at Large Membership Coordinator: Richard Decker (Walden University)

One of my main priorities as GSC Chair over the past year has been to help increase the networking opportunities between graduate students and faculty/professionals in the SPSSI community. We have had several exciting events toward this end, including a half-day conference in New York City on May 8th entitled, Psychology in the Global Context: Advocacy at the United Nations. Representatives from UN AIDS and UNICEF, in addition to our SPSSI representatives to the UN (Drs. Joseph DeMeyer, Harold Cook, Miriam Y Vega, Corann Okorodudu, Harold Takooshian, and Florence Denmark) spoke to graduate students about the role that psychology can play in advocacy work at the United Nations.

In addition, the GSC organized several successful professional development events for graduate students at the biennial convention in Portland, Oregon this summer. Highlights included a student-faculty mentoring luncheon, a social hour that was co-hosted by the diversity and early career scholar committees, and a symposium entitled PhDs for Hire: Exploring Career Options Outside of Academia (in fact, one of our panelists, continued next page...
Erin L. Thomas, wrote the Outside Academia column in this issue of the Forward—see p. 22). In particular, I would like to thank all the faculty members who volunteered to be part of our mentoring luncheon, as well as our symposium speakers (Drs. Erin L. Thomas, Alan Tompkins, Miriam Vega and Neetu Abad) for helping us to put on events that were widely attended and enthusiastically received by all attendees.

In line with the success of our symposium, the last initiative I have undertaken as Chair is to develop an online database for members to share information about SPSSI-friendly organizations (including non-profits, think tanks, etc.) that can be a resource to graduate students and other members who are looking for job opportunities in non-academic settings. For more information on these initiatives and events, not to mention other updates from the GSC, please visit our page on the SPSSI website, and “like us” on Facebook.

As my time as a graduate student comes to a close, I am very appreciative of the role that the SPSSI community has played in my development as a scholar, and the opportunities that being part of the GSC for the past three years has provided me. I leave the GSC in good hands with incoming Chair Joanna Weill, and look forward to hearing about their future accomplishments.

—Manisha Gupta

Dealing with an Advisor’s Departure
By Liz McConnell, DePaul University

Having your advisor leave is not an easy situation. In all likelihood, you moved across the country to work with this person because their research interests were a great match with your career goals. That’s not an easy thing to replicate. Beyond research interests, your advisor likely helped you navigate the requirements of your program and served as an advocate on your behalf in the department. If you were lucky, your advisor may also have been your mentor: someone who took you under his or her wing and nurtured your development as a scholar, a clinician, and a professional in the field. All of these things make this one person seem very central to your academic and professional future, and in many ways, they are.

There is no easy answer to being in this situation. As someone who went through this process in the past year, I won’t say that it is easy. But the things that help us to grow are almost never easy, and we only learn what we are capable of when we are pushed to step outside of our comfort zone. I want to be clear that I am speaking about my own experiences. I have been lucky to have a mentor who is very invested in his students and has remained supportive and professional throughout this process. This is not always the case, and for students in those situations, finding a silver lining might be a bit harder.

For me, having my mentor transition to a different institution has pushed me to become a more independent scholar and to examine my own research interests in a different way. Although my

continued next page...
interests remain very similar to his, I am also developing research areas I may not have pursued if he hadn’t left. I continue to work with my mentor on projects, such as my thesis, but am also collaborating with faculty members at other institutions whose interests are compatible with mine. I teamed up with another graduate student from my mentor’s lab to develop our own program of research, and we work with a team of undergraduate students on a few projects of our own. Designing studies and collecting our own data has been a very empowering experience and has led to potential dissertation topics for both of us.

All of this is helping me to find my own voice as a scholar. The work I do with my mentor is a significant part of that identity, but it’s not the complete picture. In some ways, his departure may have opened as many doors as it closed. Although he no longer serves as my advisor within the department, I recently took a trip to his institution to collect additional data for my thesis. Although he no longer supervises my IRB applications, we are collaborating on several papers. Although I miss having weekly meetings, he is available when I need advice, and meeting less frequently pushes me to be accountable to deadlines on my own.

If you are faced with a similar situation, it can be difficult to figure out what next steps to take. Things that helped me were communicating openly with my mentor, seeking and providing support to other members of our lab, and reaching out to start as many collaborations and projects as I could. Talking to other students who had gone through similar experiences also helped; they offered me hope and understanding from a vantage point a little further down the road. There are likely a lot more of us out there than people acknowledge or talk about. I’ve heard us described as “orphans,” but I prefer the term “independent operators.” And really, that’s a paradoxical description, because one of the most important things this experience has taught me is how broad and supportive my professional community is.

— Liz McConnell EMCCONNE@depaul.edu

Working in the Community: A Graduate Student’s Experience with Systemic Injustice

By Jarrett Lewis, DePaul University

For as long as I can remember I have had a passion for working with children and adolescents who struggle with emotional and behavioral problems. My clinical and research interests are centered on low-income, urban adolescents who suffer from severe emotion dysregulation that is associated with the experience of severe trauma. These adolescents’ inability to regulate emotion often manifests in disruptive, oppositional and defiant behavior in the school and home settings. Consequently, these children are often subjected to a number of challenges at the systemic level in their schools, homes and communities. When presented with an opportunity to work with alternative high school students in a community plagued by traumatic experiences, I excitedly jumped to take advantage of such an opportunity. However, my decision exposed me to a number of recurrent systemic challenges that further emphasized the need for more clinical work and research at the community level and highlighted the associated difficulties in trying to do so.

continued next page...
Students enrolled in this school all identify with an ethnic minority group and have either left the local city’s school district due to stressors in their personal lives (e.g., residential instability, economic stress, pregnancy) or have been expelled from the district due to disciplinary issues. I was placed in the school as an on-site therapist through the training clinic in my clinical psychology graduate program. My weekly duties included seeing clients for psychotherapy, conducting mental health assessments for students seeking therapy services, aiding in the development of a substance abuse prevention program, and working with other therapists and school administrators to provide a school environment that fosters optimal emotional and mental health. This was a perfect opportunity for me to work with population that I am so passionate about. My excitement was unmatched!

When faced with a number of challenges during my experiences at this alternative school, I have found myself frustrated, confused, and even discouraged at times while aiming to accomplish each of my duties. After all, this was dream, right? It was a great opportunity and I was doing what I loved! Although I loved the opportunity to work with the students in assisting them in processing their trauma exposure, and emotional reactions to the trauma to better delineate the effects of their traumatic experiences, it is undeniably difficult work. As a therapist and a graduate student, I was left feeling helpless at times because I felt that my hands were tied because I was unable to implement some meaningful change to ameliorate problems at a systems level. The school was struggling with financial and enrollment issues, and recurrent discipline problems among the students. When speaking with students, they were often frustrated with their school environment and also felt helpless. In my eyes, these students were more than capable to graduate high school and overcome any trauma they have faced. However, what was evident for a number of students was that several environmental stressors (e.g., family support, school support, economic stress) were countering their very thinking about succeeding in a major way. Some things were virtually impossible for them, such as attending a four-year college, building a career and possibly moving to a safer neighborhood. Please don’t misunderstand my rhetoric. Many of these students were incredibly resilient and bright. However, they were only operating within a number of systems that have failed them.

This particular experience has been challenging, but has deepened my passion for engaging in research aligned with social justice principles to better understand the nature of the effect of systemic failures on low-income, urban youth. Working in this community and school has taught me that community work is tough especially when trying to challenge a number of longstanding social issues in a particular community. The systemic failure in the community in which I worked, had pervaded the thinking and actions of the adolescents and young adults in astonishingly major ways. Although my experience has not always been “sunshine and blue skies,” it has fueled my passion and reenergized me to address these social issues in my research. My hope is that this piece will inspire those who wish to work with marginalized populations in systems that may have failed them. Through this experience, I have learned that there is a way around anything when doing community work. Although it may be difficult, as community-based researchers (and psychologists) we must force ourselves to work within failed systems in order to ultimately change them. It’s not easy, but it is incredibly rewarding in
some ways and I have found that my work has been impactful on the individual level, but the need for systemic change is evident in order to expand and enhance that impact. Our work is not in vain. The individual appreciates us. The system needs us.

— Jarrett Lewis
JLEWIS55@depaul.edu

How Social Psychology Can Be Used to Address Prison Reform

By Joanna Weill & Shirin Bakhshay, University of California, Santa Cruz

Although the United States incarcerates a larger proportion of its citizens than any other nation (Walmsley, 2013), the attention paid to these individuals, both inside prison and once they are released, is scant. Unsurprisingly, hostile prison environments do not effectively rehabilitate inmates, and recidivism rates remain high (Sedgley, Scott, Williams, & Derrick, 2010). A better understanding of the effects of incarceration on both the individual and the larger community can help improve the psychological and physical well-being of those both directly and indirectly impacted by incarceration.

Despite the clear role that social psychology can play in addressing prison policy, researchers seem reluctant to do this work. Many social scientists can relate to the feeling of frustration when years of hard work and research do not have the intended impact on social policy. But prisons are particularly resistant to change and those of us interested in this kind of work face many obstacles. First, it is very difficult to gain access to prisons in order to conduct research. There are security and confidentiality concerns, as well as the fear that social scientists are merely there to criticize and undermine the status quo (Trulson, Marquart, & Mullings, 2004). Second, prisons have limited resources and are already stretched thin. Any research findings that call for programs or services to be added will encounter the practical challenge of lack of funds, not to mention lack of political will (Gottschalk, 2009). Third, prisoners are unpopular and so research in this field, and particularly research that suggests more spending on prisoners, is often dismissed (Cohen, Rust, & Steen, 2006). It is difficult for policy makers to take research on prison reform seriously because there is no pressing public concern over the plight of the millions behind bars in this country.

How can you overcome some of these obstacles? To address access, highlight common goals shared with people working in criminal justice settings. For example, most individuals in this field support aims of public safety and wellbeing, although they may try to achieve these in different ways. Alternately, identify institutions that may be more amenable to research inquiry and recommendations, such as jails, halfway houses, and reentry service providers. Finally, we must address how best to overcome the difficulty we face in translating our research findings into policy. If you research a “hot” policy topic, APA’s Government Relations Office and SPSSI’s Policy Committee are looking to bring psychological research to bear on the creation of new law and policy. Your research can also be brought to those who implement criminal justice policy locally; while

continued next page...
receptiveness to your suggestions may vary, beginning a relationship with your local sheriff or probation chief can make them amenable to your findings and potential collaborations in the future. Finally, communicating your research to the general public either through blogs, university public affairs offices, or op-eds can begin to drum up public support for implementing reform based on your research. With these ideas in mind, dedicated social scientists can make a real impact on the problematic state of prisons in this country.

— Joanna Weill & Shirin Bakhshay
jweill@ucsc.edu & sakhsha@ucsc.edu
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**Starting a Family in Graduate School**

**By Charlynn Odahl-Ruan, DePaul University**

“There is a never a good time to have a baby.” This is a common statement, but feels particularly true for graduate students. Grad school overlaps the years when most people start families and leaves us with tough choices to make. Do we wait until graduation? Is it better to have a baby now or after I start my career? How on earth will I juggle my already crazy schedule and a child?! Sadly, many aren’t mentored through this process and have heard countless stories of pregnancy discrimination. Despite all the concerns and fears I had about having a baby in school, the time was right for me. If you are also considering starting a family, here are some tips I have found helpful in my baby planning process.

**Timing.** If you have a choice on when to have a baby, timing can be everything. If your baby is unplanned (congratulations!) don’t worry, you’ll still make it just fine. When thinking about timing, consider where you are in the program and where you want to be when the baby is born. I got pregnant right as I entered the dissertation proposal process, so by the time my baby is born I will have more control over my schedule than I would have while classes were going full force. Second, think about your overall family goals.

continued next page...
Consider how many kids you want to have, where your partner is at in their career, and what external factors can support or hinder you. Graduate school can feel like the whole world now, but in ten years it will be long gone and your family will remain. Make the choice that feels right for you and your partner.

**Pace.** I decided to move quickly through my program due to being in my thirties, my previous education, and my career plans. I plan to finish in four years, which means an insane workload up until the baby was born. The trade-off for me is more time flexibility and income once the baby comes. However, if you are planning to go into academia, you may benefit from taking a little longer to allow more time to accumulate publications. Academics have told me that graduate school can be an easier time to have a baby than when seeking tenure, so that may be something to consider.

**Support.** I have supportive advisors who have offered advice, flexibility, and advocacy on my behalf. However, I have heard horror stories from students, particularly women, who have not been so lucky. Carefully consider who you tell and when. Seek out faculty who can be supportive and brainstorm with them over timelines, plans for graduate assistantship hours, and career planning. Also, consider what support you have at home. If you have a partner, consider their career flexibility and coordinate schedules. It is common to recruit parents or other family members for childcare, as graduate students can rarely afford a nanny. Make a plan early, so you aren’t left stressing out after the baby is born. Your advisors will appreciate that you have a plan and have considered options.

Most of all enjoy this process. You may run into sexist old-school faculty who give you dirty looks or question your commitment to your career, but times are changing. Having a baby can make you more focused and productive, which has been the case for me. With planning and support, you can achieve your academic, career, and family goals. You have a life to live while in school and the family you start now will be around long after school is over. Make the choices that are right for you and your family and ignore the naysayers. Starting a family is wonderful time, even in graduate school!

—Charlynn Odahl-Ruan
CODAHL@depaul.edu

---

**Don’t Analyze Me!**

By DeAna Gray & Sheena Glover, American School of Professional Psychology at Argosy University, San Francisco

A popular question in Western culture typically revolves around an individual’s profession or chosen area of study. For some people within the field of psychology such questions can be like nails on a chalkboard when others take this newly divulged information as an invitation to unload their own personal issues. As graduate students we have become quite familiar with the array of responses and reactions that can accompany the self-
disclosure of such information. "Can you be my therapist?" and "Oh, you must be analyzing me..." have come to be commonplace responses amongst casual acquaintances, family members, friends, and potential partners.

Despite their best efforts and good intentions, family and friends frequently look to us as their trusty confidants during times of emotional turmoil and confusion. However, for those of us on the other side, this can be a double-edged sword when we are involuntarily assigned to the role of personal psychotherapist, yet scrutinized for "analyzing" them when we offer information or opinions contrary to their own. Such experiences can conjure up feelings of frustration, resentment, and self-consciousness when we are put into a position where certain expectations are placed on us to solve problems and deliver a certain level of psychological "expertise" without actually verbalizing "psychological jargon." Hence, the underlying message is that we are expected to be psychologists, while not being a psychologist. With that, personal relationships can begin to feel one-dimensional, leaving in its wake a sense of isolation and self-doubt. These hiccups in our personal relationships may be one of the driving forces that draws us closer to our colleagues and strengthens our connection, as they can empathize with these experiences. For this reason, we may choose to gravitate toward others in our respective fields of study since we are less likely to encounter the same relationship constraints and are granted a wider space to separate ourselves from our dual identity as therapists. Recognizing the mental and emotional demands that accompany such work, our colleagues can empathize with our desire to leave psych-talk at the office. Conversely, we are able to discuss psychological topics of interests within a frame of delightful discussion without overextending ourselves to take on a therapist persona.

While maintaining a supportive social network outside of our academic bubble is crucial to successfully completing such a stressful and demanding program, the relationships we create with our colleagues supply us with an enriching haven of empathy and relief.

— DeAna Gray & Sheena Glover
Advocacy Training Day on Capitol Hill
By Jessica Cundiff, Visiting Assistant Professor of Psychology at Colgate University

In early August I joined fellow psychology colleagues in Washington, D.C., for a special training on effective advocacy using empirical evidence and the opportunity to meet with congress staff to garner support for the Family and Medical Insurance Leave (FAMILY) Act (S. 1810/H.R. 3712) (see p. 7 for more logistical details).

I have always been interested in the real-world applications of social science research and its potential to impact real change, improve lives, and advance social justice. This passion for social justice issues drives my teaching and research. But beyond the research lab and classroom, I share the goal of many SPSSI members that psychological science should be used to inform public policy and promote positive social change. I feel that it is important for researchers to inform policy makers and key leaders about relevant research findings regarding important social issues. However, I had not yet had the opportunity to play an active role in the political process nor did I have any prior experience directly contacting policy makers. Advocacy Training Day on Capitol Hill provided the perfect opportunity to reach out to policy makers and learn how researchers can get involved in political advocacy. As the day approached, no doubt I was nervous about speaking with congress members and staff, but mostly I was excited for the opportunity to share relevant empirical evidence with key decision-makers regarding a critical social issue in our country.

Participants in the Advocacy Training Day were not expected to have prior expertise regarding the legislative issue for which we would be advocating. Rather, the morning training session provided ample details of the FAMILY Act, including empirical social science evidence supporting the legislation. In addition, we also received training on how to advocate effectively. We learned details of the political process and how difficult it is for a bill to even reach the floor for a vote, making advocacy work all the more important. We learned strategies for how to present arguments that were brief, comprehensive, compelling, and memorable. We also brainstormed counter-arguments and practiced our strategies in role-playing exercises. In all, the morning session provided excellent training for how to approach and speak to members of congress, preparing us for our afternoon meetings.

In the afternoon, we went in teams to visit the congressional offices of our state senators and representatives to discuss the legislation. Our goal was three-fold: bring attention to the legislation, garner support for the legislation, and build a relationship with each office we visited. Most of the congressional staff with whom I visited were supportive of family-friendly policies, but a few expressed skepticism about the monetary cost of the FAMILY Act, reminding us that the “bottom line” is a serious concern for politicians aspiring toward re-election. At the same time, many staff were genuinely interested in our psychological expertise and in learning what social science research had to say about the bill. It was exciting to share our knowledge and to make psychological research accessible to policy makers.

With this training, I gained confidence and knowledge for how to engage in the political process, and I have a better understanding for how psychological research can be used to garner support for important public policies. The experience increased my motivation to translate scientific evidence into accessible, relevant, and timely information that can be used to inform policy makers. It also provided the building blocks for establishing relationships with important leaders and key staff so that I can be an informative resource to them in the future. Importantly, the day was also a wonderful opportunity to network with other psychologists who share in the goal of applying social science research to improve lives and impact change.

I recommend this training for anyone who is interested in learning more about the political process...
Talking About Race

By Sachi Feris, Founder of Border Crossers

I have always been obsessed with my racial identity and how people perceive me. As a child, my parents’ friends often said I looked “exotic” which I accepted as a compliment though it always made me feel somewhat wary. On the streets of New York City, people assume that I speak Spanish, but I did not grow up speaking the language. I am a white, Jewish woman of Russian, Polish, Lebanese, and Cuban descent. After marrying an Argentine man, I became fluent in Spanish as an adult.

In 2000, I founded Border Crossers, a nonprofit organization that trains New York City elementary school teachers through “Talking About Race” professional development workshops. I once observed a lesson about identity where a white teacher in a classroom with no white students neglected to use the word “white” when describing her own identity. The words “Jewish” and “Russian American” were included, but “white” was left unsaid. As founder of Border Crossers, I have always clearly acknowledged that I am a beneficiary of white skin privilege.

Border Crossers has always sought to transform theory to practice. Border Crossers’ name was inspired by Critical Multiculturalist Henry Giroux, who said, “Schools [should] become places where students and teachers can become border crossers engaged in critical and ethical reflection about what it means to bring a wider variety of cultures into dialogue with each other” (1994, p. 337; emphasis added).

At Border Crossers, we often talk about the power of words when we talk about race. For example, that the act of saying certain words out loud can be scary, but that in the end they are just letters that form words that form sentences. Moreover, we become border crossers when we talk about race transparently, taking action to depart from the status quo of silence about race which reproduces racial inequality.

As a new mom to Amalia, a one-year-old whose light switch of receptive language seems to have suddenly flipped into full gear, I am living my beliefs in the daily language I use. When we are reading a book with babies of different racial backgrounds, I tell Amalia in Spanish, “This baby has blonde hair and peachy skin that people call white; this baby has skin the color of coffee that people call black.”

Border Crossers bases its professional development for teachers in social science research and provides tools for teachers to practice “race talk” so they can effectively model language and conversations for their students, whether in racially heterogeneous or homogenous classrooms. In a country where it is an overwhelming number of white teachers who teach urban students of color, these teachers have an enormous opportunity to interrupt the cycle of racism through the effective use of “race talk” and related curriculum.

Research has shown that, in fact, young people do notice race and that the only sure-fire way of educating students to have positive inter-racial attitudes is to talk about race explicitly (see, e.g., Bronson & Merryman, 2009). Such research is the backbone of Border Crossers’ work—we integrate research into our professional
development offerings to empower practitioners to “cross borders” by talking race and, therefore, educating open-minded, justice-seeking young people.

Border Crossers has a need for research that speaks directly to practitioners regarding implications for practice. Research that incorporates collaborations between practitioners and researchers would be helpful as well as the use of the narrative form—providing an easy entryway to practitioners. In particular, Border Crossers would benefit from research regarding the impact of parents and teachers “talking race” with young children in real-life, authentic settings. Border Crossers is strongly committed to ongoing research and is always open to partnering with researchers to inform and enhance its professional development offerings.

A number of years ago, a white mother expressed concern to me that her daughter’s preschool class was “pointing out something her daughter hadn’t noticed” in reference to words around race. In Border Crossers’ trainings, we often share: “If you can’t talk about race, you can’t change it.” My own mother grew up in a household where racial slurs were used—she firmly felt this was wrong and her antidote to her own experience was, of course, to bring me up in a household that did not tolerate those words.

Another white woman once shared a story that I have heard in many versions: a white two-year-old is on a bus with his white mother and is counting, “What are you counting, honey?” the mother asks, innocently. “The black people.” The mother freezes in embarrassment, checks to see if the other people on the bus are listening, and asks her son to stop counting.

“Yes,” I imagine myself telling Amalia. “There are black people on this bus and there are white people on this bus—and sometimes you can’t know how a person identifies without talking to them.” I want Amalia to hear these words. I want her to know that in an ideal world it shouldn’t matter how one looks. But in the world we live in, it does matter. I want her to know that by being honest about this reality, we can be white allies in interrupting the cycle of racism.

—Sachi Feris
sachi.feris@gmail.com

References

Internationalization Committee Update
By David Livert & Stefania Paolini, SPSSI Internationalization Committee Co-Chairs
It’s been a busy year for the SPSSI Internationalization Committee. Below we provide information about recent and future internationalization efforts.

Travel award to international SPSSI members. To support attendance at its biennial conference, SPSSI provides up to $500 in travel support for international SPSSI members (defined as those residing outside North America; note that non-members can join SPSSI when applying). This award is open to either enrolled graduate students or faculty. A three member subcommittee of the Internationalization Committee reviewed applications in April and awarded $2,000 in travel support to attend the 2014 convention in Portland. Recipients included graduate students and faculty in Australia, Germany, Indonesia, and the UK (see p. 31).

continued next page...
Biennial convention international lunch and attendance. At the 2014 Biennial Conference in Portland, the Internationalization Committee organized a lunch meeting for all attendees. The overall goal of the lunch was to provide participants the opportunity to share opinions, brainstorm activities, and consider overall goals that would further internationalize SPSSI. Also attending the lunch was Anila Balkissoon from the SPSSI Central office who answered a number of questions regarding SPSSI membership and awards programs. Topics raised by the group included raising awareness among SPSSI members regarding UN millennial goals; the identification of dual national SPSSI members; the development of special topic webinars; and the creation of an advisory group for non-SPSSI members outside the US.

Over 40 conference attendees represented seven countries outside the U.S. Notable presentations by international attendees included Maritza Montero’s keynote talk on liberation pedagogy in South America; a session on human rights and human trafficking; SPSSI’s engagement of global issues at the UN; and, certainly, Dominic Abrams’ Presidential Keynote Address.

The Portland Conference provided the chance for US and international participants to have informal chats over coffee or wine, explore Portland, renew acquaintances, and form exciting new ones. On a personal note, after more than 18 months of email and Skype, the Committee’s Co-Chairs enjoyed the rare opportunity to do Committee work in person!

Launch of the new SPSSI-SASP small group conference series. The new SPSSI-SASP (Society for Australasian Social Psychologists) Small Group Conference Series is moving ahead with its first conference in Australia in April 2015. The series is designed to parallel the widely successfully SPSSI-EASP conference by supporting small, focused meetings of scholars, researchers, and policy makers from North America and Australasia. The location will alternate annually between the two geographical areas (i.e., the continents on the Western and Eastern sides of the Pacific!). A five member subcommittee of the SPSSI Internationalization Committee reviewed applications in August 2014 with a parallel committee of SASP members doing the same across the Pacific. Both committees independently reached the same decision. We are happy to announce to Forward readers that the inaugural 2015 SPSSI-SASP Small Group Meeting will be “Collective Harm-Doing: Developing the Perspective of the Perpetrator,” organized by Winifred Louis (University of Queensland), Catherine Amiot (Université du Québec à Montréal), and Emma Thomas (Murdoch University). See p. 56 for further details. The call for proposals for the 2016 SPSSI-SASP small group conference (to be held in North America) will be circulated early in 2015.

Other initiatives in the pipeline. The Committee’s current activities are equally exciting. For example, we are working to develop a possible webinar with South African scholars and advocates reflecting upon the last 25 years in the nation. In addition, we seek to establish an international advisory group that includes both SPSSI members and non-members from around the world. And, we are always striving to further develop contacts with international organizations that share similar interests to SPSSI.

We look forward to receiving further input about internationalization issues from you. Feel free to drop either one of us an email.

— David Livert & Stefania Paolini
del11@psu.edu & stefania.paulini@newcastle.edu.au
SPSSI in Russia
By Alexander Voronov, State Academic University of Humanities

Since the SPSSI-Russia group debuted last fall, we have organized and highlighted a number of activities throughout Russia (see Forward Fall 2013 and Forward Spring 2014). We continue to host and cover events on diverse topics, all describing the work of SPSSI to Russian colleagues who are unfamiliar with it.

In spring of 2014, Alexander Voronov spoke about SPSSI and the value of applied psychology with a Russian TV station, following an article on "urban psychology" by Dr. Andrey Konstantinov in the Russian Reporter.

Looking ahead to Fall 2014, SPSSI has more than 25 members in Russia, we anticipate a few more diverse, member-generated activities, including: (a) in Moscow, more hands-on student labs on social-issues psychology; (b) hosting lectures by overseas SPSSI researchers who pass through Moscow; and (c) a conference on the work of Stanley Milgram jointly hosted by SPSSI-Russia and APS on December 9-11 in Kolomna. I welcome any questions or suggestions about SPSSI in Russia.

—Alexander Voronov
a_voronov@inbox.ru
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GIVE THE GIFT OF SPSSI MEMBERSHIP!

SPSSI is a member-driven organization. If you are not yet a member, please join us today! Visit the SPSSI membership page to learn about how you can join for as little as $25 (for student members) or $40 (for first-year members). Gift memberships start at $10. SPSSI members receive access to SPSSI’s journals (JSI, ASAP, and SIPR) and newsletters (the Forward and the Rookie), as well as discounts on SPSSI conference registration and books published by Wiley! What is more, as a dues-paying SPSSI member, you meet the first eligibility requirement of all SPSSI awards (see pp. 22-25 for award details and current award recipients). Complete the online form as either a new or renewing member (by using your login details). Providing gift memberships is also as easy as 1, 2, 3.

If you prefer to pay your dues “offline,” you may download the printable form and send a check for payment to SPSSI, 208 I (“Eye”) Street, NE, Washington DC 20002-4340. Checks must be made payable to SPSSI and be in US dollars. We cannot accept international checks.

Questions about membership? Call +1-202-675-6956 or contact our Administrative Coordinator, Brad Sickels.
SPSSI in New York
By Nava Silton, SPSSI-NY Chair

Spring 2014 marked 30 years of our SPSSI-New York group (SPSSI-NY), formed in 1984. Once again, many of our 400 members participated in the various events held around NYC. Many scenes from these activities are posted on the SPSSI-NY website as well as on Harold Takooshian’s photo gallery.

March 2014
The Kitty Genovese Memorial Conference: 50 Years Later (March 8–9). Co-chaired by Harold Takooshian & Joseph F. DeMay with 21 speakers including psychological scientists, lawyers, authors, journalists, family and friends of Ms. Genovese.

Russian Psychology Today Panel (March 19). Held at Marymount Manhattan College and chaired by Henry Solomon. The event featured a team of 10 visiting faculty and students from Moscow.

42nd Annual Hunter Psychology Conference (March 30). The conference included 2 SPSSI panels: "Autism" and "Obama as President." The SPSSI-NY cake was presented by Nava Silton, Florence L. Denmark, Deborah Hudson-O’Brien, and Nava R. Silton.

April 2014
“Obama as a Global Leader” Lecture with Dinesh Sharma and Uwe P. Gielen (April 4). Held at St. Francis.


May 2014
22nd Pace Psychology Conference (May 3). Chaired by Henry Solomon and featuring a panel on "International teaching and research."

Fulbrights for Students and Faculty Panel (May 4). Chaired by Henry Solomon.


Fall 2014
On the agenda this fall, Dr. Nava Silton (Marymount Manhattan College) expects to host the 26th SPSSI Greater New York Conference on Behavioral Research. And coming in December, a Skype session with SPSSI-Russia.

The SPSSI-NY Planning Committee for spring of 2014: Joseph F. DeMay, Jr., JD (attorney), Marisa T. Cohen (St Francis), Uwe Gielen (St Francis), Dinesh Sharma (St Francis), Henry Solomon (Marymount), Harold Takooshian (Fordham), Jason R. Young (Hunter). Direct any questions or comments to SPSSI-NY Chairperson Nava R. Silton.

For further information about SPSSI-NY events, please email Dr. Harold Takooshian or Dr. Nava Silton.

—Nava Silton
nsilton@mmm.edu
The Council of Representatives met on August 6th and 8th for its summer meeting. Unfortunately, this was the last meeting that Dick Suinn represented SPSSI after serving his term of three years. We appreciate his hard work and diligence in bringing SPSSI’s voice to APA Council—thank you, Dick!

Resolutions. Council adopted as APA policy three Resolutions—all of which may be of interest to SPSSI members. The Resolution in Support of the U.N. Convention on the Rights and Dignity of Persons with Disabilities provides important support to the work of the United Nations on directing world attention to persons with disabilities. The Resolution on Gender and Sexual Orientation Diversity in Children and Adolescents in Schools is an update to the 1993 resolution Lesbian, Gay, & Bisexual Youths in the Schools which affirms that diverse gender expressions are normal and positive variations of human sexuality. The Resolution on Interrogation of Criminal Suspects addresses wrongful convictions as a result of interrogation techniques including false confessions stemming from coercive interrogations. All of these Resolutions have now been added to the APA Policy Manual, disseminated through the APA website, and are available to be used by APA for federal advocacy efforts.

Engaging new talent. Council passed two items that were aimed at improving the representation of Early Career Psychologists on Boards and Committees and ways to highlight individuals who have never served on APA governance (i.e., “New Talent”) who are running for governance. The first item ensures that all Boards and Committees would have at least one Early Career Psychologist (10 years or less since PhD). If none are elected through current slating procedures, this item instructs the Boards and Committees to create an all ECP slate to ensure at least one ECP member on the Board or Committee at all times. The second item would provide a way to identify “New Talent” by allowing these individuals to opt to have an asterisk placed next to their name. Although there was support for this item, because of concerns that it might have stigmatizing consequences (e.g., “they aren’t a good leader if they have not led before”), the item also included a provision to review this change in three years.

Governance. As you may remember, Council has been considering changes to the function and structure of APA governance, and this deliberation process continued to dominate the bulk of our meeting time. In the end, Council voted for four main items. First, they voted to create a Leadership Pipeline and Development program. They asked the board to bring back to Council in February 2015 a proposal for creating this program which would: 1) build a broad and inclusive governance pipeline; 2) foster leadership development aimed at excellence in APA governance; and 3) promote leadership competencies, advancement and success for psychologists in varied professional settings. Second, Council had previously voted to better utilize technology for a variety of purposes including to engage members and to facilitate the work of council outside of face-to-face meetings. At the summer meeting, they passed a motion to empower the CEO to bring back to Council in February a plan (with associated costs) for implementing this work. Third, Council had previously voted to delegate the authority for financial/budget matters to the Board of Directors for a three-year trial period. At this meeting, Council voted to direct the Finance committee to develop Council’s working budget which will support the work Council does to fulfill its main purpose: discipline-focused policy development of the organization. Fourth, Council voted to receive the report on how the authority would be divided between the Board and the newly structured Council. However, Council was not happy with how the report divided these responsibilities, and so they asked that the Authority Matrix be revised and return to Council in February. In addition, although Council was presented with proposals for restructuring and had previously voted for a 1
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entity/1 vote structure, there was significant disagreement about whether to move forward with this model. Thus, Council sent the structure decision back to an ad hoc committee to determine a compromise to bring back to Council in February which will include proposals for whether to add nine “at-large” Council seats through an annual needs assessment procedure. So, in sum, although the process of streamlining and improving how APA governance functions has been ongoing for several years, the process of implementing these changes (and the actual details of how change will occur) is ongoing. Over recent COR meetings, some changes in procedure have been adopted. For instance, Council has been divided into small discussion groups with a facilitator, time-keeper, recorder, reporter to encourage more participation (Dick has been a facilitator on the current COR and previous meetings). Also the small group discussions have included ‘mega-issues’ to expand COR’s focus to include broader policy issues.

Leadership. Over the past year, Wendy has been representing SPSSI as the Chair-elect of the Public Interest Caucus, and she will be taking over as Chair in January 2015. In addition, at this meeting Wendy was elected for a two-year term to the Women’s Caucus. Caucus’ are unofficial organizations within Council who gather together to evaluate the business before Council, as well as to put forth new business, relevant to the interests of the Caucus. If there are issues relevant to the Public Interest or Women’s issues that you wish to see Council address, please contact Wendy.

Finally, we would like to congratulate the newest representative for SPSSI to Council of Representatives—Kim A. Case. Although Kim is new to the position for SPSSI, as you know, she brings a wealth of experience as part of SPSSI governance including as a past member of SPPSI Council, a SPSSI conference program co-chair, and as the Chair of the Early Career Scholars committee. Moreover, at this APA Council Meeting, Kim was elected as a Fellow of APA—Congratulations, Kim! We look forward to the energy and enthusiasm that Kim will bring to representing SPSSI at APA.

—Wendy R. Williams & Richard M. Suinn
Wendy_Williams@berea.edu & suinn@lamar.colostate.edu

GET INVOLVED!

SPSSI’s Nominations & Elections Committee is now accepting nominations for the 2015 election cycle. Please consider adding your voice and perspectives as a potential candidate, or nominate one or more of your colleagues to run for one of our leadership positions. Prior involvement with SPSSI is desirable, but not required.

This year, seats will be open for:

- four new members to our governing Council, each serving a three-year term; and
- a new President who serves for three years as President-Elect, as President, and as Past President.

Nominations should be submitted no later than Monday, November 3, 2014, either electronically via email, or by US mail (SPSSI, 208 I Street NE, Washington, DC 20002-4340). Please specify whether your nomination is for President or for the SPSSI Council.

The Nominations & Elections Committee will review and compile a slate of candidates for each position. SPSSI values an open nominations process, but nomination does not guarantee that a nominee will appear on the ballot. Please feel free to contact Dominic Abrams, Past President and chair of this year’s Nominations & Elections Committee or SPSSI’s Executive Director, Susan Dudley with any questions.

Get involved; SPSSI needs YOU!
Analyses of Social Issues & Public Policy (ASAP)
By Heather Bullock, ASAP Editor

It has been a busy, productive summer at ASAP. Our Editorial Board has been hard at work, and I am very grateful for their expert advice. We continue to receive a steady stream of applied, policy-oriented manuscripts examining a wide range of social issues. Diversity of both topic and methodology is reflected in individual papers soon to be available online:

- Predicting Problems on Campus: An Analysis of College Student Veterans. (M. Elliott)
- Impressions of Immigration: Comparisons between Immigrant and Non-Immigrant Children’s Immigration Beliefs. (C. Brown & C. Lee)
- Disgust Sensitivity Predicts Punitive Treatment of Juvenile Sex Offenders: The Role of Empathy, Dehumanization, and Fear. (M. Stevenson, S. Malik, R. Totton, & R. Reeves)

When visiting ASAP’s early view page, you will find even more diverse topics and articles on the verge of publication in an upcoming ASAP issue:


It was terrific to meet with potential authors in Portland! If you have an idea for a special section or individual paper, please drop me a note. If you would like to review books for the journal, please contact our Book Review Editor, Joel Nadler.

—Heather Bullock
hbullock@ucsc.edu

Social Issues & Policy Review
Edited by Sam Gaertner & Rupert Brown

January 2015, Issue 9 coming soon!

Table of Contents:

Feeling at Home in College: Fortifying School-Relevant Selves to Reduce Social Class Disparities in Higher Education

The Social Psychology of False Confessions
S. M. Kassin

New Routes to Recruiting and Retaining Women in STEM: Policy Implications of a Communal Goal Congruity Perspective
Amanda B. Diekman, Erica S. Weisgram & Aimee L. Belanger

Inclusive Victim Consciousness in Advocacy, Social Movements, and Intergroup Relations: Promises & Pitfalls
Johanna Ray Vollhardt

Adam Rutland and Melanie Killen

The Psychology of Charitable Donations to Disaster Victims and Beyond
Hanna Zagefka & Trevor James

Community Organizing: Practice, Research and Policy Implications
Brian D. Christens & Paul W. Speer
As you can see, we have a good number of issues in preparation, but I encourage you to submit a proposal for consideration in JSI. The JSI Editorial and SPSSI Central Office teams have been collaborating in featuring our published issues. We have been promoting each issue via press releases and social media outlets, including a blog in Psychology Today. Also, we have been encouraging Issue Editors and authors to film a video abstract of their issue or article. Finally, we identify commemoration months or days that are related to our JSI topics and feature the issues during those periods. If you have additional ideas about the ways in which we can feature our JSI issues for better exposure in the field and to the public, please contact me. I welcome any and all ideas to further strengthen the journal.

Planned 2015 Issues

Media Representations of Race and Ethnicity: Implications for Identity, Intergroup Relations, & Public Policy
*Issue Editors:* Dana Mastro and Riva Tukachinsky

Psychology, History, and Social Justice
*Issue Editors:* Andrea Hunter and Abigail Stewart

Resisting and Confronting Disadvantage: From Individual Coping to Societal Change
*Issue Editors:* Katherine Stroebe and Soledad de Lemus

At the Crossroads of Intergroup Relations & Interpersonal Relations: Interethnic Marriage in the U.S.
*Issue Editors:* Stanley O. Gaines, Eddie M. Clark, and Stephanie E. Afful

Issues in Development

Making the Community Active: Individual and Contextual Approaches in Understanding Community Involvement (Manyu Li and Irene Hanson Frieze)

Inequality: Opportunity and Mobility (Allan Ornstein and Norman Eng)

Understanding Activism (Craig McGarty, Anna Kende, and Nicola Curtin)

Proactive Behavior Across Group Boundaries: Seeking and Maintaining Positive Interactions with Outgroup Members (Birte Siem, Stefan Stürmer, and Todd Pittinsky)

Sexual and Gender Minority Health Disparities: Translating Stigma and Intergroup Relations Research (Stacey L. Williams and Abbey Mann)

Digging Deeper: The Social Cognition, Neuroscience, and Genetics of Political Ideology (Travis Proulx and Mark Brandt)

Ageism: Health and Employment Contexts (Sheri R. Levy, Jamie L. Macdonald, and Todd Nelson)

Weight Bias: Social, Policy, and Legal Implications (Twila Wingrove, Lindsey Wylie, and Evelyn Maeder)

Visit the [JSI website](http://www.jsi.org) for all recent updates, more journal information, and past issues.

—Ann Bettencourt
Bettencourta@Missouri.edu
Readers, Advocates, and Authors Wanted

Grounded in basic and applied scientific research, volumes in SPSSI’s “Contemporary Social Issues” series focus on areas of psychological inquiry relevant to social issues facing individuals, groups, communities, and/or society at large, with each volume written to speak to scholars, students, practitioners, and policy-makers. The series consists of 1-5 works per year on contemporary topics related to social issues, with each authored work between 70,000-80,000 words (approximately 220 printed and bound pages). Each volume should have a coherent, fresh, yet well-grounded, perspective to offer.

A listing of previous volumes can be found on the publisher’s website. The Series has included books that could be used as core readings in advanced undergraduate or graduate seminar courses (e.g., Bernice Lott’s Multiculturalism and Diversity). The most recent volume is Heather Bullock’s Women and Poverty: Psychology, Public Policy, and Social Justice.

SPSSI invites your support and participation in this Series. SPSSI hopes you will find these volumes valuable for your own reading, for recommending to others who might benefit from their wisdom, and for assigning in whole or in part to students.

Apropos of being a Series author, SPSSI publications have covered a diverse array of topics from A(ging) to W(ar and peace) including the three Ps (Peace, Prejudice, and Poverty) where psychological cum multi-disciplinary analysis could address social issues and be of practical utility (see JSI topic index). The Book Series welcomes new projects addressing the range of classic and emerging social issues amenable to psychological analysis. Complementing SPSSI’s current policy priorities, proposed volumes on seven topics are especially invited:

- Interpersonal Violence (e.g., violence against women; gun violence; media violence)
- Relationship Recognition (e.g., marriage equality; recognition of non-traditional relationships)
- Immigration Issues (e.g., US border security; immigration of specific groups into specific countries [e.g., Eastern Europeans into the UK], government policies [e.g., worker permits vs. path to citizenship])
- Human Rights (e.g., civil rights, including protection from discrimination on grounds of race, gender, sexual orientation; freedom of speech; freedom of assembly; economic, social, and cultural rights [e.g., right to education; right to housing; reproductive rights; right to health])
- Climate Change (e.g., Keystone pipeline, climate change communication, climate change denial)
- The Changing Nature of Higher Education (e.g., access issues, increasing role of non-tenured faculty, raise of distance/online education, corporatization of higher education)
- Psychological Aspects of Income Inequality.

Are you interested in being a SPSSI Book Series author? The Editor of the Series, Dan Perlman, welcomes hearing from you to discuss the feasibility of publishing a volume in the Series. You can contact Dan via email, Google+, phone (+1-336-334-9843), or Skype (Dan.Perlman42). Or you may contact a member of the Series’ Advisory Board: Kim Case, Rudy Mendoza-Denton, Ram Mahalingam, Colette van Laar, Susan Opotow, or Mark Snyder.

—Dan Perlman
d_perlma@uncg.edu
SPSSI Grants & Award Recognition
By Anila Balkissoon, SPSSI Program Director

2014 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. For further details and eligibility requirements, please visit the Louise Kidder Early Career Award page.

Nicole Stephens, Ph.D. (Northwestern University)

Nicole Stephens received her Ph.D. from Stanford University in 2010 and moved to Northwestern University where she is now Associate Professor in both Management and Organizations and Psychology. Her research explores how social class, race, ethnicity, and gender shape everyday life experiences as well as life outcomes such as educational attainment and health. She received a Fulbright Fellowship to Chile in 2002, an NSF Graduate Research Fellowship in 2004, and the Otto Klineberg Intercultural and International Relations Award in 2014 (see p. 53). Her work has been covered in multiple outlets, including the New York Times Magazine, Los Angeles Times, Chicago Tribune, Discover Magazine, Psychology Today, Huffington Post, Financial Times, Washington Post, and Reuters (to name a few).

For all of your early career accomplishments—and more to come—congratulations Dr. Stephens!

2014 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. For more details, please visit the Clara Mayo Grants page.

David Lick
University of California, Los Angeles
Recalibrating Body Perception: Harnessing Visual Aftereffects to Reduce Anti-Fat Bias

Kaitlin McCormick
The Pennsylvania State University
Neutralizing the Negative Effects of Emotion Stereotyping for Women in STEM

Roxanne Moadel-Attie
Stony Brook University
One of Us?: The Role of Ingroup Prototypicality in Social Belonging for Monocultural, Bicultural, and Multicultural Individuals

Gandalf Nicholas
College of William and Mary
Whose Race is it Anyway? The Effect of Mixed-Race Targets’ Racial Identity on Discrimination by Majority and Minority Monoracials

Anna Pope
Saint Louis University
Identifying the Risk of Identity Threat in Transgender Populations

Joanna Weill
University of California, Santa Cruz
The Ultimate Out-group: How Social Distance from Incarcerated Individuals Predicts Attitudes Toward Crime and Prison Reform
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. Funding cycles occur every Fall and Spring. For further details and eligibility requirements, see the Grants-in-Aid webpage.

Alex Borgella
Tufts University
Fair or Foul?: Moderators of Racial Phenotypicality Bias in Guilt Judgments

Hilary Bush
University of Massachusetts, Boston
Self-Reported Sexuality Among Women With and Without Autism Spectrum Disorders (ASD)

Kyndra Cleveland
University of California, Irvine
Parental Engagement in the Dependency System: Intervening on Behalf of Families

Marisa Crowder
University of Nevada, Reno
The social meaning of suicide between honor and dignity states

Adolfo Cuevas
Portland State University
Racial identity and social support: Do they moderate the impact of perceived discrimination among African Americans?

Hollie Granato
University of Washington
Alcohol-Involved Sexual Assault and Mental Health Outcomes: The Role of Alcohol Use Characteristics

Mary Himmelstein
Rutgers University
Acceptable Harm: Is Benevolent Sexism Stressful?

Dushiyanthini Kenthirarajah
Stanford University
The First-Name Bias: Ethnic First Names Evoke Social Stereotypes, Biasing Citizenship and Hiring Decisions

Mark Kurai
University of California, Davis
Identity theft: Implications of appropriating group symbols for intergroup relations

Jennifer Marceron
The George Washington University
Disability and Disasters: The Role of Self-Efficacy in Emergency Preparedness and Health Outcomes

Rashmi Nair
Clark University
Minority-Minority Relations in India: From Horizontal Hostility to Solidarity

Dara Naphan
University of Nevada, Reno
Does experiencing stereotype threat cause gender stereotype endorsement and self-stereotyping?

Angela M. Neal
University of New Hampshire
Motives for IPV Perpetration and the Meanings Victims Ascribe to Their Partners’ Perpetration: An Empirical Investigation of Both Perspectives

Liana Peter-Hagene
University of Illinois, Chicago
Cognitive Depletion and Motivation to Avoid Prejudice during Jury Deliberation: A Self-Regulation Perspective on Interracial Group Decision-Making

Andrew Pilecki
University of California, Santa Cruz
The Relationship Between Moral Stereotypes and Policy Preference

continued next page...
Honoring Dr. Otto Klineberg (1899-1992), an early president of SPSSI and distinguished figure in the fields of intercultural and international relations, this award is given to “the best paper or article of the year on intercultural or international relations”.

Congratulations to our 2014 Klineberg award winners,

Nicole Stephens, Ph.D. (Northwestern University)
Hazel Markus, Ph.D. (Stanford University)
Stephanie Fryberg, Ph.D. (University of Arizona),

SPSSI Members in the Media

Congratulations to Jennifer Berdahl and Sue Moon, co-authors of the JSI article “Workplace Mistreatment of Middle Class Workers Based on Sex, Parenthood, and Caregiving,” on being named one of five finalists for the 2014 Rosabeth Moss Kanter Award for Excellence in Work Family Research. Their article was published in the well-received Flexibility Stigma issue of JSI.

The work of SPSSI Fellow and former SPSSI President Faye Crosby, PhD (University of California, Santa Cruz) is featured in a Huffington Post article, Woman at Work: Negotiations -- Foreign and Domestic.

SPSSI Council member Jack Glaser, Ph.D. (University of California, Berkeley), wrote an op-ed piece published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch regarding racial bias and the law following the Ferguson events this summer. You can also hear him discuss racial profiling issues on a recent episode of Philosophy Talk. And, if you’d like to read more about this important and timely issue, pick up a copy of his new book coming out in November: book, Suspect Race: Causes and Consequences of Racial Profiling.

SPSSI members Crystal L. Hoyt, Ph.D. (University of Richmond) and Jeni L. Burnette, Ph.D. (North Carolina State University) discuss their research on the unanticipated consequences of calling obesity a disease in public health messages in Scientific American. Hoyt and Burnette make compelling arguments not only for how and why it is important for science to inform public health campaigns, but also the necessity to keep—rather than cut—federal funding for the social sciences.

In August, former SPSSI President James Jackson, Ph.D. (University of Michigan) was sworn in and began serving a six-year term on the National Science Board (NSB). Jackson was appointed by President Barack Obama to serve on this “policymaking body of the National Science Foundation (NSF)” The Board also serves as “advisor to Congress and the President on science and engineering policy”.

SPSSI member Mary Kite, PhD (Ball State University), received the APF Charles L. Brewer Distinguished Teaching of Psychology Award at the 2014 APA convention. The award is presented in recognition of “a significant career of contributions of a psychologist who has a proven track record as an exceptional teacher of psychology.” Congratulations Dr. Kite!

SPSSI member Christine Logel, PhD (University of Waterloo) made social and news media waves with her photo on gender-biased baby clothes. The picture made it to Twitter by a colleague, racking up 774 retweets and making headlines on CBC News, CTV News Canada, and USA Today, among many other outlets.


SPSSI member and former Council Member, Scott Plous, PhD, teaches the “most-followed [MOOC class] in the world” with 260,000 students. Plous and

continued next page...
SPSSI Internships for Undergrad and Grad Students

SPSSI has year round opportunities for both graduate and undergraduate students to intern at the SPSSI Central Office in Washington DC! Interns assist SPSSI staff on various projects. Interns may work on a range of communications or administrative projects. 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, but are included in virtually all SPSSI work activities.
- Intern applicants must have completed at least one year of college.
- Usually internships last about 10–12 weeks (i.e., about an academic semester or summer vacation period.)
- Internships are part-time; we will work with the ideal intern to secure time commitment and schedule.

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

To apply, send a brief letter of interest, specifying approximate dates of availability, along with a resume. Strong preference is given to students receiving academic credit during their term as SPSSI interns.

---

If you or another SPSSI member you know has been in the media, published a great book, or received an award, we want to know! Email us so we can spread the word about SPSSI members’ work!

---

**Psychologists of the modern era**, based on a recent study published in *Archives of Scientific Psychology*. Other SPSSI members (past and present) making the list: Gordon Allport (#17), Susan Fiske (#22), Leon Festinger (#26), Alice Eagly (#49), Irving Janis (#56), Marilynn Brewer (#58), Claude Steele (#63), and Morton Deutsch (#93).

SPSSI Representative to APA’s Council of Representatives, Wendy R. Williams, Ph.D. (Berea College), was honored with the Emerging Leadership Award from the Committee on Socioeconomic Status (CSES) at the APA convention in August. “CSES Leadership Awards recognize the outstanding achievements of psychologists ... who have made significant contributions to the understanding of socioeconomic status and the lives and well-being of the poor”. Congratulations, Dr. Williams!

**Luis Rivera**

A *JSI* article on self-stereotyping among Hispanics and obesity written by SPSSI member, Luis M. Rivera, PhD (Rutgers University-Newark) and Stefanie M. Paredez is discussed in an article in the *Latin Times*.

SPSSI member Claude Steele, PhD (Stanford University) made a recent appearance on NPR’s *Radiolab*. The episode focused on Inner Voices. Steele’s segment pointed out the detriment of negative inner voices based on his seminal work on stereotype threat.

SPSSI Fellow, Shelley Taylor, PhD (University of California, Los Angeles) made the list! *Taylor came in at #8 on the list of 100 Extremely Eminent*.

---

**Shelley Taylor**

---

**Wendy Williams**

---

---
CALL FOR SUBMISSIONS

Collective Harm-Doing: Developing the Perspective of the Perpetrator

This conference brings a new focus on perpetrators, including the association between their harm-doing and their well-being, and the processes through which people engage and disengage from harm-doing. We seek to include research on perpetrators of harm-doing at all levels, including both intergroup (e.g., racists, hate criminals, soldiers, extremist groups, gang violence) and interpersonal harm-doing (domestic violence, feuding). The meeting will take place April 7–8, 2015 at The University of Queensland, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia, immediately prior to the 2015 SASP conference in Newcastle, New South Wales. We aim to include up to 30 active participants, about half being from Australia, and about half being junior faculty or postgraduates. All participants and observers must be members of SPSSI or SASP.

To apply as a presenter, please send an e-mail to Winnifred Louis or Catherine E. Amiot by 15 November 2014 with your title, 200-300 word abstract, and authors (with affiliations for all and contact information for the presenting author). We aim to notify participants within 2 weeks of their approval, to facilitate timely arrangements of travel plans.

Questions are welcome to Winnifred Louis or Catherine E. Amiot.

Seeking SPSSI and APA Fellow Nominations

Self- and other-nominations are welcome. There are three routes to becoming a Fellow:

1) If the nominee is currently a Fellow of another APA division, application for Fellow status in Division 9 requires submitting a CV and a statement that highlights the candidate’s most important contributions to the psychological study of social issues (see SPSSI website for full details and SPSSI Fellow status criteria). The deadline for receipt of SPSSI Fellow nominations is December 5, 2014. Please e-mail all SPSSI Fellow nominations with the nominee’s name, professional affiliation, and contact information (including e-mail address), and a brief statement concerning the nominee’s eligibility, based on the requirements. In addition, please indicate the nominee’s current APA membership status (i.e., member, Fellow, or nonmember).

2) If the nominee is an APA member but not currently an APA Fellow, the nominee may apply for APA Fellow status by submitting an application through the APA website.

3) If the nominee is a SPSSI member, but not an APA member, the nominee may apply directly to SPSSI. Complete applications should be submitted to Brad Sickels by January 16, 2014.

We encourage eligible members to apply for Fellow status. Questions about SPSSI Fellow status may be directed to Monroe Friedman, Chair of the 2015 SPSSI Fellows Committee.

If you have questions about how to prepare the nomination or application materials please contact Brad Sickels, SPSSI Administrative Coordinator.
Each year, SPSSI, in its role as Division 9 of the American Psychological Association (APA), sponsors various programs and sessions of interest to our members at the APA Annual Convention.

2015 SPSSI Convention Theme: Social Inequalities: Causes and Consequences

Social inequalities based on race, gender, class, sexual identity, age, ability, religion, or nationality have a wide influence on groups and individuals. These inequalities have real world consequences by reducing access to education, career paths, and affordable quality health care. To deepen our understanding of how inequalities are created, persist over time, and influence society, the SPSSI theme at the 2015 APA Annual Convention in Toronto, Canada will be: Social Inequalities: Causes and Consequences. Consistent with this theme, invited speakers, special symposia, and a data blitz session will focus on basic and applied research on the development, maintenance, and consequences of social inequalities, with a special emphasis on international aspects, given the location of the conference outside of the U.S. Sessions will also focus on interventions and public policies that have the potential to reduce inequalities.

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. Early career faculty and graduate students are especially encouraged to submit proposals of their work. Note that high-quality individual paper or poster submissions related to the conference theme may be assigned to a data blitz session (5 minute talk) – you will be notified of the format of your presentation upon acceptance. We hope to have an excellent program with interdivisional appeal and strong representation from our division.

Proposals should be submitted online by midnight EST on Monday, December 1, 2014 via the APA conference website. It is not necessary to be a member of SPSSI to submit a proposal to Division 9. APA non-members may submit proposals if an APA-member is a co-author or sponsors the proposal. PhD or PsyD members of the Canadian Psychological Association (CPA) are also eligible to submit proposals without an APA sponsor (see the “Rules for Participation” section of the APA Call for Convention Proposals for full rules of submission). Full details about the procedures for submitting proposals can be found at APA’s website.

Please feel free to contact us with any questions or ideas about proposals and programming.

Your APA Div 9 2015 Co-Chairs
Anne Koenig (University of San Diego) and Elizabeth Page-Gould (University of Toronto)
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