Inside-Out: Sex Differences in Self-Perception

by Susan Pinker, Author of THE SEXUAL PARADOX
Past William James Award Winner

“Susan Pinker is a developmental psychologist and national newspaper columnist in Canada who writes regularly about human behavior for the international press, and whose writing has garnered several international awards. She has taught psychology at McGill University, and has given invited addresses in the US, the UK, Canada, the Netherlands, Austria, and Germany. Susan’s book on the science of unexpected sex differences, The Sexual Paradox, has been published in 17 countries. Her next book, on the science of social bonds, will be published by Random House in 2013.”

Know thyself, Plato instructed us 2,500 years ago. Most of us don’t, of course, and women are experts at a certain type of self-deception. Over the last two decades studies show that women are more likely than men to underestimate their influence, and this mismatch between how they feel and their effect on the outside world creates a jarring paradox. Though they can be spectacularly competent – not only to observers but on tests of their skills – many women often feel like imposters.

That’s just one of many incongruities emerging from our latest understanding of the subtle differences between the sexes—an understanding that rests as firmly on a commitment to empirical science as on an ability to tolerate some ambivalence. Ambivalence—also known as doubt—is nothing new to me. When I was asked by Vanderbilt developmental psychologist, David Lubinski, to consider submitting my book, The Sexual Paradox, for the William James Book Award, I wondered what this distinguished scientist and mentor could be thinking. And when the book was chosen, my those of Dr. Margaret Chan --whom I profile in the book--who, when asked by a New York Times reporter to describe how she came to head up the World Health Organization in 2007 (where she is still the director) replied that she just happened to be at the right place at the right time.

I too, feel extraordinarily lucky. After all, who wouldn’t feel honoured to
have their name appear in the same line of text as that of William James, one of the most astute and poetic psychologists of all time? But here come those shades of grey again. Though women have been shown in multiple studies to assess themselves more harshly than men, on average, there are also men who doubt themselves. William James was one of them. In 1890, when he submitted his 1,200 page text, The Principles of Psychology, to his editor at Henry Holt he appended the following note: “This is a loathsome, distended, tumefied, bloated, dropsical mass, testifying to nothing but two facts: first, that there is no such thing as a science of psychology, and second, that William James is an incapable.”

With typical verve, William James captured what it feels like to be a writer. A century before the fields of social and affective neuroscience came to be, he described how thoughts and feelings are irrevocably intertwined. He also presciently illustrated one of the main themes of The Sexual Paradox. Though the book describes some of the statistical differences that exist between men and women (some of them, frankly amazing, and only recently revealed by emerging studies in neuroscience and genetics), these differences should never speak for individuals, restrict their choices, or justify unfair practices.

The assumption that what we observe in the natural world is also what it “should” look like is called the naturalistic fallacy. This common logical mistake was first described by David Hume, the Scottish philosopher who warned against our tendency to unknowingly leapfrog from what “is” to what “ought to be.” Almost a century later, William James may occasionally have felt undeserving but he wouldn’t likely have confused his self-assessments or his observations about human nature--how things feel and how things are--with his ideals--his notions about the way things ought to be.

And in the 120 years since William James’ Principles of Psychology was published, psychological research has confirmed two sobering facts about self-assessment. The first is that none of us is very good at it. We’re even bad at evaluating ourselves when it comes to matters of life and death. Nurses are poor predictors of how well they’ve mastered their basic life-support skills, and adolescent boys think they’re more savvy about condoms than they really are. Gun owners don’t know if they’ve really grasped firearm safety and medical students and surgical residents are not good at predicting how they’ll fare on tests of their surgical skills. In other words, self-confidence is vastly overrated—-it’s only loosely connected to performance, if at all. In areas in which feedback is vague, rare or comes too late, the connection between self-confidence and performance is even more tenuous. People who think they are intelligent are not necessarily so. College students have little idea how they’re doing at school, and managers often rate themselves as having more competence and better interpersonal skills than they actually demonstrate. a Despite the maxim about knowing thyself, most people don’t. Most overestimate how smart they are and how well they’ve done, so it’s no use asking them. To be blunt, self-confidence feels good, but it doesn’t mean you are good.

The second fact is that there are indeed sex differences in the way our self-assessments influence how we approach cognitive tasks. More women than men think they’ll do poorly, even when they perform very well. Their predictions don’t determine their performance, but can affect what they decide to try next. Cornell University psychologists Joyce Ehrlinger and David Dunning found that women who thought they had done badly on a science quiz --even though they had actually done well-- then declined to enter a competition. Their self-perceptions didn’t affect their performance on the quiz. It wasn’t the classic self-fulfilling prophesy. But their self-perceptions influenced their desire to compete in the future. By misjudging their own competence, women often withdraw from opportunities or hang back. In the interim, those with flawed self-confidence can step forward.

Still, when two social scientists in the UK, Susan Vinnicombe and Val Singh of Cranfield University, set out to look at what distinguished the trajectories of directors of major international telecommunication companies, they discovered remarkably similar career paths among the men and women. These women did not report facing different barriers than the men (though that’s not to say there were none). All described challenges offered early on that helped them clinch their careers. Yet the women were more likely to doubt themselves and the appeal of risky ventures. “I was not at all happy about making this move, although it was a promotion. I didn’t want to do it. I didn’t know what it would entail,” said one female director who took the leap under duress. The male directors described themselves actively seeking out mentors or sponsors, whereas the female directors remember having been picked out by senior staff members for special assignments. The men reported unquestioningly accepting the chance to prove themselves, while the women described often having to be persuaded. A mountain of evidence points to women reporting
that they experience more anxiety and self-doubt than men. A huge meta-analysis by Alan Feingold confirms it, as does the most comprehensive study of mental states in the US, directed by Ronald Kessler at Harvard. His data show that women have much higher rates of mood and anxiety disorders than men. The evidence points to males, on average “externalizing,” meaning their negative behaviors are directed to the world at large through aggression, anger or substance abuse, whereas women, on average, are more likely to “internalize,” meaning their negative thoughts are more likely to be turned inward, through sadness, guilt, anxiety or shame. One group of researchers led by psychologist Stephanie van Goozen, looked at how people responded to negative feedback about their performance. The men were more likely to be angry about criticism, whereas the women were more likely to feel sad and ashamed. (The women got angry just as often, but in response to perceived interpersonal slights not negative assessments of their achievement). No matter what the context is, women are more likely to say they self-reflect, ruminate and search for causes of events within themselves.

Yet even if men, on average, have higher levels of self-esteem, a powerful sense of confidence and bluster is neither a prerequisite for success nor always a force for good. Cheaters, bullies and self-appointed enforcers have strong egos, research shows, while teenagers with the most self-confidence are early adopters of unprotected sex, drugs and drinking to excess. Insisting that women should be versions of a more male typical standard of self-assessment not only does them a disservice, it’s a sign of that old logical fumble; mistaking what is for how some people think the world ought to be.

With a more shaded understanding of the statistical variation within any human trait—including self-assessment—it no longer makes sense to see sex differences in black and white, nor does it make sense to see male as the standard, or default setting. There is no proof that men and women are indistinguishable, and with the same opportunities, will value the same things, choose the same trajectories, experience the same emotions, and behave exactly the same way.

---

Division 1 has a really exciting program scheduled for the APA Convention in August 2011. In addition to several award presentations, we have a number of interesting and timely symposia, often involving well-known psychologists. Two particular highlights are the symposium chaired by Dr. Philip Zimbardo: The Stanford Prison Experiment: 40 years later, and the Interpersonal Violence Prevention symposium chaired by Dr. Jacqueline White. Other notable symposia topics include: Women’s Depression, Health Disparities, Women in Science and Engineering and Resilience.

We hope that you will attend several of Division 1 events!

Sincerely,

Janet Sigal (Conference Chair)

Invited Address (S): George A. Miller Award for an Outstanding Recent Article in General Psychology
8/04 Thu: 8:00 AM  8:50 AM Convention Center Room 144C

Symposium (S): Applied Creativity  Education, Business, Therapy, and Morality
8/04 Thu: 8:00 AM  9:50 AM Convention Center Room 209B

Symposium (S): Challenges, Opportunities, and Future Developments in Applied Psychology Internationally
8/04 Thu: 9:00 AM  10:50 AM Convention Center Room 156

Invited Address (S): Ernest R. Hilgard Lifetime Achievement Award
8/04 Thu: 11:00 AM  11:50 AM Convention Center Room 140B

Symposium (S): Applications of Research in Cognitive Psychology to Training in the Real World
8/04 Thu: 12:00 PM  1:50 PM Convention Center Room 203

Symposium (S): Loss and Agency in Women’s Depression Recent Updates
8/04 Thu: 12:00 PM  1:50 PM Convention Center Room 204B
Division 1 Preview...

Symposium (S): Unconventional Applications of Psychology to Public Health Palatable and Unpalatable Perceptions
8/04 Thu: 2:00 PM   3:50 PM Convention Center Room 101

Symposium (S): Facilitating Transition to Adulthood The College Campus
8/04 Thu: 2:00 PM   3:50 PM Convention Center Room 203

Executive Committee Meeting (N): [Executive Committee Meeting]
8/04 Thu: 7:00 PM   8:50 PM Renaissance Washington Hotel Meeting Room 5

Symposium (S): Resilience More Than a Metaphor
8/05 Fri: 8:00 AM   9:50 AM Convention Center Room 156

Symposium (S): Stanford Prison Experiment Enduring Lessons 40 Years Later
8/05 Fri: 10:00 AM   11:50 AM Convention Center Room 146B

Poster Session (F): General Psychology
8/05 Fri: 2:00 PM   2:50 PM Convention Center Halls D and E

Symposium (S): Putting the Pieces Together Foundational Elements of Cognitive Readiness and School Performance in Children and Adolescents
8/05 Fri: 4:00 PM   5:50 PM Convention Center Room 102A

Symposium (S): Health Disparities Research Initiatives, Psychology’s Role, and Where Do We Go From Here?
8/05 Fri: 4:00 PM   5:50 PM Convention Center Room 156

Symposium (S): Transcranial Magnetic Stimulation in Clinical Practice
8/06 Sat: 8:00 AM   8:50 AM Convention Center East Overlook Room

Invited Address (S): William James Book Award
8/06 Sat: 9:00 AM   9:50 AM Convention Center Room 147A

Symposium (S): Psychological Science, Religious Beliefs, and the APA Toward a Virtuous Response?
8/06 Sat: 9:00 AM   10:50 AM Convention Center Room 152B

Presidential Address (N): [Presidential Address]
8/06 Sat: 10:00 AM   10:50 AM Renaissance Washington Hotel Meeting Room 5
Business Meeting (N): [Open Business Meeting]
8/06 Sat: 11:00 AM   11:50 AM Renaissance Washington Hotel Meeting Room 5

Symposium (S): Interpersonal Violence Prevention Through Integration and Application
8/06 Sat: 12:00 PM   1:50 PM Convention Center Room 204C

Poster Session (F): General Psychology II
8/06 Sat: 2:00 PM   2:50 PM Convention Center Halls D and E

Conversation Hour (S): Researching Your Backyard Listening to the Voices of Graduate Students
8/07 Sun: 8:00 AM   8:50 AM Convention Center Room 149B

Conversation Hour (S): Examining Psychological Science Some Inconvenient Truths in the New Monastic Order
8/07 Sun: 9:00 AM   9:50 AM Convention Center Room 204A

Symposium (S): Documenting Barriers and Supports for Women in Science and Engineering Doctoral Programs A Multiple Method Approach
8/07 Sun: 9:00 AM   10:50 AM Convention Center Room 102A

Symposium (S): How and Why to Advocate for Disseminating Research Findings
8/07 Sun: 10:00 AM   10:50 AM Convention Center Room 158

Symposium (S): Reading Outside the Box Novel Approaches to Psychology
8/07 Sun: 11:00 AM   11:50 AM Convention Center Room 149B

Symposium (S): Study of Mathematically Precocious Youth at Age 40 Fresh Longitudinal Findings With Implications for Talent Development
8/07 Sun: 12:00 PM   1:50 PM Convention Center Room 155

**************************PROGRAM IS SUBJECT TO CHANGE**************************
Division 1 Award Winners

Title: **George A. Miller Award for Outstanding Research Article in General Psychology (2010)**

Title: **The Ernest R. Hilgard Lifetime Achievement Award (2010)**
Ludy T. Benjamin

Title: **William James Book Award (2010):**


Title: **Arthur W. Staats Lecture Award for Unifying Psychology (2011)**
Wilbert J. McKeachie
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Thursday, Aug 4</th>
<th>Friday, Aug 5</th>
<th>Saturday, Aug 6</th>
<th>Sunday, Aug 7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8 - 8:50 AM</td>
<td>(I) Miller Award Address [C-144C]</td>
<td>(S2) Excellence more than a metaphor (8-10 am) [C-156]</td>
<td>(C) Research: listening to graduate students [C-149B]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(S2) Applied creativity education, business, therapy, morality (8-10 am) [C-209B]</td>
<td></td>
<td>(S) Transcranial magnetic stimulation [C-East Overlook Room]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 9:50 AM</td>
<td>(S2) Applied international psychology (9-11 am) [C-156]</td>
<td>(I) James Book Award Address: Harry C. Triandis [C-147A]</td>
<td>(C) Psychological science: Some inconvenient truths [C-204A]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(S2) Psychological science &amp; religious beliefs (9-11 am) [C-152B]</td>
<td>(S2) Barriers and supports for women in science (9-11 am) [C-102A]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 - 10:50 AM</td>
<td></td>
<td>(S2) Stanford Prison Study: 40 years later (10-12 pm) [C-146B]</td>
<td>PRESIDENTIAL ADDRESS: Nancy Felipe Russo [R-room 5]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(S) Disseminating research findings [C-158]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 - 11:50 AM</td>
<td>(I) Hilgard Award Address: Ludy T. Benjamin [C-140B]</td>
<td>BUSINESS MEETING [R-room 5]</td>
<td>(S) Novel approaches to psychology [C-149B]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 - 12:50 PM</td>
<td>(S2) Applied cognitive psychology (12-2 pm) [C-203]</td>
<td>(S2) Interpersonal violence prevention (12-2 pm) [C-204C]</td>
<td>(S2) Precocious youth at age 40: longitudinal findings (12-2 pm) [C-155]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 2:50 PM</td>
<td>(S2) Psychology &amp; public health perceptions (2-4 pm) [C-101]</td>
<td>POSTERS: General Psychology 1 [C-Halls D, E]</td>
<td>POSTERS: General Psychology 2 [C-Halls D, E]</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(S2); Transition to adulthood in college (2-4 pm) [C-203]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 - 4:50PM</td>
<td></td>
<td>(S2) Cognitive readiness in children, adolescents (4-6 pm) [C-102A]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(S) Health disparities (4-6 pm) [C-156]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Executive Committee Meeting Thursday August 4th 7-8:50pm [Renaissance room 5]

Notes: I=Invited Address, S= Symposium, C= Convention Center room. All sessions are 50 minutes, unless marked “2” hours.

Please check your program book or on-line for more detailed information. Details: Janet2882@aol.com
A Physician Under the Nazis is the autobiography of Henry Glenwick, MD (Polish name Hersz Gliniewiecki), a Polish physician who grew up in Warsaw, and survived World War II. We have this memoir thanks to his American-born son David, a noted clinical psychologist who interviewed his father in the early 1970s and transcribed the tapes, adding supplementary material and editing the work for readability.

Dr. Glenwick’s account adds to the richness of the thousands of personal memoirs published since 1945 that have helped us understand the Holocaust from the Jewish perspective, a view that can be difficult to understand for non-Jews. Told in factual style, but sprinkled with the emotion of events, it is devoid of both judgment and blame. In general psychological terms, it is interesting from the point of view of surviving an extreme disaster situation and dealing with intense stress over a very long period of time.

The 1930s were not easy times for Jews living in Poland and there is no doubt that had it not been for Dr. Glenwick’s father, who was a relatively prosperous merchant, one of the few occupations that were open to Jews, young Henry might never had been permitted to study medicine; although his father was against such an enterprise. Moreover, the method by which Dr. Glenwick and his friend entered medical school—taking advantage of a little-known rule and asking for an interview with the Dean of the University of Warsaw Medical School—demonstrates that the young adult was both motivated and had his wits about him. Yet despite the events of 1938 and early 1939 in which Hitler annexed Austria and Sudetenland, like millions of his compatriots and perhaps the rest of the world, Dr. Glenwick was content to await developments and hope for the best.

Following the outbreak of war, Dr. Glenwick managed to sign up with the Polish army and headed east, leaving his wife, family, and many other relatives behind. Not knowing that Russia had invaded the rest of the country based on a prior non-aggression pact with Germany, he soon found himself serving under Russian occupation in his capacity as a physician, and later a specialist in dermatology and venereal disease following completion of his diploma on June 10, 1940. Life under the Russians was hard, but Ukrainians were the state enemy, not the Jews, which helped. But all of that changed when Hitler launched Operation Barbarossa less than two weeks later.

Democracy in Western countries has been stable for many decades and thus it is a challenge for contemporary readers to understand the meaning of what war brings: the extreme disruptions, poverty, death, disease, and the dismemberment of families. Although in theory, Dr. Glenwick had the opportunity to escape into the hinterlands of Russia and perhaps China, as some did, he chose to stay, hoping to be reunited with his family in Warsaw, which is what happened after a long and dangerous journey back to the capital.

In Chapter eight, we see through the eyes of Dr. Glenwick the dismantling of the Warsaw ghetto by the Nazis, who consigned its Jewish inhabitants to concentrations or work camps as part of the “Final Solution.” Resistance was futile; those who resisted died in the attempt. The only way was to survive by what we would term “networking” nowadays, bribery, corruption, and using one’s wits. Whole families were gradually decimated, including that of Dr. Glenwick, as well as his son and wife.

The narrative of Dr. Glenwick’s continuing ordeal, which follows in the remaining chapters as he is transferred via a series of concentration camps to the work camps of Budzyn and Radom, provides rich pickings for observing humanity at close range.
especially for psychologists, because the only goal for the unfortunate inmates was day-to-day survival. Despite the brutality of the Nazis and some of their press-ganged “helpers”—although it has been argued that the average Wehrmacht soldier should not be included in that category—their behavior suggests at times that a few had humanitarian streaks or even peculiar habits that often saved particular individuals or mitigated conditions. Certainly it is during this period that Dr. Glenwick’s profession of physician perhaps saved his life and certainly entitled him to slightly better treatment than most of the inmates. However, it is also interesting to note that when Dr. Glenwick arrived at the Radom camp he and his friend, Dr. Tylbor were denied this role due to the intervention of the two existing physicians. Possibly they did not want to share their “privileges” or feared that their own lives would deteriorate further. Ultimately, Dr. Glenwick was liberated by the Americans, and after spending time in displacement camps was able to secure passage to the United States in May of 1946. From that point he was able to change his name, become naturalized, and after taking an internship and passing exams, resume his career as a physician, specializing much later as a psychiatrist. Readers must be grateful to Henry’s son David Glenwick, for David’s years of effort to carefully collect his father’s powerful testimony, then edit this, and share it in book form.

What is left unsaid in this memoir is what effect the trauma of the war’s events had on Dr. Glenwick’s life. Emotional detachment is challenging, but can be accomplished. For example, Dr. Bruno Bettelheim published his observations on the methods the Nazis used to break the human spirit in 1943 in the Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology following his experience of the Dachau and Buchenwald concentration camps in 1938-39. While Bettelheim had trained in the study of personality changes under extreme conditions, Dr. Glenwick had no such fallback. Glenwick’s son also notes the largely emotional void throughout the narrative of the book. Was the experience too intense or painful to color his telling of it? Possibly. It has been noted, for example, that many Holocaust survivors behaved in the same fashion or became stoic. On the other hand, it must also be remembered that our comprehension of trauma at the time was much more rudimentary: we did not understand post-traumatic stress syndrome nor the reasons why some men or women succumbed while others did not. In fact, most prisoners of war from 1945 onward did not receive any therapy at all for their experiences; they were simply told to re-integrate with society and get on with their lives. The lesson for us, therefore, may be simply to honor their lives and to ensure that the world does not follow a similar path.

Graduate Student Corner

Exploring American high school students’ interest in science: a secondary analysis of NAEP data

By Jun Li
Fordham University

Excellent academic performance results from a persistent effort in a subject, which is only possible when there is an intense interest in the subject. Students who are interested in a certain subject are more likely than others to spend more time and energy on the study of the subject. Research has found that people will become more attentive when they are interested in something (Krapp, Hidi, & Renninger, 1992). And more attention leads to persistent effort. If students like to spend more effort on their subject, they are more likely to have good performance in that subject. Thus building an interest in the subject is very important for the students’ academic success. Another possible factor that might influence students’ learning interest might come from their future plans. If the subject is closely related to the students’ future plans, chances are that students would be more interested in the subject. Thus understanding the students’ future plans would help understand where their interests lie.

Recent reports on the American students’ performance in the Program for International Student Assessment (PISA) showed that the American students trailed their counterparts in other countries (Fleischman, Hopstock, Pelczar, and Shelley, 2010). It is thought that this result might have something to do with students’ lack of interest in science. Thus, this article is to explore US middle school students’ interest in science via the use of the data from The National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP).

The research questions are:
1. Do American high school students like science?
2. What are students’ future plans?

Method

Participants
The sample used was from the NAEP data. Please refer to NAEP report (NAEP, 2009) for the choice of the participants. There were 11100 students in the twelfth-grade group. The four major ethnic groups (White, Black, Hispanic and Asian) were chosen for the analysis. Other ethnic groups were not reported because of the small sample size.

Scale scores
NAEP developed a proficiency scale in 2009 to establish the basis for future comparison. The scale at each grade level ranged from 0 to 300 with a mean of 150 and a standard deviation of 35.

Questionnaires
The current questionnaire was obtained from the NAEP data explorer. The students were asked 8 questions in the Student Questionnaire considering their interest in science, their future plans and science-related extracurricular activities.

Results

Figure 1 presents the percentage of the ethnicity and their corresponding average scale scores for the twelfth graders. There were 60% White participants, 17% Hispanic, 15% Black and 7% Asian participants. Asian scored the highest in the scale scores, followed by White, Hispanic and Black.

Figure 1. Percentage of Students by Ethnicity and Scores for the 12th graders.

Research question 1: Do students like science?
When students were asked whether they took science because required, around 31% of the students in the U.S. chose Agree, 19% chose Strongly Agree, 34% chose Disagree and 15% chose strongly Disagree. Figure 2 shows the choices of each ethnic group. More Asian and White students did not think they took science because required while more Hispanic and Black students felt...
that they did. Figure 3 presents that among all the ethnic groups, the more strongly they thought they took science because required, the lower their scale scores were.

**Figure 2** Percentages of students by Ethnicity in the perception of whether they took science because required.

**Figure 3** Mean scale scores of students who answered the question “Take science because required”.

When students were asked whether they liked science, around 48% of the students in the U.S. chose Agree, 16% chose Strongly Agree, 21% chose Disagree and 14% chose strongly Disagree. We can see that around two-thirds of the students said that they liked science. Figure 4 reveals the choice of each ethnic group. More Asian and White students liked science while more Hispanic and Black students thought that they did not. Figure 5 presents that the more strongly they liked science, the higher their scale scores were.

**Figure 4** Percentages of students by Ethnicity in the perception of whether they liked science.

**Figure 5** Mean scale scores of students who answered the question “I liked science”.

When students were asked whether science was their favorite subject, 22% of students in the U.S. chose Agree, 15% chose Strongly Agree, 34% chose Disagree and 26% chose Strongly Disagree. Figure 6 demonstrates the choices of each ethnic group. More Asian and White students thought that science was their favorite subject while more Hispanic and Black students thought that it was not. Figure 7 shows that the more the students thought that science was their favorite subject, the higher their scale scores were.
Interest in Science...

Figure 6 Percentages of students by Ethnicity in the perception of whether they thought science was a favorite subject.

When students were asked whether they did science-related activities in their spare time, 27% of the students in the U.S. chose Agree, 5% chose Strongly Agree, 38% chose Disagree and 30% chose Strongly Disagree. Figure 8 presents the choice of each ethnic group. More Asian and White did science-related activities in their spare time while more Hispanic and Black students said that they did not. Figure 9 shows the mean scale scores of those students who answered the question. It can be seen that generally the more the students did science-related activities in their spare time, the higher their scale scores were. However, Hispanic group shows a decline of score in the students who said that they strongly agreed that they did science-related activities in their spare time.

Figure 7 Mean scale scores of students who answered the question “Science is a favorite subject”.

Research question 2: what are students’ future plans?

When students were asked about their future plan, 59% of the U.S. students said that they were going to colleges. About 26% said that they were going to graduate schools. Another 7% said that they were going to have some education after they graduated from high school. Thus approximately 92% of the students are planning to have some more education after their graduation from high school. 86% of the White students and 92% of the Asian students would choose to go to colleges and graduate schools. 85% of the Black students and 77% of the Hispanic students were planning to go to colleges and graduate schools. Figure 10 shows the choice of each ethnic group. Around 60% of the White, Black and Hispanic students said that they were going to college. A little over 40% of the Asian students said that they were going to college. However, 50% of the Asian students said that they were going to graduate school, far more than other ethnic groups. More Hispanic students said that they would stop after their graduation from high school or have some kind of education after high school than other groups. Comparatively few of them would go to graduate schools.

Figure 8 Percentages of students by Ethnicity in the perception of whether they said that they did science-related activities in their spare time.

Figure 9 Mean scale scores of students who answered the question “I do science-related activities in my spare time”.

Figure 10 shows the choice of each ethnic group. Around 60% of the White, Black and Hispanic students said that they were going to college. A little over 40% of the Asian students said that they were going to college. However, 50% of the Asian students said that they were going to graduate school, far more than other ethnic groups. More Hispanic students said that they would stop after their graduation from high school or have some kind of education after high school than other groups. Comparatively few of them would go to graduate schools.
When students were asked whether they would like science job after graduation, only 22% of the students chose Agree, 15% of the students chose Strongly Agree, 29% chose Disagree and 34% chose Strongly Disagree. Figure 11 shows the percentage of choice by ethnicity. Asian students were more likely to choose a science job after graduation. Around two-thirds of White, Black, and Hispanic students would not choose a science job after their graduation. Interestingly, although around 66% of the White students said that they liked science, however, only 37% of the total white students said that they would like to choose a science job after graduation.

However, only 37% of the White students and 54% of the Asian students would choose a science job after graduation.

The results also revealed that more Hispanic (63%) and Black (57%) students liked science. However, only one-thirds of the Hispanic and one-thirds of the Black students would choose a science job after graduation. Very fewer Hispanic and Black students would do science-related activities after school.

From the above analysis, we can see that if students like science and think that science is their favorite subject or did science-related activities in their spare time, they are more likely to achieve comparatively higher scale science score in the test. Asian students seemed to like science better, followed by White, Hispanic and Black students. Likewise, Asian students also scored higher in the science test. Only one-thirds of the Hispanic students, one-thirds of the Black students and a little over one-thirds of the White students would like to take a science job after graduation although more than fifty percent of Hispanic, Black and White students said that they liked science. Even fewer would do science-related activities in their spare time.

Although lower score in science test may not mean much, high school students’ lower interest in science is remarkable. Considering the importance of science, it is imperative that government policy makers, educators and psychologists, school administers, teachers think carefully about the problem of low interest in science and its implications. Future research may further explore causes of this low interest in science and possible solutions to this problem.

References


As many of you learned through the list serve, the Society for General Psychology now has a task force designed to increase our Society’s ability to benefit early career psychologists. Reaching out to early career psychologists is a priority for APA as a whole, and many other divisions have similar initiatives, but it seems especially important to me in our Society. While it is a bit arrogant to assert one’s own experiences to be general experiences, I feel confident in asserting that most of the current generation of psychologists was encultured (intellectually) in an atmosphere that worshiped success within narrow specialization. Thus, the professional landscape today does not encourage young professionals to be vested in topics that cross traditional disciplinary boundaries. Compound that problem, it is often difficult to convince people to be interested in cross cutting issues after they have spent the early part of their careers avoiding them. As a result our Society faces more than the usual challenges in competing for the time and attention of young (and not-so-young) psychologists.

What can we offer? Two categories come to mind: 1) Good things offered by other societies. 2) Things offered only by us. While we are looking for suggestions in both categories, I have been focusing my meditations on the second. I suspect that the most important thing we have to offer is ourselves – we are, after all, the only small organization dedicated to pursuing psychology as a broad topic. We offer the breadth of expertise found in organizations like APS or the Psychonomic Society, while offering the culture of a much smaller organization. I firmly believe that this uniquely positions us to encourage and support early career psychologists who have broad interests. With that in mind I have two suggestions:

A) One of the most important things we can do is to publicize the success of psychologists who have general interests. We need some way, maybe in this newsletter, on the web, or through an award, to recognize professionals (within academia and without) who have succeeded. It is not sufficient to point at past or contemporary Great Men who did this. We need examples of normal people who recently got tenure, succeeded in industry, or ran a successful practice, while eschewing the standard narrow-specialization model. I can tell you that, as an academic, even a short list of Society members who received tenure each year would go a long way to providing comfort that success is possible. It would be even more encouraging if we could generate nuts-and-bolts discussion of challenges faced, and the methods by which they were overcome.

B) We can provide a network of support. One benefit of the narrow approach is that it makes it clear who your colleagues are. But how do we identify and gain support from our colleagues? It can be difficult even to find someone who appreciates our broad interests, nevertheless someone who can aid in cultivating them. A regular newsletter column could go a long way to alleviating this problem… no, not like the boring stuff you are reading right now… a column with useful information in it. I propose that our newsletter offers an ideal place for early career psychologists to get feedback on ideas that they are developing. If you are an early career psychologist who would like to test-drive those cross-disciplinary ideas, and receive feedback from people who take interdisciplinary matters seriously, please let me know. If I get enough interest, I will try to create an online forum to accompany the newsletter section.

In summary: This taskforce’s overarching goal is to support people in pursuing interdisciplinary issues early in their careers, or at least to do what we can to keep those interests alive and well. For now, our activities are limited, but we will be trying to expand our efforts in the near future. We are sponsoring two activities at APA in DC, a social get-together and a workshop on resumes and academic application material (see separate announcement). If you are attending the convention, we hope to see you there!

My final thought is this: This taskforce will be best served by the selfish actions of our members. If you are an early career psychologist who feels that our resources could be bent to your benefit, tell us how. We will do our best to make it happen, or to help you make it happen, for the direct benefit of yourself (and anyone else who is interested). After all, that is what this task force is for. If you have read this far, many thanks!

P.S. If you are so thoughtful as to share this column with your colleagues, do not neglect to mention that they can join the Society for General Psychology, and thereby receive our newsletter and our journal, for only $25 per year! The annual membership in APA, while encouraged, is optional.
A Sacred Application of Psychology

By Cloyd Layden Colby, Ph.D.
Chaplain, US Army

Chaplain Colby was commissioned as an Army Chaplain in 1995 and is endorsed by the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter-day Saints. He holds a Ph.D. in Counseling Psychology from Brigham Young University (2000).

It’s 4:45 on a Monday morning and I walk from my high-rise apartment to Camp Red Cloud, located about 45 kilometers from North Korea’s border. In a few minutes, I will enter a command post surrounded by my senior commanders and fellow-staffers. They will count on me to do my share of staff work but also to listen, empathize, encourage, and even offer an occasional word of wisdom as we conduct a peninsula-wide exercise of the South Korean-U.S. coalition. A flake of late winter snow brushes my face and the darkness intensifies the wet cold. I shiver and find myself thinking back to what brought me to this point in my life.

About ten years ago, I attended an advanced Army Chaplain course. About a week in, when the course requirements started piling up, a fellow chaplain leaned over the desk and wondered aloud, “So, you have nearly twenty years in the Army plus a Ph.D. which means you could be setting up a practice somewhere or maybe teaching at a college where your kids could get free tuition. Why do you keep dealing with the Army?” The directness of that comment got my attention. I had never seriously considered using my psychology training for anything but the military ministry. I felt that bringing God to American men and women in uniform—and them to God—was a perfect match for who I am. I wanted to be as rigorously prepared as possible, both in the sacred and the secular. But I understand what prompted his comments; I had sacrificed as a chaplain—frequent separations from family, lots of 70 hour work weeks, a 15-month deployment to a combat zone, occasional policy decisions that could rankle me, and so on. However, they did not seem so much like sacrifices but simply things that come with the calling. As much as I enjoyed my alma mater, whose motto is “Enter to Learn, Go Forth to Serve”, I could hardly wait to get out and serve!

To be sure, as a new chaplain, I chafed at the thought of not using my newly acquired research and testing skills more directly, but the relational skills that my doctorate prepared me with became vital. Every day there was some way I could apply the basic therapeutic skills that most psychologists take for granted. A typical week for a new Army chaplain consists of physical training with soldiers, providing a listening ear just by walking around the workplace, providing counseling to soldiers and their family members, advising commanders on religious impact of their decisions, delivering emergency Red Cross notifications, conducting premarital and marriage workshops, leading bible studies, conducting worship and giving sermons. And these duties fall into just one of the three dimensions of the Army Chaplaincy, “Nurture the Living”. The other two are “Care for the Wounded” and “Honor the Dead”.

My experience in a recent deployment to Iraq serves to illustrate these other two dimensions. As the senior chaplain for my brigade combat team, I supervised ten chaplains and their assistants situated on two operating bases in New Baghdad. We prayed for patrols as they went on missions, joined those patrols when we needed to circulate through our operating areas, and provided pastoral care and counseling when soldiers returned to their operating bases. Almost daily, those bases would come under rocket
attack. During one particularly effective attack, the chaplain who covered the troop medical clinic had the initial responsibility to provide casualty ministry care to the wounded and the dying. The look in his eyes and the weariness of his face are things I will never forget. He witnessed the carnage first-hand as he accompanied the squad of soldiers sent to retrieve the remains. In addition, he checked on each of his assigned medical providers to offer assistance in dealing with their human response to human tragedy. In counseling with this particular chaplain, I could relate with him emotionally as I had experienced the tragedy with him, but could assess his status objectively due to the training I had as a psychologist. Later, as we extended military honors to those who had died, I stood beside a soldier whose best friend was among the fallen. I became aware that I was grieving with her, in silence, yet communicating support and compassion.

In my current assignment as the Deputy Division Chaplain for the 2nd Infantry Division, I still find time to offer those personal moments of ministry, but with additional administrative leadership requirements. To support the Army Campaign Plan (2006), the Chief of Chaplains created the Army Chaplaincy Strategic Plan. My part is to align our 2nd Infantry Division Religious Support Campaign Plan with the Chief of Chaplain’s Strategic Plan. Some of the objectives of our plan are: 1) Bring God to soldiers and soldiers to God while advising the Command on matters of religion and 2) Equip and empower the 2nd Infantry Division soldiers and families for lifelong service. I apply psychological skills of testing, measurement, organizational leadership, and group process to affect these objectives and to measure their impact. I did not realize it while in graduate school, but the preparation there outfitted me for the necessary knowledge, skills, and attitudes for military ministry at this senior level. Along the way, my continued contact with APA has kept me current and relevant.

Moving from the dark, snowy Korean morning into the bright lights of the bunker, I realize that I bring all of my knowledge, skills, and attitudes with me, and stand ready to serve wherever assigned. I am grateful for these tools—and my faith—that enable me to serve in a time of significant military necessity.
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Rolland S. Parker, PhD, passed away on September 9, 2010, at age 81, due to cancer.

A fellow of APA and Division One, Parker was a noted New York neuropsychologist, founding President of the New York Academy of Traumatic Brain Injury, Adjunct Professor of Clinical Neurology at the NYU School of Medicine, scholar, author of many professional books and articles, photographer and music lover.

Rolland Parker completed his undergraduate and doctoral training at New York University (1948, 1959). He trained with David Wechsler, Hans Teuber, and Zygmund Piotrowski, and retained their influence throughout his career.

Dr. Parker's early career was as a clinical psychologist, and he wrote several books in psychology (Emotional Common Sense, two editions), before embarking on his career in neuropsychology. In 1988, he began publishing in neuropsychology, and in 1990 he published his first book on traumatic brain injury. Around this time, Dr. Parker began giving educational seminars on traumatic brain injury for both health care professional (doctors and psychologists) as well as attorneys. In these venues he built a practice in forensic neuropsychology. His book Traumatic brain injury and neuropsychological impairment (1990) gave him some prominence in neuropsychology, as did his many articles (over 30) over the next 20 years. His next book, Concussive Brain Trauma (2001) further established him in the field of traumatic brain injury.

Dr. Parker’s seminars to educate professionals evolved over the years from 1990 to 1996, leading to creation of the New York Academy of Traumatic Brain Injury, which became an official educational institution in New York City. A number of successful annual conferences followed from 1996 to 2008. In 2007, one of these was the first conference on brain injuries of war (Polytraumatic wounds of war and terrorism), featuring several presenters from the Department of Defense and Walter Reed Hospital, and more than 100 participants. Taking into account the professionals who attended these conferences, seminars, and lectures, and the patients they served, it is likely that thousands of lives received more expert care because of Dr. Parker’s efforts.

Dr. Parker had some overriding themes that set him apart from many of his colleagues. These included the importance of evaluating other bodily systems of the injured patient, conducting a wide ranging evaluation especially including the psychodynamic, stress and other factors, and the sense of the patient being wounded, defective, and a loss of their sense of self. A video of his work can be viewed at http://health.scribemedia.org/2007/02/27/traumatic-brain-injury/

For many, Dr. Parker was a beloved man of rare generosity. He often evaluated and treated low-income patients, whose insurance would pay little or no fee, then forgave them if his fees went unpaid. In another case, on April 6, 2010, he literally checked himself out of his hospital room to deliver on time his 10 am lecture on “student disabilities” at Fordham University. The month of his death, he carefully arranged the donation of his extensive library of costly reference books to Psi Chi, for use by a nonprofit clinic.

Through his publications, educational endeavors and personal generosity, Rolland Parker gave a great deal to life, and many of us will miss his contributions. His work improved the lives of many people, directly and indirectly. He is survived by his wife Irmgard.

** Note: James Lawrence Thomas, PhD is a clinical neuropsychologist and friend of Rolland Parker, www.thebrainclinic.com. Address any comments to him at: nurosvcs@aol.com
Tired of 9 Million hits that don’t answer your Practice question? Try PsycLINK instead!

Clinicians now have an interactive, online forum where they can find, share and discuss resources and useful web sites like practice management tools, anxiety, dementia, postpartum depression, and other topics relevant to their practices. Part social networking site, part community bulletin board, PsycLINK is a wiki platform “by psychologists, for psychologists.” Psychologists can also use PsycLINK to pose questions, get answers to their clinical issues, and receive e-mail updates when members add new content.

APA’s Presidential Task Force on Advancing Practice developed the new tool, and the Task Force believes PsycLINK will grow over time and increase in value as practitioners add to the content. We also see it evolving as a way for clinicians to easily get pertinent clinical and patient related references and information, interact with colleagues, and have discussions that one can participate in as desired. It is an online product, and while one can get notified of postings, it is not email intensive in the slightest.

As an APA member, you can benefit from this incredible resource by signing in to my.apa.org, click on PsycLINK. apa.org and create your profile. Sign up for e-mail updates, add materials and share resources, and comment on current materials. The more psychologists that sign up, the more the Wiki will grow and evolve into a premiere resource for practitioners, educators and researchers.

BIRTH ANNOUNCEMENT
Welcome to the newest member of D1 by proxy! Camille Grace Brelsford was born on January 31, 2011. She joined her big sister Elise in making our family complete.

Sincerely, Gina Brelsford (Editor, TGP)
Symposium organizer Joel Morgovsky is Professor of Psychology at Brookdale Community College in Lincroft, NJ where he has taught since 1971. His academic specialties are Social Psychology and Positive Psychology. Prof. Morgovsky is also an accomplished photographer whose home base is the Soho Photo Gallery in New York City. Joel is a frequent lecturer and judge at photographic societies throughout New Jersey, New York and Pennsylvania and is on the speaker's list of the New Jersey Federation of Camera Clubs. In 2007 he became Chair of the Committee on Psychology and Photography for Division One of the American Psychological Association. Among other accomplishments as Chairman, he organized and curated an exhibition titled “Psychologists in Focus: An Exhibition of Photographs by Psychologists,” which has been shown in four venues across the country. This symposium was the latest in a growing series of presentations at professional psychological conferences on the subject of PhotoPsychology.

PhotoPsychology is a field of research into the parallel developments and interactions between psychology and photography. Under the auspices of Division One of the American Psychological Association, the Committee on Psychology and Photography was inaugurated in 2007 and chaired by Prof. Joel Morgovsky from Brookdale College in New Jersey. As part of its mission, the Committee searches the published literature from both fields, then gathers, organizes, and shares the results. The earliest publication found dates to 1856, the year in which Dr. Hugh W. Diamond, director of the Surrey County Asylum in England, who was also a photography enthusiast, presented a paper before the Royal Society in London entitled “On the Application of Photography to the Physiognomic and Mental Phenomena of Insanity.” Since then, the relationship between photography and psychology continued intermittently, waxing and waning, yet rarely attracting widespread attention. A noteworthy exception to that rule is in the research and writings of Dr. Harry Beilin, a professor in the Developmental Psychology Program at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York during the 1970s and 80s.

While Harry Beilin was a cognitive developmental psychologist and one of the founding members of the Piaget Society, he was also a photographer. An avid amateur, he began studying photography in 1967 using black and white film in 35mm and printing his own pictures in his darkroom. He studied printing with the famed photographer, George Tice and was influenced visually by Josef Sudek, Robert Frank and André Kertész to name a few. Interestingly, in the mid 1970s, Dr. Beilin collaborated with a well-known colleague at the Graduate Center, Stanley Milgram, with whom he taught a course on the psychology of photography.

In addition to describing his research, the symposium included an exposition of Dr. Beilin’s own pictures organized into a narrated slide show by his wife of many years, Dr. Iris Fodor, Professor in the Department of Applied Psychology at New York University.
University. Dr. Fodor showed during her talk photographs taken of Dr. Jean Piaget and a selection of several pictures taken during Dr. Beilin’s days as a researcher in rural Minnesota, photos which he described as “found surrealism.” Also included with Dr. Fodor’s presentation was a short video in which Harry described his collaboration with Stanley Milgram.

The third panelist to expand on the theme of knowing Harry Beilin, the man, was Harry’s son, Dr. Ian Beilin, Librarian at New York University and Adjunct Assistant Professor at John Jay College of Criminal Justice, CUNY. Dr. Beilin, the junior, knows firsthand how his father chose his photographic subjects, how he was influenced by the famous photographers he knew and admired, what methods he employed to master darkroom work and his father’s interest in camera technologies. More than that, Ian shared with the audience how Harry encouraged both of his sons to become involved in photography especially in light of the elder Beilin’s research into how children pass through developmental stages of understanding and relating to photographs.

Harry Beilin was truly a pioneer in the interplay between psychology and photography. The time during which his scholarly inquiries took place was one during which photography’s status rose significantly as evidenced by its introduction into the curriculum at several universities. It was becoming a proper subject of intellectual analysis and Harry Beilin was ideally situated by temperament and profession to turn a scientifically oriented psychological eye to photography. This symposium was dedicated to bringing his substantial accomplishments to light once more and placing him rightfully into the new, emerging system known as PhotoPsychology.

**This article was submitted as a Symposium proposal for EPA Annual Meeting, 2011**
APA Council of Representatives Meeting

by Bonnie R. Strickland, University of Massachusetts

The Council of Representatives met in Washington, D.C. on February 17 to February 20, 2011.

The meeting began with a plenary session chaired by President Melba Vasquez. She welcomed the participants and invited those persons interested in being nominated for President-elect of the Association to say a few words on behalf of their candidacy. Those persons who hope to be nominated for President-elect are Don Bersoff, James Bray, Doug Haldeman, Robert McGrath and Steve Reisner. Melba also commented briefly on the litigation in which APA is involved. This will be discussed in Executive Session.

We received the Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Report of APA. As of December 31, 2010, APA’s total workforce was 548 employees. Ethnic minorities represented 44.89 percent, women represented 66.24 percent and ethnic minority females represented 31.02 percent of the total workforce. These numbers have remained quite stable across the last few years.

There was a brief discussion about the dues reduction proposal and its impact on the Canadian Psychological Association and the seating with vote of the four ethnic minority psychological associations. The draft Consent Agenda was also presented.

The business meeting convened on February 18. President Melba Vasquez recognized Past-president Carol Goodheart in appreciation of her past service. New member of Council introduced themselves. There was then a moment of silence for those members of APA who had passed away since our last meeting. We also noted the passing of three Council members, James K. Cole, Lynn P. Rehm and Barbara C. Wilson.

President Vasquez noted some of the accomplishments of the Association and discussed the role of Council and its position of leadership. She then shared her Presidential Initiatives and Projects and noted the Chairs and Members of three Task Forces. The first is the Task Force on Immigration. The second is a Task Force on Preventing Discrimination and Promoting Diversity. The third is the Presidential Task Force on Educational Disparities. There are also Telepsychology Projects and a Project on the effectiveness of psychotherapy.

Sandy Shullman was introduced as Parliamentarian.

CEO Norm Anderson gave an update on Strategic Planning for the Association. We have a Mission and Vision Statement and have published our Core Values and established our Strategic Goals. We are discussing Objectives and Strategic Initiatives. We have a Good Governance Project and a group to consider how we might best invest in APA’s Financial Future. We also have a Public Education Campaign underway.

Council passed a Consent Agenda covering items that required no discussion. These included the withdrawal of certain items and accepting practice guidelines in the area of parenting coordination; practice in healthcare delivery systems; psychological evaluations in child protection matters; assessment of and intervention with people with disabilities; evaluation of dementia and age-related cognitive change; and practice with lesbian, gay and bisexual clients.

Council passed a motion to include the inclusion of diplomate credentials in the APA Membership Directory based on criteria created by the Commission for the Recognition of Specialties and Proficiencies in Professional Psychology.

Council received the Report of the Presidential Task Force on Advancing Practice. Notable recommendations include the development of Psyclink: The Practice Wiki and PsychOUTCOMES: Measures for Practice, a data base. Council also received the Report of the 2010 Presidential Task Force on Caregivers which has established a data base covering various aspects of importance related to caregivers.

Considerable time was spent discussing the Good Governance Project which is the mechanism via which our Strategic Planning will progress in regard to governance. The Chair of the Project is Sandy Shullman and the Vice Chair is Ron Rozensky. Members of the Project Group represent a diverse and varied set of backgrounds and experience. In small groups, Council members gave input for the deliberations of the group.

Council received information about APA’s products and the marketing enablement of these products.

The Council adopted as APA policy a Resolution on Affirming Psychologists’ Role in Addressing Global Climate Change.

Council approved the Report of the 2010 Presidential Task Force on Caregiving. The work of the Task Force included the creation of a Web-based resources “briefcase” for psychologists and members of the public on caregiver issues. Council approved as APA policy the Principles for Quality Undergraduate Education in Psychology. These principles replace an earlier version and are an outgrowth of the 2008 APA National Conference on Undergraduate Education in Psychology. The guidelines articulate a set of learning goals and outcomes that should be attained by all psychology ma-
Council received the Report of the BEA Task Force on Classroom Violence Directed against K-12 Teachers and approved a new Division 43 journal, The Family Psychologist.

The Treasurer, Bonnie Markham, and our Chief Financial Officer, Archie Turner, presented information about APA’s financial picture. The equity in our real estate holdings is valued at $72M. Our long-term investment portfolio is valued at $67M. The annualized return for 2010 was 17.2% and the average return since 1988 is 11.5%. The 2010 budget had revenues of $106,567,900 and expenses of $99,908,200 with an operating margin of $6,659,200. The 2011 proposed budget is a balanced budget with revenues of $106,877,300, expenses of $106,857,300 and an operating margin of $20,000. The budget was approved. An investment in the APA Plan authorizing management to utilize the designation vehicle or other vehicle(s) as may be deemed appropriate to begin implementation of the Plan in 2011.

Council received the report of the Working Group on Diversity Training. The cost of the training for Council and Board and Committee members is $10,000.

In one of the most important agenda items, Council discussed a dues reduction. To promote equity in costs across various APA groups and to retain members (those who leave APA often cite high dues as their reason for leaving), Council approved a $40 decrease in the APA base membership member dues rate ($287 to $247) for 2012-2014. An evaluation of dues revenues and membership retention rates will be conducted prior to Council’s consideration of the dues rates for 2015. Council rescinded previous actions regarding special discounts to various groups. The cost of this action is estimated to be $450,000 to $700,000. Council voted to change the Life Status/Exempt Category by raising the criteria to 69 years and 29 years of membership. A $25 administrative fee will be charged for those who do not choose to receive publications. Considerable discussion was devoted to a consideration of the Canadian Psychological Association members who now have a 50% reduction in dues and whether this provision should be rescinded. It was decided to postpone action on this item until the August meeting.

Council members were engaged in diversity training around issues related to immigration, immigrants and intercultural effectiveness.

Council voted to add a one new member to the Committee on Early Career Psychologists.

Council approved a motion to forward summaries of information concerning APA work or issues from CR members elected by a State, Provincial, Territorial Association to all APA members residing within the state they represent. This will be evaluated at the end of the year to determine the impact on APA staff.

A motion to seat the four ethnic minority Associations on Council was postponed until the August meeting of Council.

Council heard a report from the Practice Directorate on the characteristics of a 501(C3) organization and a 501(C6) organization. APA is a C6 organization that advocates for practitioners. Each has certain tax implications. Council heard of many activities sponsored by the APA Practice Organization. APA Executive Director for Professional Practice Katherine C. Nordal, PhD, shares with members her recent annual report to the APA Council of Representatives on the APA Practice Organization — highlighting many of the ways the organization serves its practitioner members through legislative, legal/regulatory and marketplace advocacy initiatives.

In Executive Session, Council received the Treasurer’s Annual Compensation Report.

Council approved the establishment of a Joint APA/ASPPB/ APAIT (APA; Association of State, Provincial Psychology Boards; APA Insurance Trust) Task Force on the Development of Telepsychological Guidelines for Psychologists.

David Baker presented information about the Center for the History of Psychology. Council reauthorized the continued support of the Center in the amount of $60,000.

President Vasquez presented several Presidential Citations. Recipients were Susan Whitbourne, William Strickland, William Hill, Terry Gock, Helen Coons and Linda Campbell.

Respectfully submitted.

Bonnie R. Strickland, Ph.D., ABPP
Council Representative, Division 1
Ad Hoc Committees of the Society for General Psychology

Division One has several committees to examine issues that (a) impact psychology across specialties, (b) are relatively overlooked, or (c) may engage our younger colleagues or students. These committees are listed below.

The charge of each committee chair is to define the committee’s mission, appoint a few Division One members to serve on it, including one early career psychologist (ECP), and to provide a report on its activities to The General Psychologist. In addition, it is hoped that some of the activities of these committees will turn into sessions at the APA convention. Members who would like to join a committee should contact the chair of the committee. Members who would like to chair or simply suggest a new committee topic should contact the current President of the division or the President-Elect.

1. Early Career Psychologists - Chair: Eric P. Charles
   Mission: Work with APAGS and others to recruit and engage students and ECPs in general psychology.

2. Coping with Technology - Chair: Richard S. Velayo
   Mission: Examine the negative impacts of email and changing technology on the field of psychology (teaching, science, practice) and practical means of coping with technostress.

3. National Speakers Network - Chair: Harold Takooshian
   Mission: Use CODAPAR funds to identify convenient speakers for local student and community groups, by developing (in cooperation with Divisions 2, 21, & 52, Psi Chi, Psi Beta, TOPSS) a web-based zip code list of willing Division One fellows, with their contact information and preferred topics. The division has applied for a second grant to continue this work.

4. IRB/Scientific Integrity - Chair: Richard O’Brien
   Mission: Probe the impact of IRBs on science, scientists, and society, as well as academic freedom, junk science, and other trends threatening the integrity of the scientific enterprise.

5. Advisory Committee - Co-chairs: Bonnie Strickland, Harold Takooshian
   Mission: Insure continuity within Division One, using a panel of past officers/presidents to help guide Division One procedures.

6. Publications - Chair: Bob Johnson
   Mission: Oversee effective communication within the Society, coordinating TGP, RGP, book series, Website, listserv, and possible member surveys.

7. Evolutionary Psychology - Chair: (open)
   Mission: Develop and give a home to this interdisciplinary specialty.

8. Photography and Psychology - Chair: Joel Morgovsky
   Mission: Seek out the many members of APA who are deeply involved with photography; become a networking hub and community of psychologist/photographers.

9. Science and Practice - Chair: Mark Koltko-Rivera
   Mark is developing an exciting research program that requires cooperation across much of psychology.

10. Outreach - Chair: Rivka Bertisch Meir

11. Fellows - Chair: Florence Denmark

12. Membership - Chair: Brian H. Stagner
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To become a member or affiliate of Division One, The Society for General Psychology, please fill out the form below and send it, along with the appropriate fees, to Division Services, American Psychological Association, 750 First Street, NE, Washington DC 20002.
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_____ APA Dues-Exempt Member (also known as Life-Status Member): Division One membership is free. To receive the Review of General Psychology, please submit $16.50.

_____ Student Affiliate of APA: Membership is $7.50. To receive Review of General Psychology, submit an additional $16.50, for a total of $24.

_____ Other Student: Membership is $7.50. To receive Review of General Psychology, submit an additional $16.50, for a total of $24.
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