Each April issue of the Division 3 newsletter carries an autobiographical sketch of the president-elect and, when our very capable Editor, Emily Klein, issued the invitation, one of my first thoughts was, “Hmm, just how much of my very unlikely “presidential-elect” past do I dare divulge?” Granddaughter of German immigrants? (I’m told my Grandfather was a braumeister in Germany.) A Mom who, when she needed to know my precise whereabouts in the house, affectionately called out, as her own mother did, “Wo bist du?” Childhood in a primarily working-class community in Pittsburgh? Twelve years of education in a Catholic parish school taught by Franciscan nuns (which included two years of Latin, not so much to prepare us for the verbal SAT but to enable us to sing Mass in Latin)? Etc.

Bruce’s door always open to us, but also he often attended more to our careers than we did ourselves: Bruce nominated us for anything and everything that would enhance our CVs; he suggested joining committees and boards germane to each of our particular interests; he kept us informed of every opportunity that we might find useful or interesting; and, of course, he wrote letter after letter in support of our goals and ambitions…and he has continued to do so, steadfastly, for the last thirty years. I owe all these mentors, Bruce in particular, my profound thanks.

Others, too, have had a large influence on my research career. After I finished my dissertation research, I spent two years in Sara Shettleworth’s lab at University of Toronto. Under Sara’s direction, I began to see how an animal’s ecological niche might shape—or constrain, as we called it then—it’s ability to learn. Continuing my peripatetic existence (my father used to quip that I was in “Grade Twenty-Something”), I joined the Animal Behaviour Research Group (ABRG) at Oxford University, where as a post-doc I had the great good fortune, not only to interact with folks like Richard Dawkins and John Krebs, but also to work alongside those who would become the next generation of behavioral ecologists. At the time, I very much wanted to become a field researcher, and in the spirit of hands-on-learning, I volunteered for every opportunity to help other ABRG post docs and grad students: I marked hedgehogs, caught swans, herded deer and recorded the successful predatory attacks of a sparrowhawk in Wytham Woods (from a blind, no less, perched on a climbable scaffold some 35 feet up a tree). However, for one reason or another, field research was not in my cards, at least not then. Instead, while still in the ABRG, I started some lab research with blue gourami fish, which I continued after settling down at Mount Holyoke College. More recently, after a sabbatical in an entomology lab at the National...
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Institute of Biology in Slovenia, I’ve been exploring the role of learning in antlions’ predatory behavior. Almost certainly you have seen these amazing insects, or at least their prey-traps: They dig conical pits in sandy soil by spiraling backwards, and then wait, sometimes for months, for prey to stumble inside. And, even more amazing, antlions learn.

Until last year, all of my research has been conducted in a lab. However, when Division 3 Secretary/Treasurer Veronica Dark emailed to say that I was to be the next president-elect, I was conducting field research (finally!) on ant behavior in Spain, at Reserva Científica de Doñana, a beautiful Spanish wildlife sanctuary reserved for field researchers. My new collaborator, French researcher Elise Nowbahari (Université Paris 13), and I have begun to look at the role of learning in the predator-prey relationship between my subject species, larval antlions, the predator, and her research subjects, sand-dwelling ants, the prey, which, we discovered, rescue their nestmates — and only nestmates — from antlion pits. Returning to the theme with which I opened this sketch, namely my unlikely background, this new direction in my research career is not the kind of experimental psychology that I studied in graduate school. Nonetheless, “unlikely candidate” though I may be, I am honored to have been elected as the next president of our division, and I look forward to representing, to advancing, all of our experimental research interests — human and non-human animal alike — in APA.

Grad Corner: Women in Academia
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Last year at the Psychonomic Society annual meeting a presentation of the history of the Psychonomic Society was given in honor of the 50th annual meeting. The speakers all highlighted the good ol’ boys club attitude of early meetings of the society noting that an early letter between meeting attendees went so far as to proclaim, “no women, smoking allowed.” My modern day self found this adage rather amusing and I snickered imagining that the founding members of the society would likely be none too pleased to find me, a woman, sitting at their meeting that day. Sometimes as a liberated woman born well after the women’s suffrage and even the bra burning days of the second-wave feminist movement, we (or maybe just I) spend little time thinking about gender inequalities that might still impact my academic success. Raised in an environment which taught that “if you work hard and produce high-quality results, gender doesn’t make a lick of difference,” I spent my undergraduate years blissfully unaware that my sex had any bearing on my academic future. Consequently, I was completely blind-sided in May of my senior year when one of the female members of the faculty pulled me aside to congratulate me on my graduate school acceptance and let me know that although we didn’t know each other well, if I ever needed to talk to a woman about my academic future, she would be happy to hear from me. At the time, while certainly very grateful for this generous offer, I found it somewhat peculiar. However, as my graduate school career begins to wane and I look forward to future job opportunities, I am nothing but appreciative of this gesture.

A quick look around my own department paints a reasonably accurate picture of the current state of affairs for women academics. While 55% of the PhD students in my department are female, women make up only 17% of
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the faculty. According to the Council of Graduate Schools, in 2010 women comprised 60% of the national graduate school population and 2009 was the first year that women graduate students were granted the majority of doctorates (50.4%). However, the National Academy of Sciences reports that in 2006, only 15% of full professors were women. Clearly there is a disparity. But why?

As anyone who knows me will attest, I’m an advocate of personal responsibility, so perhaps it’s unsurprising that I found Esther Rothblum’s 1988 article “Leaving the ivory tower: Factors contributing to women’s voluntary resignation from academia” fascinating. Although not a recent synthesis of the information (though more recent surveys have produced similar findings, e.g., Honeyman & Summers, 1994), Rothblum reports that while departmental termination rates were equal among men and women, women were significantly more likely to voluntarily depart from academia. Reasons for voluntary attrition included: 1. Barriers to productivity (unsupportive environment/colleagues, high student contact, etc). 2. Heavy teaching demands (particularly undergraduate service courses). 3. Stress, anxiety, perceived lack of control and information. 4. Family concerns. So as a woman, once you’ve decided that an academic career path is for you, it seems that you yourself might be one of your greatest obstacles. So what’s a girl to do?

In 2003, Denise Park and Susan Nolen-Hoeksema wrote a wonderful chapter which we consider to be a sort of guidebook for women in academia. They propose that the single most defining hindrance for the success of a woman in academia is overcommitment. Overcommitment results in less productivity, more stress, and less respect in your department. According to this chapter, in the early stages of your career it is essential to be seen as productive, smart, and a contributor to the intellectual life of the department through your fair-share of departmental work. A series of recommendations are provided for success, the highlights of which we outline here.

First, don’t self-deprecate. Stop it right now. Women in society are often valued for their modesty and humility; however, as a faculty member it is essential that you give the impression of confidence and competence. This can be achieved in a number of ways. Don’t talk to excess about your private life and particularly your stress level, you will be stressed, but work is not the forum for discussing it. Dress well, although unfair as it may seem, this is less important for your male colleagues. Park and Nolen-Hoeksema advise women to dress above the norm in the department which will help project competence. Finally, give strong presentations both in the department and at national conferences.

Second, women are typically seen as compassionate and cooperative. While certainly admirable qualities, there is a downside as well. Specifically, Park and Nolen-Hoeksema point out that if you are seen as extremely compassionate and cooperative it is likely that students and even colleagues will seek you out to talk about their problems and it is easy to get exploited (chair committees, write reports, head social events). While satisfaction is to be had in these roles, Park and Nolen-Hoeksema remind us that “you will get respect if you get your work done” so figure out what matters in your department and make that your first priority. It’s alright to pick and choose what you commit to and failing to do so can be destructive to your relationships, general happiness, and academic success.

Finally, family considerations often weigh heavily on aspiring women academics. While men have families too, it is still true that women bear children, do most of the child rearing, and are more likely than men to have partners in specialized professional fields. Park and Nolen-Hoeksema do caution, however, that child-responsibility is one area where gender-perception is obviously biased. For example, it is often considerably more acceptable for a man to leave a meeting to pick up the kids than for a woman. In this situation, men get a “gold star” and are seen as “such good fathers” while it reminds colleagues of women’s “overwhelming responsibilities” when raising children. So, it’s alright to be vague when scheduling your time. If a meeting time doesn’t work for you, it is okay to say so and not elaborate. One additional consideration when having children is stopping the tenure clock. While Park and Nolen-Hoeksema don’t advise you not to stop the tenure clock, they do note that while it is unfair and often illegal, some reviewers (particularly outside of your department) see a stopped time clock as still ticking and expect productivity. Therefore, it is important to plan and be strategic. Try to have reliable students to continue data collection and manuscripts that are ready for submission so that your research program doesn’t halt in its tracks.

While we can see how these statistics and recommendations might seem daunting or somewhat depressing, we prefer to think of them as opportunities. Quaint as it seems, there is likely some truth to the old saying, “knowledge is power.” Understanding the situation empowers you to be able to handle
Grad Corner: Women in Academia

continued from p. 3

women are equally as likely as men to have their grants funded, be nominated for honors and awards, and receive offers for positions at other institutions. So work hard and make it happen.

conflicts and stressors deliberately, tactically, and effectively. Plus, while women may be underrepresented in the higher echelons of academia now, in some sense this offers an opportunity. According to the National Academies,

In August 2009, the APA Council of Representatives approved a set of goals for the first strategic plan in APA’s history. The three overarching goals that will guide the association’s activities over the next several years are:

1. Maximize APA’s organizational effectiveness.
2. Expand psychology’s role in advancing health.
3. Increase recognition of psychology as a science.

Although involved in working toward all three goals, the Science Directorate allocates the greatest proportion of its efforts (not surprisingly) toward the science-oriented third goal. Within each goal, the strategic plan also spells out a set of objectives. The objectives for goal (3) are:

a. Enhance psychology’s prominence as a core STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics) discipline.
b. Improve public understanding of the scientific basis for psychology.
c. Expand the translation of psychological science to evidence-based practice.
d. Promote the applications of psychological science to daily living.
e. Expand educational resources and opportunities in psychological science.

(See the APA Monitor for the objectives falling under the other two goals.)

So what progress have we made toward accomplishing goal (3) and its objectives?

Much activity over the last year has been devoted to objective (a). A Presidential Task Force on the Future of Psychology as a STEM Discipline issued a report in August 2010 that examined why psychological science is inconsistently included within initiatives to enhance STEM research and education and offered ideas for how the field could achieve consistent inclusion. As reported previously, this report has received a good deal of attention from psychologists, educators, and policymakers.

The 2010 APA Science Leadership Conference was designed by the Science Directorate and Board of Scientific Affairs to follow up on the task force report. The aim of the conference was to develop specific activities that APA and other organizations and individuals could undertake to increase recognition and support of psychology as a core STEM discipline. Among the more than 100 participants at the conference were representatives of almost every APA division and of each major APA governance group concerned with science and education, along with representatives of other be-
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Working in break-out groups, the participants produced a large number of ideas that were subsequently organized into a set of more than 50 distinct proposals. These proposals include recommendations for improving public understanding of psychological science, enhancing advocacy at the federal and local levels, and strengthening and expanding psychology education from elementary school through graduate training. APA governance groups and headquarters staff are now studying these proposals and deciding which ones will have priority for implementation over the next few years. Other groups – divisions, scientific societies, departments, labs – and individuals are invited to adopt some of these proposals as their own and act on them as well. Feel free to contact me if you would like to discuss what you or your group can do to help implement these proposals.

Regarding objective (b), one way to improve public understanding of psychological science would be through a broad public education campaign. The participants in the Science Leadership Conference offered ideas for the content and format of such a campaign.

In fact, APA has experience with public education campaigns. Since 1996, it has sponsored a successful campaign aimed at increasing the public’s understanding of psychological services, stress management, and the relations between physical and mental health. In 2010, the Council of Representatives voted to expand this campaign to encompass other goals of the APA strategic plan – including enhancing the public’s understanding of psychology as a science. APA staff from the Science Directorate and other offices are currently engaged in planning this expanded campaign and will share an initial outline of the campaign with governance groups this spring.

Turning to (c) – expanding the translation of psychological science to evidence-based practice – APA has embarked on a significant new initiative. For the first time, APA will develop and disseminate evidence-based clinical treatment guidelines for psychological practitioners. A steering committee, composed of nine leading clinical researchers, was appointed in September 2010 to oversee this initiative. The steering committee has begun to work out procedures for selecting disorders for guideline development and for conducting systematic reviews of the scientific literature on treatments. The committee receives feedback from several governance groups, including the Board of Scientific Affairs, and is supported by staff from both the Science and Practice Directorates. Reports on the steering committee’s progress will be released in the coming months.

Not as much concrete work has been carried out yet for objectives (d) and (e), although ideas for how to address them are circulating among governance members and staff. Of particular note, the Science Leadership Conference generated proposals for (e) – expanding resources and opportunities for education – that are being considered and elaborated by a variety of groups. Stay tuned for further developments in these areas.

You can keep up with what the Science Directorate and other parts of APA are doing in pursuit of the science-related objectives of APA’s strategic plan by checking Psychological Science Agenda each month. As always, I invite you to contact me to share any questions and comments (email: hkurtzman@apa.org, phone: 202-336-6000).

The Top Ten Lies Told by Graduate Students
(taken from the Harvard Crimson)

10. It doesn't bother me at all that my college roommate is making $80,000 a year on Wall Street.
9. I'd be delighted to proofread your book/chapter/article.
8. My work has a lot of practical importance.
7. I would never date an undergraduate.
6. Your latest article was so inspiring.
5. I turned down a lot of great job offers to come here.
4. I just have one more book to read and then I'll start writing.
3. The department is giving me so much support.
1. No really, I'll be out of here in only two more years.

From http://users.erols.com/geary/psychology/
The 2011 Winter Meeting of the APA Council of Representatives took place February 17-20 in Washington, DC. The major item of business relevant to members of Division 3 was a motion to restructure the dues. At the last meeting of Council in August of 2010, Council voted to replace the 25% dues discount that was provided to members of APA who belonged to other science-oriented organizations such as the Association of Psychological Science, the Psychonomic Society, and the Society for Neuroscience with a flat $25 discount. Members of state psychological associations felt that they too should receive a discount and at the present meeting it was proposed that all members should receive a $40 discount, irrespective of the other organizations to which they belonged. It was also proposed that members of the Canadian Psychological Association, who by agreement with that organization, had received a 50% discount for many years, would now receive only the same $40 discount as all other members.

Both the Canadians and scientists argued that the change would mean there would be no increase in dues (over $100 for the Canadians and over $30 for scientists), whereas it would mean a net decrease in dues of $40 for everyone else. The practitioner members of Council apparently felt sorry for the Canadians and voted to delay the vote on rescinding the 50% discount for them until the August meeting.

After the vote to separate the increase in dues for the Canadians from the original motion, Kurt Salzinger, Council Representative from Division 25, Behavior Analysis, proposed a substitute motion to give everyone a 25% discount. Such a discount would “level the playing field” without incurring an increase in dues for the scientists. We were told by the APA staff that a 25% discount would mean an additional loss in revenue of over $1 million, however, earlier in the day we were told that the APA budget for 2011 was $106 million so that loss would represent only about 1% of the budget. The reason for that is that dues represent a very small percentage of the APA budget. More than 50% of the income that APA receives comes from licensure of journal subscriptions, books, and databases. It was pointed out to Council that virtually all of that income comes from products originating from research produced by scientists with no compensation from APA.

A further argument in favor of the 25% discount for everyone, proposed in the substitute motion, was the fact that although the $40 across the board discount that would be given to everyone would be perceived as a $40 discount by practicing clinicians, it would be perceived as a $32 increase in dues by the scientist members of APA. And it was the fear of the representatives from the science divisions that this increase might result in some members of the science divisions choosing to drop their membership.

The final vote in favor of the original motion (to reduce dues from $287 to $247 for everyone) was 93 in favor and 64 against. I viewed the fact that there were 64 votes against the proposal as a minor victory because it meant that a number of nonscientist council representatives had voted against the motion.

A second important item that came before Council, but only indirectly, had to do with a relatively new organization that had been established by APA, APAPO (APA Practice Organization). APA is a 501 (c3) organization that to stay within the tax code as a nonprofit organization, has greatly limited
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lobbying ability. APAPO was established several years ago as a 501(c6) which allows it greater lobbying latitude. Practice members of APA are assessed dues to support APAPO, however, several members of APA have brought a suit against APA because of the required assessment, citing federal antitrust legislation. As this is an ongoing case we were given very little information about the suit or its progress but we were told that APA had spent considerable time and staff defending the Association.

Respectfully submitted,
Tom Zentall
Division 3 Council Representative

Randy Engle, our second representative, was ill and could not attend the meeting.
tions or comments (or wants to write a column), I would love to hear from them.

As was done in the spring, following distribution of the newsletter, email addresses for members were updated to the best of my ability. Any emails that bounced were investigated via google and new (updated) email addresses were substituted when possible.

The spring 2011 issue of the newsletter is expected to be published in early April 2011.

III. Old Business

A. the Division 3 Program

The main agenda item was the APA program for August 2011. Discussion had already begun electronically when an email from President Jeremy Wolfe noted that there had been almost NO RESPONSE from the membership to his proposals in the October Newsletter that we scrap the usual program at APA and that we fundamentally alter the nature of Division 3 to emphasize its role as a political lobbying tool for its members rather than its role as a scientific meeting. The newsletter comments came out of EB discussion at the August 2010 meeting. In the recent email to the EB, President Wolfe concluded that we should plan a standard meeting. That conclusion initiated a lively email discussion continued in person at this meeting.

Among many points made/issues raised were:

- Attendance is generally down at APA, so it might not just be us.

- There may be unintended consequences of withdrawing from the convention.

- What are we going to do with our New Investigator Award winners?
  - Perhaps they should be the program?
  - No, too specialized. Could they be tuned into TED-type talks?

- There was much discussion of making Division 3 more visible on the web.
  - The FABBS Science Cafes and YouTube videos of critical science experiments were offered as examples.
  - APS is doing something like this. APA has the resources, perhaps they will help us.

- What is the long-term goal that we wish to accomplish by withdrawing from the convention.
  - Stop wasting our time and effort only to be embarrassed by a great talk to 10 people.

- What will the EB do at the Convention? Will we meet?
  - We will attend and we will offer to help the Science Directorate if there is some way that we can be of use to them.

- Does the Science Directorate already believe that Div 3 is extinct since we withdrew the name change recommended last year?

- Should we move the poster presentation to Psychonomics for more visibility?
Minutes of Executive Committee Meeting

Perhaps we should just have a scaled back regular program in 2011: a program light?

After much discussion, a motion was made to scrap the program for August 2011.
Motion passed with a close vote.

President Wolfe will inform the Science Directorate that Division 3 will not have a program but that members of the Division 3 Executive Board are available to help the Science Directorate if they would like the help.

The Division 3 “program” will be an executive board meeting, a business meeting, and a poster session with student awards (because the poster call has already gone out). The possibility of a Social Hour with Division 6 was left open.

IV. New Business
A. Timing of committee appointments
President Elect Karen Hollis noted that Division 3 bylaws are ambiguous about timing of committee appointments. The current procedure is that people are not appointed by the President Elect until later in the term and that they then act as committee chair two years later when the current President Elect is Past President. A motion was made to change the procedure so that the President Elect appoints members early in his/her term and that the appointed person serve as the chair when the President Elect becomes President. Motion passed.

B. EB position on proposed amendment to APA bylaws
Dark asked the EB to take a position on the proposed APA bylaws change on how council seats are apportioned. The change puts State coalitions on par with Divisions, giving each a seat regardless of apportionment votes. This could result in fewer seats for the Science Divisions. The EB took a position against the amendment; this will be conveyed to the membership in the email from the Secretary-Treasurer.

C. Division Services request
There was no time for discussion of an email circulated by Division Services on Ten Reasons to Join a Division. Members should send comments to the Division office by December 1.

The meeting adjourned at 7:55 am.

Respectfully submitted,
Veronica J. Dark
Secretary-Treasurer, Division 3

From http://www.all-about-psychology.com/psychology-jokes.html
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Submissions Welcome!
The Editor encourages submission of any announcements, and/or letters to the editors, regarding psychological science. Comments on the content and presentation of the newsletter are also appreciated. Submit to:
edklei0@gsu.edu

Division 3 Email Listserv Access

Subscribe to the Division 3 Listserv to keep informed about Division 3 & issues regarding psychological science. This is a monitored network to keep the number of emails down.

Subscribe: Send an email to listserv@lists.apa.org. Leave the subject line blank and type “subscribe div3” in the body of the message.

Send a Message (once subscribed): div3@lists.apa.org

Questions: Send email to Anne.Cleary@colostate.edu