In a press conference several months after the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, National Security Advisor Condoleezza Rice said: “I don’t think that anybody could have predicted that these people…would try to use an airplane as a missile, a hijacked airplane as a missile.”

President Bush expressed similar surprise when he told the press corps on April 13, 2004: “Had I had any inkling whatsoever that the people were going to fly airplanes into buildings, we would have moved heaven and earth to save the country.”

Yet long before September 11, social scientists had warned that an attack might occur. According to an overlooked 1999 report on “The Sociology and Psychology of Terrorism” by the Federal Research Division of the Library of Congress, “Al-Qaeda’s expected retaliation for the U.S. cruise missile attack against Al-Qaeda’s training facilities in Afghanistan on August 20, 1998, could take several forms of terrorist attack in the nation’s capital.” Among the possibilities listed in the report: Suicide bombers might crash an aircraft into the Pentagon or other buildings.

As that passage indicates, social scientists have made substantial progress in understanding and predicting terrorism. Moreover, that progress has accelerated since the attacks of September 11. In psychology, for example, a search of the PsycINFO database (the largest psychological database in the world, with entries dating back to the 1880s) reveals that more research on terrorism has been published since 2001 than in all previous years combined.

In this season of political campaigns, commissions, and controversies, the results of social science research should be a part of any educated and informed discussion of the war on terror. From this new research in the social sciences, as well as other scholarship in history and political science, several key findings have emerged.

First, studies suggest that, compared with the general public, terrorists do not exhibit unusually high rates of clinical psychopathology, irrationality, or personality disorders. As John Hogan points out in the opening chapter of *Terrorists, Victims and Society: Psychological Perspectives on Terrorism and Its Consequences* (Wiley, 2003), edited by Andrew Silke, the idea of a “terrorist personality” rests on unsteady empirical, theoretical, and conceptual foundations. Indeed, because terrorist cells require secrecy, terror organizations frequently screen out unstable individuals who might compromise their security.

Nor do terrorists differ greatly from other people in self-esteem, religiosity, socioeconomic status, education, or personality traits such as introversion. Nasr Hassan, who spent years studying Palestinian terrorists, put it this way during a lecture she gave in 2002: “What is frightening is not the abnormality of those who carry out the suicide attacks, but their sheer normality.” Thus far, behavioral research has found only one psychological attribute that reliably differentiates terrorists from nonterrorists: a propensity toward anger.

In the words of a National Research Council report titled “Terrorism: Perspectives From the Behavioral and Social Sciences”: “There is no single or typical mentality—much less a specific pathology—of terrorists. However, terrorists apparently find significant gratification in the expression of generalized rage.”

Beyond various sociopolitical, economic, and religious objectives, one of the most common motivations for joining a terrorist organizations is the desire for revenge or retribution for a perceived injustice. Many terrorists report that acts of violence committed by police officers, soldiers, or others are what led them to join a terrorist group. Studies by Ariel Merari and others have found, for example, that Palestinian suicide
bombers often have at least one relative or close friend who was killed or injured by the other side. In addition to harboring intense anger over perceived injustice, terrorists differ from the general public in their demographic composition. Although exceptions exist, terrorists are usually males between 15 and 30 years of age—the same population most likely to commit violent crime in general, and the demographic group least likely to be deterred by the threat of physical force. Perhaps for those reasons, studies suggest that large-scale military responses to terrorism tend to be ineffective or temporarily to increase terrorist activity. To cite just one example, a 1993 time-series analysis by Walter Enders and Todd Sandler in the American Political Science Review, “The Effectiveness of Anti-Terrorism Policies: A VAR-Interval Analysis,” examined 20 years of terrorist activity and found a significant rise in terrorism following U.S. military reprisals against Libya. For a general review of the effects of military responses to terrorism, see “Retaliating Against Terrorism” by Silke, who is a United Nations counterterrorism adviser, in Terrorists, Victims, and Society.

Although every situation is different, researchers have found that military responses to international terrorism can unwittingly reinforce terrorists’ views of their enemies as aggressive, make it easier for them to recruit new members, and strengthen alliances among terrorist organizations. Following the invasion of Iraq, for example, Al-Qaeda’s influence and ideology spread to other extremist groups not previously linked to the movement, according to Congressional testimony by J. Cofer Black, the U.S. State Department’s coordinator for counterterrorism. The futility of fighting terrorism with large-scale military strikes is perhaps clearest in the case of Iraq, where U.S. troop casualties have steadily increased over time. In May through August 2003, after President Bush declared the end of major combat operations in Iraq, an average of 4.9 military personnel were wounded per day. That climbed to 10.3 in September through December 2003, 15.3 in the first four months of 2004, and 21.4 from May through mid-August. Even after the capture of Saddam Hussein, on December 23, 2003, suicide bombings and guerrilla attacks in Iraq continued to rise. Similarly, the average number of suicide attacks per week in Israel was higher in the month after Baghdad fell than in the preceding 14 months. And despite the fact that 70 percent of Al-Qaeda’s core leadership has been caught or killed, the organization has carried out more attacks since September, 2001 than it did in the three years before. According to the U.S. State Department’s most authoritative report, “Patterns of Global Terrorism 2003,” there was a 27% increase in “significant terrorist incidents” worldwide from 2002 to 2003—along with a 56% increase in casualties—despite unprecedented spending by the United States to wage war on terrorism.

If military responses to terrorism are counterproductive, what can be done? In the short run, the United States can fortify measures that promote self-protection, encourage citizens in likely target areas to be more vigilant, and improve training and information sharing among intelligence organizations, law-enforcement personnel, branches of government, and our allies. The report by the National Commission on Terrorist Attacks Upon the United States, released on July 22, 2004, and available at http://9-11commission.gov, offers detailed recommendations on how such goals might be accomplished. Although self-protective measures will never be foolproof, they have the virtue of being non-provocative and less costly than war. For example, the cost of safeguarding weapons-grade uranium and plutonium is relatively low, yet according to a recent report from Harvard’s John F. Kennedy School of Government (“Securing the Bomb: An Agenda for Action”), less nuclear material was secured in the two years immediately after September 11, 2001 than in the two years before the attacks.

In the long run, research indicates that at least three priorities are of paramount importance: reducing intergroup conflict, creating incentives for the reduction of terrorism, and socializing young people to reject violence as a means of problem solving. With respect to the first goal, social science research indicates that intergroup conflict is reduced when members of each group are equal in status and are mutually dependent on one another. At the level of nations, those conditions can be strengthened by addressing legitimate grievances and developing fair-trade agreements, joint investments of venture capital, cultural exchange programs, and respect for human rights, sovereignty, and international law.

In terms of the second goal, the United States can create a sense of shared purpose and incentives for reducing terrorism by increasing its foreign aid, hunger relief assistance, and medical exports to countries working actively to fight terrorism. Currently, the United States gives a lower percentage of its gross national product to foreign aid than does any other developed nation. Clearly, however, one of the surest ways to win friends and reduce anti-Americanism is by helping those in need.

Finally, any comprehensive strategy to reduce terrorism must ensure that children are not socialized to embrace violence as a means of problem solving. In the Oslo Interim Agreement of 1995, Israel and the Palestinian Authority pledged that they would “ensure that their respective educational systems contribute to the peace between the Israeli and Palestinian peoples and to peace in the entire region, and will refrain from the introduction of any motifs that could adversely affect the process of reconciliation.” For the sake of future generations, a similar pledge should be formalized as part of a worldwide multilateral treaty banning educational materials that condone or incite violence. With incentives for compliance and provisions for enforcement, such a treaty would be of considerable value.

Thus far, the Iraq war has cost the United States an estimated $150 billion and is responsible for the deaths of more than 1,000 coalition soldiers and 100,000 Iraqi civilians—more than 30 times the number of Americans who died in the September 11 attack, and more than double the number of civilians who died when the U.S. dropped an atomic bomb on Nagasaki. The time has come to rethink our global strategy on terrorism, apply what we know from social science research, and find a more effective way to make the world safe.

An earlier version of this article was published in The Chronicle of Higher Education, September 10, 2004. For a research bibliography and web links on terrorism, please see http://www.socialpsychology.org/peace.htm.
A Word from Our President
Bonnie Strickland, University of Massachusetts

Although we only meet in person at the annual APA convention, your Executive Committee is busy throughout the year. You can see the results of some of these efforts in this edition of The General Psychologist under the new leadership of Bob Johnson. We hope that you like the format and will contribute your comments and ideas to the publication. Douglas Candland continues his excellent work as Editor of The Journal of General Psychology which remains one of the most respected journals in psychology.

Different Officers are responsible for overseeing our very successful Awards Program and each 2004 Award winner will give a presentation at the upcoming convention. We are fortunate that the Division One program celebrates and presents some of the most distinguished scholars and scientists in the field. Nancy Felipe Russo has done an outstanding job of publicizing our 2005 Awards, and you still have until the end of April to submit nominations. We especially need more nominations for the best article in general psychology or integrative article that spans our subfields.

Our Program Chair, Richard Meegan, has put together an exceptional program for the 2005 APA convention and we hope to see you there.

We have a new Treasurer, Neil Lutsky, a new Fellows Chair, Richard Velayo and a new Membership Chair, Howard Tennen. Since all of the early divisions have been losing membership, we are launching a membership drive in which all of you can help by recruiting new members and student affiliates. The Division remains a bargain with our low dues of $25 that include our Journal and Newsletter. We currently have about 2,000 members and have elected 30 new Fellows into the Division this year. At the convention, please join us at the New Fellows breakfast reception on Friday morning to welcome and honor them. And, don’t forget our Social Hour on Friday night.

All of our other Officers, Members-at-Large, and Representatives continue to work hard on the regular business of the Society. We have proposed a revision of our Bylaws to update and reflect current practices. You will see a copy of the revised Bylaws in another section of this Newsletter. We hope that you will read them, note the changes, and come to our Annual Business Meeting at the Convention to vote on them. We have also been updating our Division One Web site available through our APA web page: http://www.apa.org/about/division/div1.html and updating our Division One Listserv. We need desperately to improve communication among our members. We realize that not everyone has access to the internet and e-mail so we need to hear from you when you had rather receive printed information.

As always, your Executive Committee continues to ponder the ways in which we may best promote coherence in psychology and help cross boundaries across specialty areas. We always welcome your ideas and invite you to join us in bringing your enthusiasm and efforts to the activities of the Society.

Join the Division One Listserv

The Division One listserv is a mechanism for the officers of the division to keep you informed about division activities, upcoming APA highlights of the division, and other matters of special interest. The resources for this effort are provided without charge by the American Psychological Association as a service to members and affiliates. Besides receiving Division 1 messages, you may also communicate ideas, issues, and questions to your colleagues on the list. We promise not to bother you with junk mail. Only items that are of relevance to your affiliation with Division 1 will be placed on the listserv. This is a wonderful way for us to keep in touch and share information of special interest to Division 1 members.

Should you decide to join the list, you will have three options for subscribing, unsubscribing, and managing your subscription:

Internet Option:
To subscribe or unsubscribe, visit http://listserv.apa.org/cgi-bin/wa.exe?SUBED1=div1&A=1 to the sign on/off page for the DIV1 list and enter the requested information.

Almost all functions of the listserv can be accessed through the Listserv Web Interface. The Listserv home page is located at http://listserv.apa.org/.

A tutorial help guide for using the Web Interface is located at: http://listserv.apa.org/cgi-bin/wa.exe?SHOWTPL=WEBHELP_GEN.

E-mail Option:
To subscribe, send the command [subscribe DIV1 First-Name Lastname] to listserv@lists.apa.org. Put nothing in the subject line, and place this command in the body of the message.

To unsubscribe, send the command [signoff DIV1] to listserv@lists.apa.org. Put nothing in the subject line, and place this command in the body of the message.

Listmaster Option:
Send an e-mail to Matthew Goodwin at msgoodwin@earthlink.net requesting subscription to the Div1 listserv.

Matthew Goodwin, Listmaster

Bonnie Strickland

Matthew Goodwin
The opposite of a great truth is also true.
—Buddhist dictum, quoted by Nisbett (2003, p. 176)

In the Preface to his book, *The Geography of Thought*, Nisbett (2003) states that at one time he “had been a lifelong universalist concerning the nature of thought” (p. xiii). The content of thought (specific perceptions, beliefs, judgments) may vary, but the forms of thought—cognitive processes—he presumed to be innate and hence everywhere the same. Based on the kind of evidence reviewed in this book, however, Nisbett adopted a different view, namely, “the historical-cultural one established by the Russian psychologists Lev Vygotsky and Alexander Luria” (p. 86). In other words, cognitive processes are relative to social conditions. But then, as the Buddhist dictum cited above suggests, the opposite of a great truth is also true. Accordingly, Nisbett concludes that he is “not willing to lie in this bed of relativism I’ve helped to make” (p. 203), and he ends as he began, ensconced on a universalist bed—but now one made differently.

If all that seems a bit incongruous, it is because we in the West are accustomed to thinking in an “either/or” fashion, that is, believing that a proposition must be either true or false, or else logically vacuous. Easterners, by contrast, are comfortable thinking in a “both/and” fashion, thus finding a “middle way” between apparently contradictory propositions. By the end of his book, Nisbett implies that he has found a middle way between the extremes of biological universalism and social relativism, namely, cognitive processes can be both universal and socially constituted. Nisbett’s journey from biologically based universalism to socially based universalism makes for lively reading.

Stephen Hawking (1998) tells the story of a well-known scientist (Bertrand Russell, he speculates) who gave a lecture on astronomy. Afterwards, an elderly woman accused him of talking rubbish. “The world is really a flat plate supported on the back of a giant tortoise,” she asserted. “And what is the tortoise standing on?” the scientist asked. “You’re very clever, young man, very clever,” the old lady responded. “But it’s turtles all the way down!” (p. 1).

Culture is the turtle in Nisbett’s story, and it, too, goes all the way down. At bottom, there is no foundation to thought that is not influenced by culture. Others have made this claim (for notable recent examples, see Cole, 1996, and Tomasello, 1999). This is not a return to the hoary notion that the mind is a blank slate on which experience is free to write just anything. If culture goes all the way down, it is equally true that biology goes all the way up. There is hardly a cognitive process that does not reflect the influence of our long evolutionary past (Pinker, 2002). Biology, however, cannot account for the type of cultural differences in thought documented by Nisbett and others. To take but several examples, Easterners, compared to Westerners, tend to think in a more holistic (less analytic) manner, to be more sensitive to situational cues, and to be more willing to find common ground between seemingly opposing positions. Such differences are no more due to biology than are the differences, say, between Chinese and English languages. (Parenthetically, by Easterners, Nisbett means East Asians, primarily Chinese, Japanese, and Koreans; by Westerners, he means Europeans, North Americans, and anyone else, regardless of geographic location, in that cultural tradition.)

Nisbett does not simply illustrate differences in cognitive processes between Easterners and Westerners, he also offers an hypothesis to explain those differences, namely, ecology (geography, broadly speaking). Structurally, he postulates a line of influence that runs as follows:

- ecology — economy — social structure — attention —
- metaphysics — epistemology — cognitive processes

Nisbett also assumes that the social differences between East and West today are similar to those that existed in ancient times. This assumption allows him to proceed back and forth along the chain of influences—temporally as well as structurally—tracing contemporary differences in cognition to differences in ancient ecologies; and, going in the opposite direction, testing inferences about ancient ecologies by exploring differences in contemporary cognitive processes. Obviously, there is risk of circularity here, as well as danger of oversimplification. But there is also plausibility to the notion that geography influences ways of life (e.g., trade versus agriculture), and hence what people consider important in their lives, and, perhaps, even the way they think. The devil, as they say, is in the details.

Perhaps it is inevitable that Nisbett’s historical speculations draw him into controversial waters. For example, in attempting to explain how Eastern and Western societies diverged about the time of the Scientific Revolution (16th and 17th centuries), he states that “the history of Europe had created a new sort of person—one who conceived of individuals as separate from the larger community and who thought in terms imbued with freedom” (p. 41). This paved the way for people like Galileo and Newton, who made their discoveries “because of their curiosity and critical habits of thought” (p. 41). By contrast, a “lack of curiosity was characteristic of China” and, presumably, other East Asian societies. “Even modern Chinese philosophers,” Nisbett asserts, “have always been more interested in the pragmatic application of knowledge than with abstract theorizing for its own sake” (p. 40).

As evidence, Nisbett mentions the voyages of the Grand Eunuch (Zheng He), which took place in the early fifteenth century. He states that, when the fleet arrived in other countries, “the Chinese were quite uninterested in seeing anything that those societies might have produced or known about—including even a giraffe that their African hosts showed them” (p. 40). But in fact one of the major purposes of the voyages was trade, which was fulfilled successfully, even if the follow-through was less than might have been expected. Moreover, two giraffes were brought back to Beijing and presented to the emperor as a precious gift. Nisbett may be right when he says “there has never been an interest in knowledge for its own sake in China,” but the comment that the Chinese “had little continued on next page . . .
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interest in the tales brought to them by foreigners” (p. 40) cannot be fully justified.

If we consider earlier periods of history, the contention that the Chinese had little interest in other cultures or abstract theorizing is even less compelling. The story of Xuanzang, a Chinese Buddhist monk who lived at the outset of the Tang Dynasty (which lasted from 618 to 907), illustrates the point. Xuanzang spent 17 years on a long trip through Central Asia to India, during which he studied with many famous Buddhist masters. When he returned, Xuanzang brought with him more than 650 Buddhist scriptures. He was warmly welcomed and honored. The emperor was so curious about the countries Xuanzang had visited that he requested Xuanzang to write a book about his journey, which he did (Xuanzang, ca. 646/1968). 

Both Zheng He (the Grand Eunuch) and Xuanzang were—and still are—respected by the Chinese for their journeys into other countries.

What is past is prologue, Shakespeare observed. The question is, Which past? Let us leave the issue at that and return to the present. Currently, Asian countries lag behind the West in scientific advancement. As an example, Nisbett cites the fact that, in the decade of the nineties, forty-four Nobel prizes were awarded to scientists living in the United States, whereas only one was awarded to a scientist living in Japan. The disparity is not simply a reflection of funding. Japan spends about half as much as the U.S. in support of science, and it spends more than either West Germany or France. The latter received five and three Nobel prizes respectively in the same decade. Neither can the disparity be explained in terms of individual talent or expertise: Asian students today tend to excel in math and science, especially in comparison with their American counterparts.

In Nisbett’s view, the lag in Asian science stems from a social ethic that fosters respect for tradition, discourages public criticism of the work of colleagues, and places an onus on individual accomplishment. (“The nail that stands out gets hammered down.”) Such attributes contribute to the ease and grace of social living: they are, however, less suited to the give and take of scientific research, which resembles more a competitive sport than a family gathering.

Let us now turn to an issue raised at the outset of this review: How does Nisbett get from cultural differences to universality in cognitive processes without resorting to biological reductionism? In an ever shrinking world of commerce and communication, globalization is inevitable. Looking toward the future, Nisbett entertains three possibilities. The first possibility, adumbrated by Francis Fukuyama (1992), is a spread of Western style democracy and capitalism—and associated habits of thought. The second possibility, advanced by Samuel Huntington (1996), is the internationalization of societies with the retention of traditional social customs and ideologies. Fundamentalist theocracies, such as Iran and Saudi Arabia, might be examples. The third possibility, which Nisbett believes most likely, or at least preferable, involves neither cultural displacement nor compartmentalization, but complementarity. For example, Nisbett illustrates how Eastern styles of thought can correct some of the shortcomings inherent in the West, and vice versa. A kind of universality might thus be reached without sacrificing the strengths of either.

The universality envisioned by Nisbett might seem to beg the question; still, it may be the best course between the Scylla of cultural relativism and the Charybdis of biological reductionism. To illustrate how this might be, we make a brief digression.

N isbett’s The Geography of Thought received the William James prize for 2004, awarded by Division 1. Among the characteristics reflected in James’s work are (1) an interest in the diverse ways people think, and (2) an ability to express complex ideas in readable, often elegant, prose. Both of these characteristics are evident in Nisbett’s book, which is enjoyable, informative, and thought provoking. Important as these characteristics are, they are relatively superficial. We believe there is a third, more fundamental way that Nisbett resembles James, namely, pragmatism. Within the tradition of pragmatism, the problem of relativism has received some of its most searching analyses.

We mean pragmatism in the philosophical sense advocated by James (1907/1955), not in the commonplace sense of a concern with the practical. (As noted earlier, Nisbett characterizes Asian thought as “pragmatic” in the latter sense, which he contrasts with “abstract theorizing.”) One feature of philosophical pragmatism, shared (if we interpret them correctly) by both James and Nisbett, is a rejection of any hard and fast distinction between the form and content of thought: Form (cognitive processes) helps determine content (an idea, say) and, dialectically over time, content helps determine form.

Moreover, according to James (1907/1955), “ideas [which themselves are but parts of our experience] become true just in so far as they help us to get into satisfactory relation with other parts of our experience” (p. 49, emphasis in original). In other words, if a new idea is to gain pragmatic truth it must preserve “the older stock of truth with a minimum of modification, stretching them just enough to make them admit the novelty, but conceiving that in ways as familiar as the case leaves possible” (p. 50). Pragmatism is thus conservative; it preserves the kind of cultural continuity emphasized by Nisbett.

Pragmatism is radical even more than it is conservative. To quote James (1907/1955) again, pragmatism is an “attitude of looking away from first things, principles, categories, supposed necessities; and of looking towards last things, fruits, consequences, facts” (p. 47, emphasis in original). Looking away from first things means abandoning the quest, long a tradition in the West, of seeking to ground knowledge and morality on a foundation that is not only firm but also universal. Because of its rejection of universalism, pragmatism has often been accused of relativism. The accusation is warranted if by relativism we mean that truth is dependent, in part, on cultural context. It is not warranted if by relativism we mean that no criteria exist to help distinguish the true from the false, the good from the bad.

The problems for science posed by relativism have been addressed by Richard Rorty (1982, Ch. 9), a prominent contemporary pragmatist. His analysis is too complex to be summarized here. One aspect, however, is particularly relevant to issues raised by Nisbett. A central task of Western philosophy, Rorty observes, has been “the possibility of grounding the European form of
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Thought... life—of showing it to be more than European, more than a contingent human project” (p. 172, emphasis in original). Pragmatism calls that possibility into doubt. Truth is ineluctably ethnocentric. Thus, we may speak of truth within the Western tradition, a legacy of conversation and debate bequeathed by such figures as Plato, Newton, Kant, Marx, Darwin, Freud, Dewey, and Milton. (These are a few of the persons mentioned by Rorty; obviously, others would illustrate his point as well.) By implication, we might also speak of truth within the Eastern tradition, a legacy of conversation and debate bequeathed by Confucius, Mencius, Lao Tzu, Chuang Tzu, Mo Tzu, Han Fei Tzu, Sun Tzu, and Chu Hsi, to mention a few Chinese notables.

It is time for East and West to join in the debate of the other—which brings us back to the third possible outcome of globalization considered by Nisbett, mentioned earlier. By looking forward toward common “last things,” while preserving what is unique in each culture’s “first things,” a kind of universality of thought may be reached. It will not, however, be a static universality that transcends time or place; rather, it will be a dynamic universality that captures in thought a moment in an ever changing and increasingly interdependent world. Nisbett’s book is a welcome contribution to that possibility.

In sum, we believe that William James would have found The Geography of Thought well worth reading—and thinking about. And we believe the readers of The General Psychologist will too.
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Behaviorism Died Today, Again!

by Larry Alferink, Illinois State University

Behaviorism is dead! Or so I have been told. Repeatedly! Reports of its death even extend to my daughter. When her Educational Psychology professor discovered her father was a psychologist, he asked “What kind?” When she indicated that I was a behaviorist, he responded “Oh how dreadful! They are all dead.” My daughter knew I was still alive, and she also knew that I had many behavioral friends who were also still alive. And they had students! Her response to the professor was to write a term paper that, among other objectives, showed that behaviorism is still alive and well and doing very useful empirically validated work in his field. I wish I could reproduce that term paper here as it would save me some work in composing this column and in reporting that I have learned not to wake up every morning and read the obituaries in the latest journal to find out whether my professional interests have finally met their demise. Fortunately for me, these obituaries are not written by people who publish in the journals that I regularly read. The authors in these journals continue doing new and interesting things that advance the field and contribute to human well-being, unaware this work is not supposed to happen.

Let me assure you that behaviorism in general and behavior analysis in particular is alive and well, both within the American Psychological Association through the work of Division 25 and other related divisions, and in other organizations such as the Association for Behavior Analysis International (ABA) and the Association for Behavioral and Cognitive Therapies (formerly AABT). ABA, for example, started as a small regional organization of approximately 200 members with a conference in Chicago in 1975. Many others involved in behavioral work belong to affiliated organizations around the world. Today, ABA draws participants from around the world, has 4,300 members and continues to grow. ABA also sponsors an international conference every other year, with recent conferences so far in Italy, Brazil, and China.

If there is a sense in which behaviorism has died, it is that its progeny have ceased to focus solely on basic learning processes with rats and pigeons in the laboratory but have branched out into so many fields. Who among you does not understand the importance of behavior as the basic data in our field, whether it is a rat bar pressing, a student learning to read, or a college student in an experiment on priming and implicit memory? Can any of you honestly say you have never used reinforcement or extinction with your children or your students? Behaviorism will always be alive and well as long as its contributions to our understanding of behavior continue to be used. And used it is, with examples of behavioral techniques incorporated broadly into the work of a wide range of members representing a broad array of APA divisions.

Many of you will certainly be aware that the use of behavioral techniques played a major role in integrating individuals with developmental disabilities into society, allowing them to be mainstreamed in public schools or employed through sheltered workshops instead of being housed in state institutions, as was so common in the past. Given the growth in the number of children diagnosed with autism spectrum disorder, you may also be aware of the critical importance of applied behavior analysis as the only empirically validated technique in the treatment of these individuals. You will undoubtedly also know about systematic desensitization and other extinction-based therapies in the treatment of phobias. Token economies, contingency contracting, and a variety of other behavioral techniques have been empirically validated and are widely used in clinical practice today. You may even be aware of Acceptance and Commitment Therapy and other therapies that have been developed based on behavioral extensions of verbal behavior or the work of Steve Hayes in developing Relational Frame Theory as a behavioral account of complex verbal relationships.

But there are other applications of which you may be less aware. Consider the behavior of animals in zoos. Typically, if you go to a zoo on a nice summer afternoon, you may be lucky to see some of the animals. They may be hiding in the shade or taking a nap. In other words, the animals may be rather passive, and you may not see much behavior. In the case of predators, their “predatory” behavior consists of waiting for the zookeeper to dump some food in their vicinity. When behavior analysts have become involved in zoos, the animals have become more active as the food may be contingent on something resembling more natural predatory behavior by making them chase and catch their food, an “animated” prey, rather than simply having it dumped in front of them (Markowitz, 1978). This not only is more interesting for visitors, arranging for greater levels of activity may also be good for the health and well-being of the animals. In addition, the use of aversive control is reduced, and the use of positive reinforcement becomes much more prevalent. Consider, for example how elephants have sometimes been managed in zoos in the past. When the zookeepers need to clean the elephant’s area, they may have used fire hoses to force the animals back. But of course it is a simple matter to teach an elephant to move back on cue using positive reinforcement, with an added benefit that the elephants and the zookeepers may have much better relationships! If any of you have visited Shedd Aquarium in Chicago, or similar facilities elsewhere, you may have witnessed the result of training marine mammals to engage in various entertaining routines. But in addition to captivating an audience, the training also includes reinforcing marine mammals to roll over on their backs so that their temperature can be obtained and engage in other behaviors that facilitate routine health care. The simple use of reinforcement techniques arranges for animals to participate cooperatively in their health care, rather than resisting it. Given the success of behavioral techniques in zoos, perhaps it is time to consider taking your pet to see a behavior analyst. (Yes, we do that too!)

You may be aware of the close linkages between Division 25 and Division 28 (Psychopharmacology and Substance Abuse), because behavioral techniques have been of critical importance in assessing the behavioral effects of psychoactive drugs. You may not even know of the importance of behavioral contracting in obtaining striking outcomes in treating substance abuse. You may be even less aware of work that occurs in behavioral toxicology, where behavioral techniques are used to assess the possible behavioral and cognitive deficits that may be caused by potential neurotoxins. You probably are not aware that operant conditioning and “Schedule-Controlled Operant Behavior” are part of detailed EPA guidelines that manufacturers must follow under the Toxic Substances Control Act or other acts regulating the use of pesticides. In fact, operant techniques played a critical role in the removal of lead from products.

In the field of education, behavioral techniques play an important role in classroom management and instructional techniques that are based on evidence of effectiveness. “No Child Left Behind,” for whatever its shortcomings, has had several important impacts that fit well with the applications of behavior analysis to education. The first is...
Behaviorism Died...

the promotion of evidence based, empirically validated approaches to instruction that characterize our work through techniques such as Direct Instruction and Precision Teaching. Precision Teaching, for example, focuses on the rate at which a behavior occurs, rather than a more typical measure such as percent correct. Response rate is a key variable in fluency. Jack Marr, a former President of Division 25, has even adapted Precision Teaching for use in the Engineering Program at Georgia Tech. Marr noted that despite having average SAT scores in the mid-1300s, only about half of Georgia Tech students pass the beginning engineering courses, a figure that is common nationally. In analyzing the problem, Dr. Marr found that many students who failed did the work correctly but did not complete all the problems on the test. He then instituted a program that had two features. He taught students the frames in which typical engineering problems fit, and how to solve problems that fit that frame. Secondly, reinforcement was based on response rate in working problems, increasing the likelihood that students would complete all of the problems on the exams. This program had a significant impact on retaining students in engineering, reducing the fail rate by half.

A second feature of “No Child Left Behind” is a focus on the individual child rather than the average student typically used in measures of school performance. If you live in a wealthy school district with high per pupil expenditures, does it really matter whether the average student does well if one student has not learned how to read by the third grade? With its focus on the individual and single-subject research designs, behavioral approaches are well suited for such cases. Consider how a reading program might be developed using programmed instruction moved forward to the Internet age, with everything we have learned about effective instructional design incorporated into the program and with the program thoroughly researched before it is made available for use. Consider also a reading program that can track student progress through every mouse-click as the student progresses through the reading program, generating more than 2,000,000 data points thus far. Visit www.headsprout.com to see such a program in use. Sign up for the free sample lesson, and let me know if you think this program would maintain the behavior of the beginning reader!

A number of School Psychologists in Division 16 and the National Association for School Psychologists (NASP) rely heavily on behavioral techniques in consultation with teachers and parents in solving student problems in our schools. Behavior analysts have also set up schools that rely heavily on behavioral approaches to education and on obtaining data on instructional effectiveness with each child. Examples of such programs are the work of Kent Johnson at Morningside Academy in Seattle, Charles Greenwood and others at Juniper Gardens in Kansas and the work of Douglas Greer at Columbia Teachers College. Behavioral programs have been shown to produce success for groups of at-risk students who often fail in the typical classroom.

Behavior analysts have also been very active in working with businesses and organizations. Such work in Organizational Behavior Management may involve more effective approaches to employee training or the effective use of reinforcement and feedback to enhance productivity. Particularly noteworthy is work on Behavioral Safety Programs, because such work deviates significantly from traditional approaches to safety in the workplace. Traditionally, industry has relied on measures of low-incidence behaviors such as work place injuries. But of course, once injuries have occurred, it is too late. It is better to have a program that focuses on injury prevention through teaching and monitoring safe work practices, to prevent injuries thorough reinforcement and feedback of safe practices.

While I have largely focused on applications thus far, I would be remiss if I did not indicate the strong linkages between basic research in behavior analysis, applied behavior analytic research, and the important work in behavioral service delivery. The members of Division 25 are perhaps unique in the strong linkages and integration that occurs between basic research, applied research, and service delivery. In fact, while Division 25 is classified as a “science division” and works closely with the Science Directorate of APA, we also have a significant percentage of our members pay the special practice dues assessment and we also work closely with the Practice Directorate. Several years ago, Division 25, working cooperatively with Division 33, ABA and AABT, developed a Behavioral Specialty that was approved by APA Council.

But let me assure you that both basic and applied research remain active and vibrant today. A significant development regarding basic research is the role that quantitative models play, largely as the result of research on choice behavior and on behavioral economics, potentially generating a paradigm shift in the way we look at fundamental characteristics of behavior (Baum, 2000). In fact, the Society for the Quantitative Analysis of Behavior (SQAB) was formed specifically to serve as a forum for quantitative work in behavior analysis. Likewise, much recent work has focused on complex stimulus relationships, such as that exemplified by conditional discriminations and stimulus equivalence (Sidman, 2000). While the Partial Reinforcement Effect (PRE) has been around for years, recent developments in behavior analysis have encompassed this effect in a much broader phenomenon as resistance to any change, not just a change in the reinforcement schedule. Resistance to change is expressed theoretically as behavioral momentum (Nevin and Grace, 1999). Finally, among many other possible examples, work in the self-control paradigm and in behavioral economics has lead to considerable work on the subjective discounting of rewards provided after a temporal delay (Myerson and Green, 1995).

For those who would like a slightly different approach to the work I have described here, you may also enjoy reading an excellent Presidental Column by Roddy Roadgir in the 2004 APS Observer. For APS members, the column can be accessed at http://www.psychologicscience.org/members/login.cfm?end_location=/observer/getArticle.cfm?id=1540. Additional information about many of the applications I have described can be found at the web site for the Cambridge Center for Behavioral Studies (http://www.behavior.org).
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Without compromising privacy, this feature invaded the bedrooms of three prominent psychologists, Neil Lutsky, Suzy Horton, and Jane Halonen, to see what reading material might be found on their nightstands. All three provided brief annotated bibliographies of books that they have recently enjoyed reading.

NEIL LUTSKY

Although Neil is a psychology professor at Carleton College in Northfield, Minnesota, the readings described came from his nightstand in London, England, where he is currently co-directing a Psychology and English Seminar. Dr. Lutsky is a former president of the Society for the Teaching of Psychology and the Treasurer of Division 1. He noted, “The books on my nightstand usually differ in character from those on my desk. That’s one of the attractions of ending a day by reading. The fact that the nightstand in question is in Hampstead, London, where I am spending a term, further distances these current readings from my daily fare.”

Saturday, by Iain McEwan. This is a novel using a day in the life of a London neurosurgeon to address how we might respond with a measure of integrity to the threats and anxieties of post-September 11 life. Passing references to research on neurotransmitters, parenting and behavioral genetics, facial expressions of affect, and the psychology of belief also suggest that perhaps we are more successful giving psychology away than we often suppose.

Will in the World, by Stephen Greenblatt. This illuminating imagining of historical, cultural, family, and personal influences focuses on the work of William Shakespeare. I appreciate the sober reminders that both Will in the World and Will himself provide about the roles that religious orthodoxy, jealousy, ambition and power, grief and guilt, thwarted love, and social and self deception may play in the world. Greenblatt’s hypotheses are often beautifully stated (e.g., with attention to base rates and control cases) but then magically transformed into fact. (Perhaps exposure to a potant flower juice is the culprit.) Read with caution (see, e.g., Fowler’s critical review in the February 4, 2005 Times Literary Supplement) and delight.

Fountain Pens: United States of America and United Kingdom, by Andreas Lambrou. This is a reference work on my current passion in London: learning about and collecting antique fountain pens. Perhaps ink is the juice of the flower working its magic on my time and income! It’s enjoyable to learn about the varieties and technologies of fountain pens—a strange world of Swan eyedroppers, Mandarin Duofolds, Vacuums, button fillers, and other ancient denizens—and to remember that there were and are means of communication other than e-mail.

SUZY HORTON

The second contributor, Suzy is a professor of psychology at Mesa Community College in Mesa, Arizona. Her area of specialization is gender and human sexuality. Dr. Horton shared the following synopses of three books in the stack on her nightstand.

Love at Goon Park, by Deborah Blum. After you read this book your lectures about Harlow and the wire and cloth surrogate mothers will never be the same! Blum does such an incredible job putting Harlow’s research in context. And that context is full of “Who knew?” moments. The Behaviorists’ “no cuddling” dictum makes more sense when we realize that polio and whopping cough and all sorts of childhood diseases made kissing and hugging mom and dad—and visiting hours at the hospital—a dangerous activity. We learn that Harlow’s first wife was a “Termite” (one of the genius kids in Terman’s original study), and that Terman liked to play matchmaker. Since Terman believed in mating smart people, it was a real tribute to Harlow. (She eventually divorced Harlow but later remarried him.) One interesting factoid I learned reading “Love at Goon Park” was that Terman played matchmaker and introduced Harlow to one of his female subjects. Terman also convinced Harlow to change his last name from Israel to Harlow.

You’ll grumble at the various deprivation studies that turned baby monkeys into psycho-monkeys. My least favorite section involved surrogate mothers who air-blasted their babies to the floor. Others had blunt-tipped spikes. Some shook the babies. Yet the baby monkeys desperately clung to their mothers, craving their touch, even when it was painful. And finally, the greatest irony of all: that the man who made a science out of affection was a chain-smoking alcoholic who neglected his own wife and kids. Get the book and find out how Harlow’s lab got its interesting name!

Sperm Wars: The Science of Sex, by Robin Baker. If you ever wondered what evolutionary purpose a woman’s orgasm could have or why men send forth millions of sperm in each ejaculation, Baker, an evolutionary biologist, has some fascinating theories to mull over. It seems there must have been an awful lot of “cheatin’ goin’ on” throughout human history. Using steamy vignettes and modern science, Baker introduces his controversial yet fascinating theory of sperm competition. It seems that all sperm are not equal. Only about 1% are egg-getter sperm, capable of fertilization. The other 99% are either blocker (or kamikaze) sperm whose function is to prevent other men’s sperm from getting to the egg or attackers ready to demobilize other men’s sperm. Baker used questionnaires, collected hundreds of ejaculations during masturbation and coitus (he provided his subjects with condoms), and (can you picture this?) somehow collected samples of semen “flowback” from women’s vaginas. Using a fiber-optic endoscope attached to the underside of a man’s penis, Baker was able to see what happens inside a woman’s body at the moments of ejaculation and female orgasm. From routine sex to extramarital sex, from fantasies to oral sex, from masturbation to wet dreams, Baker combines evolutionary theory, speculation, and storytelling and forces you to see human sexual behavior in totally novel ways.

I Am Charlotte Simmons, by Tom Wolfe. (This is the latest book-on-tape I’ve enjoyed.) I heard Tom Wolfe interviewed about this book. He spent four years hanging around campuses across the U.S. He learned about “sexiling,” “the walk of shame,” “booty calls” and other facets of college sex in the 21st century. However, the book is really more about pride, envy, and hypocrisy than sex. The main character is a naive and prim girl from Sparta, North Carolina in the Blue Ridge Mountains. Eager to experience the “life of the mind,” Charlotte isn’t prepared for life at Dupont, a fictional, continued on next page...
elite, Eastern university. She has to cope with life in a coed dorm (with some pretty squallid bathroom scenes), a haughty roommate, loneliness, and the universal and agonizing adolescent need to be accepted. Wolfe, ever the master at social realism and hubris, is fun to read. You’ll love his exposition on F@#$% patois, for example. His descriptions of Charlotte’s depression were so authentic, I found myself in a bad mood for days. There are secondary plots about college basketball, academic honesty and politics, but Charlotte’s confrontation with sex, alcohol, fraternities, and the vagaries of relationships were more interesting. This is a novel marinated in adolescent egocentrism. The characterizations are stereotypical and there isn’t a lovable one on the entire campus. I also think Wolfe could have cut out about a third of the book. Ultimately, I thank my lucky stars that my children are grown and out of college.

JANE HALONEN

The third contributor, Jane is dean of the University of West Florida College of Arts and Sciences. She is a former president of the Society for the Teaching of Psychology and of the Council of Teachers of Undergraduate Psychology. Dr. Halonen reported that the following books were on her nightstand in various stages of being read:

The Tie that Binds, by Kent Haruf. I have no idea how I ended up with a copy of this little gem but I remember Ken Keith talking about this author positively. It is a marvelous novel that addresses the sacrifices that agricultural families face. The writing is so good you can practically smell the farm and feel the grit involved in the endless work. The family dynamics that unfolded in the novel were especially gripping. I come from farmer (hillbilly) stock so I was intrigued to read about the arduous life related to farming in the plains.

Savage Beauty: The Life of Edna St. Vincent Millay, by Nancy Mitford. Millay’s poetry has always had the potential to mesmerize me and I’ve used snippets of her work to support key points in some of the textbooks I’ve written. I’m a sucker for biography. Always have been and I remember reading the earlier biographical work of Nancy Mitford on Zelda Fitzgerald and really enjoying that. Millay’s fragility seems to be an outgrowth of having to grow up too soon, serving as the parent to her two sisters while her mother earned a living away from the home. My early research in psychology was linked to attachment theory so I’m drawn to what happens to those in life when attachment goes awry.

Lolita in Tehran, by Azar Nafisi. I requested this one as a Christmas present because of the great press I’d heard about its ability to connect people who love to read. It promises to give a new appreciation of the bonds that reach across culture through literature.

Harry Potter! by J. K. Rowling. I’m working my way through the audiotaapes of the Harry Potter books. I marvel at the complex and creative world that J. K. Rowling has constructed. The remarkable delivery of Jim Dale allows me to rediscover the pleasures of Hogwarts all over again. I am entirely indebted to Rob McEntarffer for recommending Harry and company to me at an Advanced Placement reading many summers ago. I appreciate the intricacy of the world she is creating and also love the story of how she has been able to capture the reading world with her work.

Grading, by Barbara Walvoord (on my desk at the university). Here is the latest in a long string of books I wish I had written! Barbara has been very ingenious in identifying ways to blend traditional grading practices with contemporary demands for assessment. I highly recommend this work for anyone facing accountability challenges, such as a regional accrediting review. She inspires a great deal of creativity in how best to engage students in meaningful learning.

These bibliographies, shared by three prominent psychologists, provide great suggestions for potential summer reading. The range of topics, from recreational to serious academic, should appeal to the needs and desires of everyone. Many thanks are extended to Neil, Suzy, and Jane for their timely recommendations.

— A.E.
We Oughta Be in Pictures!

W hen did you first become interested in the profession of psychology? What sparked that interest? I love colleagues’ stories of what drew them to the discipline. Psychologists’ accounts of lifelong interest or evolving careers are instructive and entertaining. Some people choose psychology in order to be healers; others seek to explore the labyrinth of the mind. A few admit they always felt a little screwed up or out of place socially, and preferred the do-it-yourself approach. Me? I was inspired by the movies.

From an early age I was encouraged by my parents to appreciate films of every genre—epics and capers, tragedies and slapstick. From black-and-white classics on “Saturday Night at the Movies” and “The Sunday Matinee,” I learned some key lessons about human nature: the scariest monsters are the ones you never quite see; when people fall in love, they burst into song in broad daylight; the good guys always win and usually survive—although Shane does not come back. I did not realize I was learning, of course, much less acquiring a taste for my life work. Rather, I merely took on my parents’ passion for movies, and made it my own. (Shared movie viewing remains a central tradition among my siblings to this day. We’ve been known to halt plans and postpone travel if The Enemy Below (1957) is on, just to recite the dialogue we already know too well.)

Spellbound by Psychology

My parents enjoyed most genres, but taught me a special appreciation for mystery and suspense films. In the 1950s and ’60s, I learned from my mother, who was a consummate movie nut, that the director Alfred Hitchcock was peerless. So many Hitchcock films retain their compelling, subtle scariness even today: Rebecca, Lifeboat, Strangers on a Train, Dial M for Murder, Vertigo, and of course Psycho, to name only a few. I can now identify some of the elements that Hitchcock wove together to create his effects: sharp shadows and camera angles; uncertain and foreboding dialogue; macabre yet understated scenes; intense personalities and swelling soundtracks. As an adult, I appreciate the artistry in his movies; as a kid, all I knew was that they were wonderfully creepy.

Our favorite Hitchcock film was Spellbound (1945), perhaps the psychological thriller showcasing the best and worst of the genre. A new chief of staff, Dr. Edwardes (Gregory Peck), an expert on the guilt complex, has arrived at Green Manors to oversee its operations. He is immediately attracted to the brilliant and beautiful Dr. Constance Peterson (Ingrid Bergman), and they fall in love. But Edwardes exhibits increasingly odd, distressing symptoms: secretiveness about his past, and a defensive temper if questioned about it. It appears he is an impostor, who is impersonating the real Edwardes, who had treated him briefly for war-related amnesia. Constance chooses to flout the rules of psychoanalysis (Green Manors is a strictly Freudian establishment) and continue the analysis herself, concluding that neurotic guilt has caused her lover’s fugue. Their relief at his cure is short-lived when the real Edwardes is found to be not on an extended vacation but the victim of murder—and the false Edwardes is the prime suspect. The lovers flee to escape arrest, and continue the analysis in hiding. Constance studies the amnesic’s dreams for clues to the identity of the true murderer. After a vivid revelation, we enjoy a tense confrontation—and a happy ending. The evildoer may run but cannot hide from a psychoanalyst.

Over the years, I saw Spellbound many times before analyzing its appeal, its psychology, the elements that made it such a captivating film: The psychiatric hospital is like a village, but populated by patients and analysts, giving it some of the intrigue of classic British locked-room murder mysteries. The protagonists’ love is complicated first by professional association, and then by Freudian transference. The movie makes great use of design (what we today call ‘production values’), triggering anxiety with stark black-and-white arrangements and sideways glances. The surreal dream sequences were designed by artist Salvador Dali, juxtaposing masked figures, eye-patterned draperies, and outsized props. Most haunting to me still is the eerie soundtrack of Miklos Rozsa, with instrumentation that firmly established the theremin as the instrument of soundtrack paranoia. There are some flaws to be found: some lines and movements seem stilted; a few patients’ outbursts are over the top; and a climactic sound-stage sking sequence gives our actors the downhill slope and moving background, but apparently not enough wind to even slightly ruffle the leading lady’s hair. Nonetheless, the film’s overall effect, even today, is satisfying, intriguing, and memorable—in a word, spellbinding.

Finding Focus

I was so impressed by Spellbound, and later by the 1957 drama The Three Faces of Eve, that I came to see psychology as a combination of the puzzle, healing art, and detective story. As a child, I had dreamed of growing up to be an archeologist, or an adventurer, perhaps another Marie Curie, or maybe a real-life Sherlock Holmes; they all appealed to me, but how could I choose only one? The power of film psychology helped bring my dreams into real focus: Psychology was clearly an encompassing scientific adventure, a quest to seek, discover, and solve. I could find all I loved in one profession. Crime, disorder, and confusion—these were all mysteries—and psychologists the detectives of the mind.

Since becoming spellbound, my interest has deepened not only in psychology as a life’s work but also psychology movies in themselves. I keep a running list of such titles, classic and current, to exchange with students and colleagues. I’ve developed courses on “Psychology in Film” and “Psychology in Story” (including written narrative as well as movies) to explore the facts and fictions abounding in psychology movies. Now my friend and your editor, Bob Johnson, has asked me for the occasional psycho movie article. In issues to come, I’ll review common themes or misconceptions in these films, and review classic and contemporary movies in this category. For this introductory article, I make some further observations about the power and value of psychology as portrayed in film.

Plots and Characters

I’m not the only one who finds movie psychology fascinating: The stories may be far-fetched, the characters stereotyped, and some plot lines downright enraging (e.g., rampant, “zipless” therapist-client sex). But for all their flaws, psychology movies are not likely to be boring. What other profession is so regularly portrayed in movie story or character than psychology? You just don’t get that many movies about accountants, teachers, travel agents, or even physicians. Lawyers might abound in legal thrillers, but less so in other story lines. Crime detection is more directly thrilling than psychology per se, but good film noir portrays the detective as a lone and mythic antihero, not as the less glamorous, more likely forensic investigator. Psychology is still the more versatile movie profession.

Like the psychoanalyst in Spellbound, psychologists in movies can “be” detectives—as well as victims, lovers, crusaders, and villains. What continued on next page...
kind of psychologists make the best characters? The therapist is the obvious favorite; they have all the fun. Occasionally, psychological researchers do show up as movie roles; they are okay in good-guy supporting roles, or as narrators or observers of the action. But research psychologists are lots more fun (if less accurate) as cold, manipulative evildoers. No, the on-screen psychologist is less likely to be depicted with a Skinner box than with a couch, as in The Snake Pit (1948), Final Analysis (1992), Good Will Hunting (1997), and Mumford (1999). While our favorite film psychologists work as clinicians, screenwriters seem sadly unable to distinguish between psychologists and psychiatrists. (Even television’s Frasier claims credentials in both disciplines.)

Psychological plot lines may focus obviously on illness and treatment, or less obviously on inner conflicts, between passion and intellect, control and loss, delusion and reality. Frankly, any story about power, secrecy, social problems, the individual effort to change, even the nature of reality, seems to beg for a psychological perspective. Consider just a short list of movies whose “narrow” psychological themes were parlayed into cinematic success: Rain Man, Ordinary People, Memento, Vertigo, One Flew Over the Cuckoo’s Nest, Awakenings, The Snake Pit, As Good As It Gets, A Beautiful Mind—even comic exaggerations like What About Bob? and Analyze This! The variety in this list reflects the fact that movie psychology is really a device to provide launching points for stories and characters. These movies use disorders and roles as devices to deliver tragic or comic conflicts. These scenarios are familiar to movie audiences, who need only a few cues to understand the setup. We see the couch in the psychologist’s office on screen, and we think, Aha! She is the therapist and he is the client; let’s see what happens next. And cinematically, what happens next could be anything from premeditated murder to wacky mayhem.

What Movie Psychology Means

Most people will never visit a therapist or take a psychology course. Our cultural ideas and ideals are “informed” not by information but image. Right or wrong, the psychology featured in popular movies shapes the way our discipline is viewed. Some audience members might get a bad impression of psychologists from film portrayals. But others might find movie psychologists sympathetic and appealing, or even feel moved to seek much-needed help. Reputedly this happened for at least a few who saw the 1980 drama Ordinary People and were impressed by Judd Hirsch’s portrayal of the ultimate warm-and-fuzzy therapist.

Even we insiders aren’t impervious to the charms of psychology movies. We cheer for psycho-heroes like Robin Williams’ Sean Maguire in Good Will Hunting; we shrink from Louise Fletcher’s placid, evil Nurse Ratched in One Flew Over the Cuckoo’s Nest. Movies offer cultural lessons and personal inspirations. As I’ve described above, I chose a career in psychology partly because, as a child, I was dazzled by movie psychology. In the course of my education I certainly became more pragmatic and diligent, but I never lost the stars in my eyes. Our discipline is glamorous. You oughta be in pictures, raved the old song. Yes, we oughta be—and we are. Let’s consider how we look in the movies, and how we like what we see. Let me know your own psychology movie reviews and comments: You can reach me at weber@unca.edu. I hope you enjoy this column in articles to come, and that together we enjoy, all the move, the fun and instructiveness of psychology in the movies. With or without the popcorn.

With or without the popcorn.

The APA Teachers of Psychology in Secondary Schools (TOPSS) is looking for a few good psychologists! TOPSS is starting a Speakers Bureau of current and retired psychologists who are interested in visiting local high school psychology classrooms to speak with students about their careers and experiences in psychology. Many high schools have psychology clubs, and teachers could tap into the TOPSS Speakers Bureau to find local psychologists to speak at club events. This is a wonderful way for young students to learn about psychology, and psychologists would have the satisfaction of sharing their experiences with eager students. You can learn more about TOPSS at http://www.apa.org/ed/topss/homepage.html. The Speakers Bureau will also be available for community colleges and four year colleges and universities, so participants should be willing to speak with any level of students. If you are interested in participating in the TOPSS Speakers Bureau, please contact Emily Leary at eleary@apa.org or 202-572-3013. Please include your location and area of expertise or experience. We appreciate your time.

The Taiwan Psychology Network (TPN) was established in 2001. Members include professors, students, and practitioners in psychology who are currently living in the United States or Taiwan. TPN’s mission is to promote collaboration and networking among members and to assist their professional development in training, education, research, and practice. Currently TPN has 88 members and is still growing. The discussion group at http://health.groups.yahoo.com/group/Taiwan_Psychology_Network/ has become a place where members exchange information, experience, opportunities, etc. Membership is free! They warmly welcome all professionals and students who are interested in Taiwanese/Taiwanese American psychology to join. For a membership application, please contact our Membership Officer, Ms. Hsin-Ya Liao at hsin_99@yahoo.com.

Division 1 President-Elect George W. Albee spoke at a meeting in Scotland Nov. 26, 2004 held to honor the memory of Professor Ignacio Martin-Baro, Vice Rector and professor of psychology of the Central American University of San Salvador, who was murdered by a death squad in 1989. Prof Martin-Baro was one of five Jesuit scholars killed. Martin-Baro had spoken out frequently against the devastating impact of US policy in Central America. He was long active in efforts at establishing an international network on human rights. Prof Albee’s appearance was sponsored by the Community Psychology Program at Stirling University directed by David Fryer.

The Annual Division 47 Ray’s Race and Walk at the 2005 Washington, D.C. Convention of APA will be held at 7 a.m., Saturday morning, August 20, in Anacostia Park along the southern edge of the Anacostia River. Buses will be provided at the major hotels to take participants to and from the race. Maps and additional information will be available at Division Services at the convention. Awards will be given to the overall men’s and women’s winners and to the top three finishers in each 5-year age group from under 25 to over 75. Awards will also go to the top three male and female finishers who hold membership in Division 47, the top three finishes who are Psi Chi members and Psi Chi National Council members. To honor our convention exhibitors (who provide excellent raffle prizes for us), an award will also be given to the highest finishing male and female exhibitor.

Pre-registration will run until August 12 which means that the entry form and fee must be received by that date. The entry fee for pre-registered runners is $20.00, which includes a commemorative T-shirt, raffle chances, and post-race refreshments. After August 12, during the convention, and day-of-race registration fee is $25.00. Pre-registration for students is $10.00 and convention/day-of-race student registration is $14.00. Please pre-register to help us avoid too many convention and day-of-race registrations.

More information, including a registration form, can be found online at: http://www.pscy.unc.edu/apadiv47/running.html or through the Division 47 Web site at: www.apa47.org. Click on the Running Psychologists link.
Let’s introduce this series with a pop quiz:

1. Which of the following was not advocated by Wundt as a method of psychological research?
   a) reaction time studies of simple thought processes.
   b) detailed study of the cultural activities of different ethnic groups.
   c) extended analytic introspection of the contents of consciousness.
   d) statistical surveys of the mental capacities of the general population.

The answer, at least to a first approximation, is c. This may be surprising to many because in textbooks Wundt is usually described as (and criticized for being) an introspectionist. More important than the “right” answer, however, is the widespread tendency to think about history in terms of trivia questions that can be given definitive, snappy responses. As it turns out, Wundt used two different terms to refer to quite different methods, one of which he endorsed and one of which he rejected but which, confusingly, were both rendered in English as “introspection.” The long, analytic sort, which is better associated with Titchener, Wundt rejected (see Danziger, 1980).

The point here is that historical questions are rarely answerable in a single word. One reason for this is that the very words we use to form questions often carry with them connotations that are not applicable to the time in question. Consider: Was Wundt’s psychology scientific? Behaviorists bet their future on the answer being “no.” Many who followed in their wake simply assumed that they must have known what they were talking about. But for the historian, the answer to the question depends on how Wundt and his 19th-century German colleagues used the term “science” (or, rather, Wissenschaft), not on what some Americans, looking to advance their own agenda, claimed some 40 years later.

For historians, context is the key. Unfortunately, history of psychology is conveyed to psychologists mostly through textbooks in which context is often the first casualty. Many of these textbooks are fine pedagogical works. They are not, however, the primary means by which historians communicate their scholarly endeavors to each other. Like most textbooks, they are necessarily full of vast oversimplifications and out-of-date material. In just a few hundred pages, they race through immense periods of time, glossing over massive cultural and disciplinary differences. These constraints are, shall we say, less than optimal for getting a deep understanding of what the psychologists of a particular era were up to and why.

Historians of psychology, needless to say, find this situation a little frustrating. They would naturally prefer if psychologists outside the area would have a glance at the scholarly journals in the field: Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences, History of Psychology, and History of the Human Sciences. But psychologists of every area would like their colleagues to read the journals in their own area, and it is clearly too much to ask. As a compromise, Bob Johnson and I have developed this column, “RetroReviews,” in order bring to members of Division 1—psychologists who identify themselves as “generalists”—a stimulating taste of the sort of work that historians of psychology really do. Each issue will feature an important or controversial reading from psychology’s past that is available in full on-line at the Classics in the History of Psychology Web site (http://psychclassics.yorku.ca/). We will then invite an established historian of psychology to write a brief commentary on the historical piece, expanding on the context in which it appeared, its meaning for the people to whom it was addressed, and the relevance it continues to have for us today. The commentators will be drawn, in the main, from the membership of the Society for the History of Psychology (APA Division 26).

The first article we have chosen is E. G. Boring’s “The Woman Problem,” first published a little over a half-century ago in American Psychologist. You can find Boring’s piece in full at: http://psychclassics.yorku.ca/Boring/woman.htm. We are pleased that Alexandra Rutherford has agreed to write the commentary. Dr. Rutherford is on faculty with the History and Theory of Psychology graduate program at York University in Toronto; she is the editor of the “Heritage Column” for The Feminist Psychologist, the newsletter of the Society for Women in Psychology (APA Division 35); and she is the author of several articles on the work of, and public reaction to, B. F. Skinner. In the future we will feature articles by Francis Galton, William James, and other luminaries of psychology’s past, along with provocative commentaries by expert historians of psychology.

We hope that those who teach the history of psychology will bring some of what we offer to their classrooms, but the intended audience is broader than that: general psychologists from all backgrounds who simply have an interest in learning more about where their discipline has been, and where it might be going.

And now, let me introduce Alexandra Rutherford, whose review of Boring’s article begins on the following page.

Reference
When the professional woman starts out on her career, she can be imagined as having two choices to make:... [S]he might perhaps attempt a decision about job concentration and whether to work with particularities or generalities, in technology or in science. If she chooses less job-concentration in order to be a broader person, a better wife or a better mother... she is not choosing the maximal professional success of which she would be capable. She is in competition with fanatics—the 168-hour people—and she had better accept that bit of realism about job concentration.

The most prestigious activities in our society expect of people who are going to rise to leadership positions in their fortiess near total commitments to their work... And it is a fact about our society that this is a level of commitment that a much higher fraction of married men have been prepared to make than of married women.

A French author once wrote, "The more things change, the more they remain the same." Certainly the two passages above, written by two different people more than 50 years apart, prove the point. In 1951, Edwin G. Boring, a psychologist at Harvard University, noted that married women faced a tough choice: either become better wives and mothers, or devote themselves to professional success by competing against the "168-hour people." In 2005, Larry Summers, the current president of Harvard, remarked that leadership positions require "near total commitment to work," and married women have been less likely than married men to 'choose' this option. Leaving aside the question of why the current Harvard president would himself choose to make such remarks, let's have a look at what—or who —turned Edwin G. Boring's attention to the "woman problem." In light of the rest of Boring's scholarly contributions, his 1951 article seems curiously out of place.

Boring's essay on the "woman problem" was actually the culmination of a long and somewhat complex wartime collaboration with his colleague, Columbia psychologist Alice Bryan. Bryan, along with many of her female colleagues, had become concerned that women psychologists were being professionally excluded from the war effort. When a number of women broached the subject, they were abashed by their male peers to be "good girls"—to be patient, and to wait quietly until plans could be made that would include them. When, almost two years later, nothing had changed, a group met in Alice Bryan's Manhattan apartment to draw up a charter for a national organization of women psychologists. On December 8, 1941, one day after news of the bombing of Pearl Harbor, the National Council of Women Psychologists (NCWP) was born.

From the start, there was some tension within the group. Although fully aware that they were being edged out of military positions because of their sex, and that they were not being invited to fill the academic positions that their male colleagues were leaving vacant, women were reluctant to make the NCWP simply a clearinghouse for charges of sex discrimination. As Bryan remarked, in the devastating aftermath of Pearl Harbor, "Winning the war had to be given first priority." In addition, male psychologists used subtle strategies to undermine the women's feminist resolve. Several denied that sex discrimination existed in psychology, and suggested that in drawing attention to gender issues at a time of national emergency, women were being self-indulgent. Others remarked that women were undermining their status as scientists, who, it was pointed out, used pure merit to determine professional success.

So, what became of this debate over the woman problem? The post-war period of the 1950s did not offer a particularly hospitable environment in which to sustain feminist activism. When the war ended, the NCWP was re-named the International Council of Women Psychologists. The re-organized group adopted a distinctly apolitical mission statement, eventually began to admit more men, and was re-named the International Council of Psychologists. Neither did women psychologists necessarily benefit from the post-war economic boom: Men quickly filled both the academic positions they had traditionally dominated, as well as the newly-prestigious clinical positions that had previously been relegated to the "woman's sphere." It was not until the second wave of the feminist movement in the late 1960s that organized psychology would again be called upon to re-examine its professional treatment of women and confront issues of sex discrimination.

It was in this highly charged atmosphere that Alice Bryan met Edwin Boring. Boring, and other male psychologists, were becoming increasingly provoked by Bryan's repeated assertions that women did not hold proportionate representation in APA offices. Always the empiricist, Boring suggested that he and Bryan collaborate on a study of the problem. Their study resulted in three articles published in the Psychological Bulletin and the American Psychologist between 1944 and 1947. In his autobiography, Boring characterized their unlikely collaboration as one in which Bryan, with her feminist convictions, and he, with his conviction that women, for both biological and cultural reasons, “determined most of the conditions about which she complained,” could potentially moderate each other and reveal the truth. Boring may have been naive in his expectations. What actually happened was that, in an effort to work together amicably, the pair sidestepped their ideological differences and presented their results—which clearly vindicated Bryan's suspicions that women were underrepresented—in largely descriptive format. Boring refrained, in these articles, from fully disclosing his position on why women were underrepresented. But he would not remain silent for long.

In 1951, Mildred Mitchell, a member of the NCWP and one of the few women to hold a military position during the war, published an article in the American Psychologist where she revisited the gender disparities reported in Bryan and Boring's reports. In response to Mitchell's article, Boring wrote, “There can be no question that professional women acquire less prestige than professional men in proportion to their numbers.” He then suggested two primary reasons for this state of affairs. The first was the natural predisposition on the part of women to prefer “particularistic” tasks over the work of generalization that was the true calling of the scientist. The second was that women suffered from the aforementioned “job concentration” tasks over the work of generalization that was the true calling of the scientist. He concluded that indeed she could, but that she must be “abnormally bright to combine charm with sophistication.”

... continued on next page ...
profession as a whole, salary disparities continue to disadvantage women purely on the basis of their sex. Moreover, while it may be tempting to conclude that we have now eliminated much of the discrimination that obviously worked against women’s professional advancement at mid-century, it is clear, if we use Summers’ remarks as any indication, that expectations about appropriate roles for men and women in our society have not changed all that much. Biological and cultural determinism are still alive and well – especially at Harvard.

Further Reading:

For the full text of Larry Summers’ controversial remarks at the National Bureau of Economic Research Conference on Diversifying the Science and Engineering Workforce, see http://www.president.harvard.edu/speeches/2005/nber.html.

Further information on Alice Bryan and Mildred Mitchell can be found in their autobiographical accounts published in Agnes O’Connell and Nancy Felipe Russo’s 1983 edited volume, Models of Achievement: Reflections of Eminent Women in Psychology. In her account, Mitchell gives several personal examples of Boring’s sexism at Harvard.

The formation of the NCWP and the wartime activities of women psychologists are discussed in historical context in Capshew and Laszlo’s 1986 article, “We Would Not Take No for an Answer: Women Psychologists and Gender Politics During World War II,” published in the Journal of Social Issues, Volume 42, pp. 157-180.

For an expanded version of this article with a complete reference list, see http://htpprints.yorku.ca/archive/00000245/.

The Aging Problem

Call it what you will—The Aging Problem or “the pig in the python,” as Past APA President Diane Halpern has referred to it—the problem is the advancing demographic bulge of baby boomers who are nearing retirement. It’s a problem poised to hit professional organizations like APA very hard: The average age of APA members is now nearly 54 years and the mode is relentlessly advancing one year every year.

A look at the demographics of the divisions, displayed at http://www.apa.org/about/division/images/tables01.pdf shows that the aging problem is even more serious with the divisions of APA because younger psychologists are not joining the divisions. In fact, according to the most recent data, half of our members in Division One are older than 55. Even more sobering is the fact that the report cited above shows Division One to have only one member under 30 years of age!

The Aging Solutions

If you are a veteran member of Division One and a member of an academic department, consider giving a first-year membership to a promising younger colleague: It will cost you only $25. Consider also giving a student-affiliate membership to one of your more promising proteges—for a mere $7.50. (It’s only a little more, if you want to include a subscription to Review of General Psychology.) A Division One membership might also make a good departmental award.

You can find a membership application at the end of this newsletter.
Raymond J. Corsini’s long career as a general psychologist (and grad school dropout, prison psychologist, group psychotherapist, educator, iconoclast, etc., etc., etc., encyclopedia and dictionary-ist) has always been characterized by the integrity of a fine piece of marble. As Tony Marsella informed us, he is the son of a marble cutter in Rutland, Vermont, whose parents had both come to the United States from Tuscany. When Ray was a few months old, the Italian family moved to Marble, Colorado, where his father Giuseppe continued working as a marble cutter. Tony Marsella in print has called Ray’s mother Evelina “the archetypal mother for many Italians who came to America determined to provide their children with a better life”; her traits, “loving, strong-willed, hard-working, determined, tough, and unwilling to surrender a dream, regardless of the obstacles,” molded Ray’s early years and seems to have permeated all of his career thereafter.

Ray’s prodigious output of tests, educational practices, therapeutic innovations, journal articles, books, interviews, encyclopedias and dictionary over some six decades has never failed to meet the marble test of toughness, intolerance of error, and ardor—even if it may not always have lived up to the courtly standards of excessive politeness and diffidence. While his initial contributions were primarily in prison psychology, organizational psychology, testing, psychodrama, and clinical psychology, by the early 1980s he had become a major editor of books on psychotherapy, learning, and personality assessment and research. Then in 1984 appeared his monumental (four-volume!) Wiley encyclopedia of psychology, at the time by far the most comprehensive English-language product of its type. The subsequent editions of his encyclopedia, and then later the appearance of his enormous dictionary of psychology, likewise the most comprehensive product of its type, have established him as one of the premier general psychologists of his time.

Edwin G. Boring, in his book A History of Experimental Psychology, commented on how prolific Wilhelm Wundt, often considered the founder of experimental psychology, was during his long career. His output came to 2.2 published pages a day, “which comes to about one [written or revised] word every two minutes, day and night for…sixty-eight years”—not counting time for sleep, eating and other vital activities. I’m not sure what Ray’s comparable figure might be. Perhaps when he’s not too busy writing about some new topic like family counseling or religions or revising some of his earlier works, Ray might want to calculate whether he is responsible for felling fewer—or more—trees than Wundt did.

When I was invited to participate in this roast—symposium—I was asked to focus on Corsini as a generalist and encyclopedist. I will try to do that for a few minutes.

Ever since the reorganization of the American Psychological Association during the mid-1940s, Division One of APA, now called the Society for General Psychology, has argued about, been confused about, and obsessively worried about just what the meaning and identity of “general psychology” is and should be. Discussions of this issue have been part of the division’s convention programs, its presidential addresses, the content of its newsletter and even of its repeatedly revised by-laws, for some five decades. And the debate continues. But it need not, for it has been resolved; and the resolution is personified in Raymond J. Corsini, Ph.D., The Marble Kid

Joseph Corsini, Ph.D.

Corsini has repeatedly referred to himself as an over-achiever, because his academic record before he finally completed his doctorate at the University of Chicago in 1955 was, frankly, abysmal—despite his invariably soaring scores on standardized tests. His terrible initial academic record was doubtless, at least in part, a function of the intolerance of bloated bombast, the insatiable curiosity, the independence of thought, and the sheer orneriness, creativity, prodigious energy, rambunctiousness, and broad interests that have characterized Corsini since his youth and that have made him into the brilliant personification of a generalist that he has been for so long.

For very long. It is indeed fitting that we are gathered here today to honor Ray Corsini—and congratulate him on his one thousand eighty-second-month birthday tomorrow, when he turns ninety years and two months old. He has been and is the personification of general psychology—as well as a major contributor to the many other fields mentioned before and to nursing, counseling, role playing, adolescence, and still others too. His many books on this amazingly broad range of topics have been translated into lots of foreign languages: German, Spanish, Japanese, Russian, Greek, Dutch, and even Iranian, Korean, and Bulgarian—but not yet, as far as I know, into his native Italian. The breadth of the topics addressed in these books and in his dozens of published papers alone stamps him as a model general psychologist, since one hallmark of general psychologists is that they not only are at home in a single specialized subfield, but overcome the fractionation of psychology by being experts in a number of them.

But what marks Corsini as the prototypic general psychologist is his incredibly mammoth works that cover the entire field: his encyclopedia and his dictionary. A quarter of a millennium ago, Denis Diderot with Jean Le Rond d’Alembert and many others attempted to encompass all human knowledge in a single encyclopédie, and it took them some 35 small volumes to do so. Corsini’s Encyclopedia of Psychology—only of psychology—has required more than a tenth as many large volumes: four each in 1984, 1994, and 2000. The first edition alone of Ray’s encyclopedia contains 1,879 huge two-column pages. The three so-called “concise” single-volume versions of it contain some 1,200 pages each. Corsini’s 1999 dictionary of psychology, which took a decade to compile, has 1,171 pages and includes definitions of 27,000 terms, more than twice as many as any other dictionary of psychology, and more terms than most average users of the English language have in their entire vocabulary. Corsini’s dictionary, and his encyclopedia, were, to repeat, by far the most extensive English-language products of their kind ever attempted when they were published. What project could be more “general” than a dictionary, or an encyclopedia, of a field? Corsini has indeed been a general psychologist par excellence.

According to my incomplete set of APA directories from the last half century or so, Raymond J. Corsini became an associate of the American Psychological Association in 1943 and a full member in 1958. He joined APA’s divisions 5 (evaluation and measurement) and 17 (counseling psychology) in 1949, but by 1953 had dropped his membership in 17 and limited his division affiliation to Division...
APA divisions have the opportunity to honor their most distinguished members by nominating them to the APA Membership Committee for nomination to the APA Board of Directors for nomination to the APA Council of Representatives for election as Fellows of APA. Only those nominees for whom it can be documented that they have indeed made unusual and outstanding contributions to the sub-area identified with the nominating division make it through this elaborate successive screening. Since Raymond Joseph Corsini is not listed among recipients of this honor, modest though it is in comparison with the enormous range, quantity, and quality of his achievements, I took it upon myself to nominate this individual, the incredible breadth of whose many significant contributions to many different subfields demonstrates his prodigious generalism and, furthermore, in addition, whose mammoth multiple-edition encyclopedia of psychology as well as his enormous dictionary of psychology make him, to repeat, may not tell the full story, for they come from my (unfortunately somewhat incomplete) collection of APA directories from 1948 to the present.

The roughly 180 people attending the Council meetings had been supplied several weeks earlier with a detailed agenda book and other paper materials (the total stack measured just over 5 inches by 8 1/2 inches by 11 inches), and additional pieces of paper were distributed during the meetings themselves. (The full 3-inch-thick agenda book was also made available in the form of a DVD disc.) The agenda book was broken down into some 50 specific items, classified as 33 for action or discussion, a few “new business” items, some “business pending” ones, and seven that were limited to providing information to members of Council. Supplemental materials included a handout on the implementation of Council’s actions in July 2004, a report on progress on new business items from the July 2004 Council meeting, a 290-page small-print detailed final proposed budget for 2005 (as well as a 20-page “executive summary” of that budget), a booklet providing a report on APA’s real estate activities, ample “exhibits” related to a variety of agenda items, a confidential report on the 2004 annual survey about the CEO, a slick-paper 43-page 8 1/2 x 11 inch “handbook” for 2005 Council Representatives, propaganda supporting the candidacies of various APA members for such offices as the APA presidency or membership on the APA Board of Directors, and various and sundry additional pieces of paper.

The Division One council representative attended all the meetings of the Council as well as the plenary session, meetings of the Coalition for Academic, Scientific, and Applied-research Psychology (CASAP, to which he had recently been elected as a member-at-large of the executive committee), the Women’s Caucus, the Public Interest Caucus, the Ethnic Minority Caucus, and two meetings of the CASAP executive committee, as well as an evening reception sponsored by the APA Science Directorate and another reception honoring new members of the Council; as well as an evening reception sponsored by the APA Science Directorate and another reception honoring new members of the Council at the APA building next to Union Station. What with trying to absorb all the new information provided both orally and in writing during the meeting, planning strategy on how to deal with a few agenda items, responding to efforts to lobby on behalf of various positions concerning several action items, and networking with other members of Council, there was little time for leisure during those almost four days of concentrated activity, and less time for sleep at night than the Division One representative is normally accustomed to have. Altogether, it was a full and often exciting time. But as has been true for several decades now, relatively few of the agenda items were of central interest to general psychologists; the Council has for a long time had more members identified with the practice of psychology as a profession than with those identified with academic or scientific psychology.

continued on next page...
President Ronald Levant opened the formal meeting with a brief report that centered on his “theme” of “making psychology a household word.” He spoke about APA’s relief efforts for the devastating tsunami earlier this year, about a task force on national security on which he is working, about a “biopsychosocial model of care” for “promoting health care for the whole person,” about his initiative to enhance diversity via a diversity task force whose mission it is to increase minority representation in all APA efforts, and about his intent to try to reduce a current controversy concerning “evidence-based practice” by appointing a task force aimed at integrating science and practice and at generating an APA policy and making recommendations about clinical practice.

APA’s Chief Executive Officer Norman Anderson reported that electronic products have been generating more revenues than APA’s print products since 2002; that difference continues to grow. He mentioned that several changes have been, or are being, made in APA accounting procedures, partly in response to recommendations made by APA’s accounting consultants and partly due to a change in revenue patterns: since much of the revenue associated with APA’s electronic products comes in during the last six weeks of the year, some adjustments in technical accounting procedures are required. He mentioned that APA’s real estate tax might be reduced by about one million dollars a year if APA were to promise to hold its convention in Washington every third year, and he talked about making APA’s “information technology” activities “system-wide” rather than just relying on creative individuals in Central Office. He closed with a statement of appreciation for Henry Tomes, who is about to retire after 14 years in the position of APA’s Executive Director for Public Interest.

Treasurer Carol Goodheart provided further information on APA’s financial status. After the recent improvements in the stock market, APA’s stock portfolio is now worth about 50 million dollars. About $2.5 million dollars profit is now being generated annually from APA’s building activities. With a six dollar annual increase in regular dues, and a four percent average salary increase for workers in the APA Central Office, as well as substantial contributions to tsunami relief from the APA, the total 2005 budget is now projected to end with a surplus of about 500 thousand dollars.

Chief Financial Officer Jack McKay provided yet more information on APA’s financial situation. APA now rents out about 600,000 square feet in its two buildings, and has about a 70 million dollar “theoretical equity” in 750 First Street and approximately a comparable 50 million dollar equity in 10 G Street. Altogether, the financial picture improved more than 10 million dollars in 2004, with gains of almost two million from APA’s “operational,” 3.6 million from “building operations” and 4.8 million from long-term investments. While subscriptions to APA publications continue to decline, income from the licensing of APA’s electronic products is still growing substantially. APA’s long-term investment portfolio, of which 61 percent is in large-cap value stocks, grew 11 percent in 2004. The membership of APA (about 90,000 members and 60,000 affiliates) has been roughly steady during the last decade. Staff in the APA Central Office stands at about 550 now. Print products bring in about 20 million dollars a year now, and electronic products about 39 million—even though it took about 15 years for income from electronic products to reach 12 million dollars in 2000, and it doubled to 24 million in 2004. Overall, only about 14% of APA’s annual income comes from dues; about 44% of APA’s annual expenses are allocated to salaries and benefits. The proposed 2005 budget, with revenues of about 98.5 million dollars and expenses of just under 98 million dollars, is predicted to yield a net end-of-year surplus of just over half a million dollars.

Among agenda items that generated extensive discussion (some in open session and some in “executive session”) were a report of a task force on a World Conference Against Racism Report (focusing largely on the need for APA to develop a resolution or a position condemning anti-Semitism) and a proposal for a new division in APA devoted to “human-animal studies.” A “multicultural organizational leadership workshop” consumed about 1¼ hours Saturday morning, and two hours were devoted that afternoon to “break-out groups” for discussion of what APA’s priorities should be (the last such discussion had occurred in February 2001).

Among agenda items that might be of some interest to general psychologists were a decision to allocate 60 thousand dollars annually to support the Archives of the History of American Psychology (a motion which had been introduced at the February 2004 council meeting by the Division One representative); rejection of the proposal to establish a new division of “human-animal studies” (largely because its aim was viewed by some as overlapping with, or as being inimical to, the aims of other already-established divisions); passage of a resolution opposing capital punishment of certain persons with mental disabilities; renewal of the recognition of clinical geropsychology as a proficiency in professional psychology; funding of one meeting of a task force to identify student learning outcomes at the lower division of the undergraduate psychology curriculum, especially focusing on the learning of undergraduate psychological science; reaffirmation that APA should seek expert input on policy issues (from such existing resources as APA’s divisions); passage of a resolution favoring empirically supported (rather than only faith-based) sex education and HIV prevention programs for adolescents; and establishment of a new task force on socioeconomic status within the APA’s Public Interest Directorate. Progress also continues to be made on such matters as the development of a report and resolutions on the psychological effects of efforts to prevent terrorism.

The representative from Division One will complete six successive years on the APA Council this summer when the Council meets in Washington in August. APA rules require representatives who have served for six successive years to remain off of the Council for at least a year thereafter. It has been an educational, sometimes frustrating, and occasionally very rewarding experience, and members of Division One are encouraged to consider becoming candidates for election to Council from the division. As APA’s pendulum continues to swing further toward practice, dedicated voices in support of general psychology, academia, and research are needed all the more—indeed many psychologists who are primarily identified with the professional practice of psychology are eager to have their colleagues in science and academia join them in APA governance to provide the needed background and expertise to continue to enhance the public image of psychology as a science-based discipline. APA needs you!

Respectfully submitted,
Michael Wertheimer
Representative to Council
APA Division One
The Society for General Psychology
The 2005 Division One convention program has been developed. The program will include a variety of presentations that should be interesting to our membership. The program officially begins on Thursday August 18 with a Division business meeting at 9:00 AM. There are many programs of note. First, the Division will present awards to Frans De Waal, Steven Pinker, Richard Nisbett, Mark Koltko-Rivera and M.E. Bitterman, each for outstanding contributions to General Psychology.

In terms of other programs, Linda Bartoshuk will chair a workshop entitled “You are What You Eat? Oral Sensations and Chronic Disease Risk.” Brewster Smith will lead a panel discussion, “Prescription Privileges.” Mark Koltko-Rivera will chair the symposium “21st Century Psychology,” co-listed with Division 17. Thomas Sexton will chair a program called “Evidence-based Culturally Competent Psychology,” and Hogop Pambookian will chair a symposium entitled “Binet-Simon Intelligence Scale: A Century of Contributions Worldwide.”

Division President Bonnie Strickland will host a Presidential Symposium entitled “Promoting Unity in Psychology.” She will be joined in discussion by Robert Sternberg, James Greeno and Linda Knauss. The Division is also pleased to host the “Twenty-Sixth Eminent Women in Psychology Symposium: Historical and Personal Perspectives.” This program will be chaired by Agnes O’Connell. Participants in this program will be Elizabeth Capaldi, Susan Fiske, Ruby Takanishi and Susan Whitbourne.

We are also providing opportunities for Division One members to socialize. We will host a social hour for our new division fellows. We hope many members will attend this function to congratulate the new fellows. On Friday evening, all members will have the opportunity to de-stress and have conversation with division members as we meet in the Sports Bar of the Renaissance Hotel along with the members of Divisions Three and Six.

The program review committee wishes to thank all of the people who submitted proposals for our program. The program is only as good as the proposals submitted. There were many excellent proposals submitted for review and we think that the ones selected for our program best fit the goals and interests of the Society for General Psychology.

Most readers will know that the “file drawer problem” involves studies that never see print because they failed to produce statistically significant results. Hence, the research goes into the file drawer and is lost to the scientific community. The file drawer problem recently gained public notice when the press reported a publication bias in drug studies, favoring those that report positive results. As a result, many drugs may actually be much less effective than the published data make them appear.

What might be the consequences in psychology? I’ll illustrate one possibility with an example from my own file drawer.

The study grew out of comments made by a literature professor of my acquaintance who was explaining the concept of “comic relief” (which offers a segue for the mention of George Albee’s column near the end of this newsletter). The lit prof noted that Shakespeare often interjected a humorous episode even in his darkest tragedies, as in the gravedigger’s scene from Hamlet. The comic scenes, professed the professor, provoke catharsis—preventing the intensity of the drama from overwhelming the audience with despair.

“Nonsense!” thought I. Taking a smugly cognitive approach, I suspected that Shakespeare was taking advantage of a contrast effect: I guessed that the interjection of comedy in a tragedy might intensify the audience’s sense of the play’s tragic scenes, much as a light-colored tile placed beside a dark one may make the dark tile look even darker. And that led to what I thought was a brilliantly conceived experiment that now resides in my file drawer.

I contacted Diana Mahony (BYU, Hawaii), a colleague interested in humor. Together we hatched an experiment that would assess people’s reactions to a series of tragic and comic pictures scanned from old issues of Life magazine. (Old timers will remember, especially, the comedic photos that appeared on the last page of the magazine every week.) Rachael Williams, one of Dr. Mahony’s students, did the hard work of loading the photos on a computer and testing a group of undergraduates. We had predicted that the tragic photos—shootings, explosions, famine, immolation—would be rated as more sad when they followed a happy or funny photo. The results? Classic file-drawer data.

Was our hypothesis untrue? Or, did we have a bad design or merely a sample of outliers? I cling irrationally to the latter explanation—that we committed a Type 1 error—although we haven’t pursued the idea further. Perhaps someone reading this will refine our approach and have better luck.

But here’s the larger question: What impact do “file-drawer studies” have on the field of psychology? In those cases in which a correct hypothesis is rejected, the loss may only be a missed theoretical opportunity. On the other hand, the bias of the file drawer may account for the persistence of certain forms of therapy and assessment techniques that might otherwise have vanished years ago. There is also another possibility that I will call a Type II+ error: Because the results reside in file drawers, the same compelling-but-invalid hypothesis could be tested over and over again—and no one would ever know.

Readers are invited to submit summaries of their own file-drawer studies to The General Psychologist.
What do you want from your Division One newsletter? You will notice some experimental changes in this issue of The General Psychologist that attempt to answer that question. Driving these changes are several editorial hypotheses.

First, we suspect that members of the Society for General Psychology want a publication that features varied, interesting, and innovative articles that make connections among psychology’s diverse specialties. Accordingly, the “Connections” series, exemplified in this issue by Larry Alferink’s article on behavior analysis, will offer new perspectives on topics that many of us haven’t studied since graduate school.

A second editorial hypothesis asserts that readers want articles that connect psychology with aspects of the human condition that have traditionally lain beyond the boundaries of our field. Hence, the lead article in this issue of TGP features Plous and Zimbardo’s take on terrorism.

Third, we hypothesize that readers want features in TGP that personalize psychology—pieces that put a human face on our enterprise. That’s what we’re attempting to do with such columns as “What They’re Reading,” “Psychology at the Movies,” and “The Marble Kid.” George Albee’s column of psycho-humor, although it resists classification, probably fits this particular rubric as well as any.

Our fourth hypothesis states that readers want articles that are short enough to be read with a cup of their morning wake-up beverage.

How will we assess the outcome of this editorial experiment? If the eclectic collection of articles in The General Psychologist can serve as the independent variable, then our dependent variable has to be your feedback. Suggestions, praise, and criticism are welcome—particularly if delivered in a spirit of constructive support.

Given the motley nature of the Division One membership, we don’t expect everything in TGP to appeal to everyone. But it’s our hope that you’ll find something in these pages at least as stimulating as that morning beverage.

One last prediction: If you are reading this as a printed, black-and-white document that you received in the mail, we think you will enjoy it even more in full-color and with active hyperlinks on the Division One Web site at http://www.apa.org/divisions/div1/news.html. The hard-copy version is expensive to print and mail, while the electronic version of the newsletter costs your Division almost nothing to produce. If you like what you see online, please tell us to send your next issue of The General Psychologist electronically by changing your preference on the Membership Application form. Thanks.

—Bob Johnson
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Freud wrote a whole book about humor and its relation to the Unconscious, sometimes in shocking detail. This discovery had denied, or placed on hold, all previous explanations of possible causes of mental disorders. But here and there pockets of resistance smolder, keeping alive the hope that sooner or later there will be a return to sanity in the world of insanity. And, even a return to Freud.

Freud’s work emphasized many unfamiliar, shocking, and controversial ideas. Those related to his explanations of humor include the existence of the Unconscious mind, where repression buries and holds impulses that are socially unacceptable. Life in civilized society requires that people repress and control both sexual impulses and aggression. Many strategies (ego mechanisms) allow for the escape of this unconscious aggressive and sexual material in socially accepted forms. Pro football mayhem and TV wrestling are examples of acceptable release of aggression. Many ways of releasing sexual impulses in acceptable ways exist. These include porn on the Internet, half-time boob shows, art museums and soap operas. Dreams also release both unconscious aggression and sexual wishes, sometimes in shocking detail.

Freud wrote a whole book about humor and its relation to the Unconscious mind. Laughter, he said, is a release of pent-up unconscious energy. In his series of lectures at Clark University in September 1909, he spoke in German to a large, mostly-scholarly American audience. He told this joke, (I have abridged it, and report it in English, as many readers are not still fluent in their college German):

Two shady business men, by dint of risky and questionable practices, amassed large fortunes, and they were now trying to push their way into good society. One method was to have their portraits painted by the best, most expensive and most reputable artist in the city. The paintings were exhibited for the first time at a large evening party with all the town’s most influential citizens in attendance. The two hosts led the nation’s most influential and respected art critic up to the wall on which their portraits were hanging side-by-side. The critic studied the works for a long time, then pointed to the gap between the portraits and asked: “But where is the Savior?”

Freud’s audience was greatly amused by his story as, I hope, is mine. Everyone quickly fills in the forbidden knowledge: These are two thieves. Jesus should be shown hanging between them. The joke releases the repressed knowledge that the businessmen are dishonest.

Is there really an Unconscious mind? Freud is certain. It is filled with amoral base impulses, wishes and fantasies that constantly seek to escape but are mostly held in check by repression. Freud divided the mind into Id (primitive wishes), Ego (the conscious self) and Super-ego (the conscience). Personality is a unique blend of these. The first time, many years ago, I saw a comedy skit in burlesque, and there they were: 1. An Id character (a scruffy comic trying to get at the attractive young woman); 2. The Ego (a well-dressed, experienced, sophisticated man holding back the comic and explaining how to proceed properly and successfully); and 3. A Super-ego person (a policeman or judge who beat the comic over the head for his inappropriate behavior).

How many recent movies have you seen with a bad guy, a good guy and a law-enforcement agent? White hat, black hat and sheriff.

Freud often showed how slips of speech, errors, accidents and dreams reveal the influence of the unconscious forces trying to escape. The unconscious also makes us forget.

Why does the dentist’s office call to remind you not to forget tomorrow’s appointment? Why does the bill-envelope remind you to sign your check? Why do you forget the name, or phone number, of someone you know well? Why do you “accidentally” send an e-mail to someone you do not want to see it? Why are people angry when you forget a date or a birthday?

Freud made much of slips of the tongue. The expression “Freudian slip” is common. Some wit has defined it as: “When you say one thing, but mean your mother.” Or: “If it’s not one thing, its your mother!” Others: An airline passenger at the sales counter asks the attractive sales woman for “Two pickets to Tittsburgh, please” . . . or, “Two tickers to Viagra Falls,” or, “It’s not pretty, being easy.”

Jokes are seen, by Freud, as tricks sprung on the unsuspecting listener that allow sudden escape of pent-up repressions of unconscious sexual and/or aggression energy. This explains why so much everyday humor cannot be reported in a family newspaper or to a proper audience. Here is a mild example:

A man calls home to his wife and says, “Honey, I have been asked to go fishing at a big lake up in Canada with my boss and several of his friends. We’ll be gone for a week. This is a good opportunity for me to get that promotion I’ve been wanting, so would you please pack me enough clothes for a week and set out my rod and tackle box? We’re leaving from the office and I will swing by the house to pick my things up. Oh! Please pack my new blue silk pajamas.

The wife thinks this sounds a little fishy but being a good wife she does exactly what her husband asked.

The following weekend he comes home a little tired but otherwise looking good. The wife welcomes him home and asks if he caught many fish.

He says, “Yes! Lots of walleye, and a few pike. But why didn’t you pack my new blue silk pajamas like I asked you to do?”

She answered:

“I did. They’re in your tackle box.”

George W. Albee is now retired from the University of Vermont, living on Longboat Key, Florida. Dr. Albee was president of APA in 1970 and is the president-elect of Division 1. This column originally appeared in The Longboat Observer and is reprinted here with permission.
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