This column is my swan song as President. The reins of the Division now move to the most capable hands of Danny Wedding. Danny is one of the stars of APA leadership and I am thrilled that he will lead our fine Division in 2009.

One accomplishment for 2008 has been the development of a revised name for the Division that better reflects our evolving mission and interests and the dramatic changes in our field. The proposed revised name is “Society for Internet and Media Psychology (Division 46 of APA).” It adds “Internet” to our current title and establishes the Division as a Society as well as Division. This revised title has been approved by the Division’s Board of Directors at it’s February 2008 Meeting and re-confirmed at it’s August 2008 Meeting and also by the Division membership at the Annual Open Business Meeting of the Division in Boston in August at the APA Convention.

The revised title now needs to be approved by a vote of the full membership, all of whom will receive this issue of the Amplifier with a ballot.

One important reason for adding “Internet” to our title is that so much of what media psychologists now do involves the Internet in one way or another. The Internet is a medium of profound importance for psychology and for understanding so many aspects of human functioning and we felt that the appropriate primary home in APA for research, scholarship, educational and practice issues, and more, directly concerning the Internet and cyberspace, should be our Division, and our title should reflect this. Indeed, the Internet and cyberpsychology are widely seen as significant components of what is now being termed the “new media.”

The change to “Society” from “Division” is in line with a major trend in the APA divisional structure. In the view of many it adds some stronger identity and cachet to a division, and facilitates recruitment of new members who may not want to join APA itself (high dues, economic hard times...), but would be interested in joining an affiliated “Society” in their area of interest. The revised title would of course also include the divisional designation, and our role and status as an APA division would be unchanged. Only the formal title would change. Elsewhere in this issue you will find a ballot. Please photocopy it or tear it out and mail it to the APA address indicated. It requires a signature for authentication but will only be seen and will be kept confidential by Mr. Keith Cooke of APA's Division Services Office. It would be more difficult to handle as an online ballot as APA does not have email addresses for all members.

Turning to other matters, let me note the outstanding Divisional Program we had in Boston. Many of you attended or participated in our sessions. I would like to thank Krishna Kumar for his incredible help with the Program. He and I co-chaired it, and we partnered with Division 32 (Society for Humanistic Psychology) in a jointly sponsored “Humanizing an Inhumane World: The Miniconvention” for which many sessions were SRO. Such outstanding speakers as Larry Balter, Rochelle Balter, Aaron Beck, James Bray, Sharon Brehm, Dorothy Cantor, Betsy Carll, Noam Chomsky, Pat DeLeon, Stuart Fischoff, Ray Fowler, Douglas Gentile, Dan Goleman, Elaine Hatfield, Judy Kuriansky, Larry Kutner, Sharon Lamb, David Shapiro, Bob Sternberg, Richard Suinn, Lenore Walker, Danny Wedding, to name a few, brought in excited APA members by the hundreds. One or two other divisions also co-sponsored some sessions with us. Many of our joint sessions were among the most highly attended at the entire Convention!

The Division has seen one or two transitions in 2008. I would particularly like to thank Lita Schwartz for her fine work as Editor of The Amplifier. We are all grateful for her contributions to The Amplifier as well as to the Division in other ways over the years. The newsletter is an important part of our Divisional communications and is always a source of interesting commentary and information. I would like to welcome aboard our new Editor Krishna Kumar, Professor of Psychology at West Chester University of Pennsylvania and a very experienced writer and editor.
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President-Elect’s Column

Danny Wedding
danny.wedding@mimh.edu

My Fulbright sabbatical teaching at Yonsei University in Seoul, Korea, continues to be a fascinating and richly rewarding experience, and both my undergraduate and graduate students have turned out to be very sophisticated about the media and entirely at home in a digital world. It is somewhat disconcerting to realize that some of my students can text message faster than I can type.

My students—and just about all graduate students in Korea—have easy access to English language psychology journals (especially those published by the American Psychological Association), and they routinely scan English language websites, read English magazines and watch English language films. I’m fascinated by the fact that English is becoming, de facto, an international language; when Chinese, Korean, Thai, and Japanese business people or academics meet with one another, English is almost always the primary language used to communicate. Of course, this privileges those of us whose first language is English.

I’m showing a weekly film to my undergraduate Abnormal Psychology class to illustrate the topics we discuss in class (e.g., last week I showed Iris, a biopic about the life of philosopher and novelist Iris Murdoch, to illustrate my lecture on dementia). The practice of integrating films into psychopathology classes is illustrated and explored in some detail in Movies and Mental Illness (Wedding, Boyd, & Niemiec, 2005).

I’m attempting to expand my personal interest in films to Korean cinema, and I am determined to watch every important Korea film relevant to psychopathology while I’m on my sabbatical. In particular, I’m focusing on the work of a fascinating Korean director, Chan Wook Park, perhaps best known in the United States for the film trilogy Sympathy for Mr. Vengeance, Oldboy and Sympathy for Lady Vengeance.

Fulbright scholars are expected to give frequent public lectures, and I’ve had the opportunity to give guest lectures at universities around the country. There is a great deal of interest in Korea in positive psychology, and I’m frequently asked to present on some of the concepts included in Positive Psychology at the Movies (Niemiec & Wedding, 2008). My collaborator on this book, Ryan Niemiec, is the Division 46 Program Chair for the 2009 convention in Toronto, and he is doing an outstanding job planning a program based on the theme “Psychology, the Internet, and the Brave New Digital World.” I’m looking forward to seeing many of you there.
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When “Free Speech” May Be Limited

Rochelle Balter
rbalt@aol.com

In recent weeks there has been some discussion on the listserv, both direct and indirect regarding elections and political stances. We have taken immediate steps to stop this type of communication, not because we are ogres or want to deny our members their First Amendment Rights, but because by allowing this type of speech we would be putting APA in a compromising position.

You might ask “how could that be,” or if you are more aggrieved than that, you may actually have expressed anger as well as dismay. After all, isn’t freedom of speech one of this nation’s highest core values? Isn’t that why it leads off the Bill of Rights?

The American Psychological Association operates as a 501C3 corporation. It is a non-profit entity. APA meets the guidelines for C3 status in that it falls exclusively under one of the categories of C3s, i.e., educational. The other categories are religious, charitable, scientific, public safety, or literary and meets the structural requirement of being a corporation, fund or foundation. A 501C3 tax status affords organizations a number of monetary benefits. It is not taxable, it can receive charitable contributions which contributors can deduct from their taxes, and depending on where it is situated, it probably does not have to pay certain taxes such as sales tax.

The Convention, an educational event, also will be given a local reduction in taxes if it is in Washington DC on a regular basis.

These benefits however, are accompanied by restrictions. The organization cannot be involved in any political campaign activity. Political speech of any kind is considered a sign of political campaign activity…even humor.

The organization may lobby but only in a limited manner for educational purposes or to promote an issue within its purview. The organization is required to notify the government of its intent to lobby.

You may therefore ask, why not be a C6? A 501C6, like our APAPO also has limitations. A 501C6 must be organized from persons having some common business (including professional) interest and its purpose is to promote such interest. It also has to be a membership organization with membership support. It may not carry out business ordinarily performed for profit. It’s lobbying needs to be done in support of its interest not an in support or benefit of an individual.

From the Editor

Let the Media Lights Shine on Psychology

V. Krishna Kumar
vkumar@wcupa.edu

In a typical newspaper, news magazine, or a television news broadcast, there is an astounding variety of topics covered. These include political issues and commentaries, scandals and ethical issues, education, weather reports, money, resume preparation, lifestyle issues, science and technology, medical and psychological treatments, and reviews of computer games, books and films. Not only is there much fodder for research and analysis in the media, both popular and less popular, for psychologists, there is much that psychologists can contribute to the media. However, you rarely see psychologists contributing analysis of political matters, opinion pieces, tips for this or that, or even reviews of books and films in these varieties of Medias on a regular basis. Even the psychology-related pieces are mostly written by journalists. There is no one of the likes of Sanjay Gupta, MD, representing psychology on a regular news show. The most popular shows are those related to psychotherapy, for example, Dr. Phil. But psychology is more than psychotherapy and it has plenty to offer about everyday matters of life, including money, happiness, coping with disasters, political behavior, crime, education, lifestyle issues, and so on. Psychologists do appear on shows offering their expert opinions on talk shows, but there is not a large number of them, at least on the major TV networks. Indeed, very little of professionally published psychological research sees the light of the media.

A question arises as to why psychologists, in general, have shied away from the media. There are several possibilities:

1. Psychologists view themselves primarily as either academicians or clinicians, or possibly both. They view their primary role is to teach students enrolled in their classes, conduct research, and/or practice psychology in their specialty areas. Possibly, even the general public primarily sees psychology as a clinical field.
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other websites devoted to gossip, but even blogs and forums are places inundated with negative comments about people.

Gossip even occurs online where you would least expect it. Recently, on our own American Psychological Association Division 46 listserv, a psychologist hurled an insult at another professional in the media. This insult now lives on in cyberspace, so it affects the target’s reputation and potentially that of the author.

Studies show that people don’t take as much responsibility for the content of email messages as they do for other forms of communication. Email communication fosters detachment and lessened ethical considerations (Kibby, 2005). Perhaps that is why gossip has inundated the Internet. Despite the reasons why people gossip online, the posts are available forever, to be perused in an Internet search or to be reread by the target. From celebrity gossip sites to professional organization listservs, online gossip is everywhere.
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Report From the Council of Representatives

Lenore E. Walker, EdD
Div. 46 Council Representative
drlenorewalker@gmail.com

The continuation of the February 2008 meeting of the Council of Representatives occurred all day Wednesday, August 13, prior to the beginning of the APA Convention in Boston and concluded on Sunday, August 17. Council approved the 2009 budget including funding for a 2009 presidential summit on the Future of Psychological Practice to be held in San Antonio Texas on May 14–17, 2009, with 140 invited participants. Remember the work on the new strategic plan for APA that I reported on in my last message? Well, we now have a new mission statement: The mission of the APA is to advance the creation, communication, and application of psychological knowledge to benefit society and improve people’s lives.

Since that meeting, Council members have become aware that the $700,000 projected surplus to the budget that we passed has been eliminated along with a percentage of our portfolio consistent with the economic crisis that has impacted all of us. Norm Anderson, our CEO, Paul Craig, our treasurer and the finance committee are working together with the staff to find ways to cut our expenses so that we continue to fund as many activities as is possible. We expect updates that I shall forward to you on our listserv.

In these difficult economic times, APA is fortunate to have just elected Carol Goodheart, PhD, as our new President-Elect. Dr. Goodheart has been our treasurer and will provide strong leadership as the association and we personally must deal with this latest economic crisis.

Other highlights of the meeting included acceptance of several important task force reports including one on abortion and mental health indicating no serious mental health problems were caused by elective abortions, one documenting the need for more mental health care for children and adolescents, one suggesting more studies on the resilience of African American children, one recommending more collaborative relationships between researchers and their institutional review boards, one recommending less discrimination against transgender and gender-variant individuals, and one recommending a developmental sequence of learning across five domains in undergraduate education.

The Council approved funding for the sustained contribution of psychology to the World Health Organization’s revision of the mental health chapter of the current International Classification of Diseases and Related Disorders (ICD-10). APA will support the effort through a contract with the International Union of Psychological Science (IUPsyS), which will retain a psychologist consultant to work on the core revision team at WHO. The IUPsyS consultant will be Geoffrey Reed, PhD, former APA Practice Directorate assistant executive director for professional development, and APA's principal representative to WHO’s International Classification of Functioning, Disability and Health system since 1995. Dr. Reed is already at work in Geneva with WHO assuring that the ICD-11 will have more psychological and less biological underpinnings to the mental health chapter than the American Psychiatric Association’s DSM-V.
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The Amplifier is the official newsletter of APA Division 46, Media Psychology, and is published periodically throughout year (Spring, Summer, Fall/Winter). Unsolicited contributions from members are welcomed and encouraged. Articles must be relevant to media psychology and should not have been published elsewhere. All submissions should be sent to the Editor, V. Krishna Kumar, PhD (vkumar@wcupa.edu). Submissions must be received by February 15 for Spring issue, May 30 for the Summer issue, and September 15 for the Fall/Winter double issue. Authors should ensure that their manuscripts comply with all APA publication and ethical guidelines.
Lessons Learned From the New Book Publishing Environment

Lawrence Kutner
lkutner@HMS.harvard.edu

“The book biz ain’t what it used to be,” a fellow writer told me about a year ago. His point was driven home when my sixth and most recent trade book, *Grand Theft Childhood: The Surprising Truth About Violent Video Games and What Parents Can Do*, was published last spring.

My co-author, Dr. Cheryl K. Olson (who’s also my spouse), and I had received a $1.5-million grant from the U.S. Department of Justice in 2003 to conduct a study of the relationship between playing violent video games and engaging in violent behavior in the real world among young adolescents. Our multidisciplinary team of about a dozen researchers worked for two years reviewing the literature, designing questionnaires, conducting focus groups and national surveys, and analyzing data. (Our young research assistants, who were recent college graduates, enjoyed being able to call up their parents and say, “I got a job at Harvard because I’m good at video games!”)

Although most of our analyses have been and will be published in refereed scientific journals, we decided that there was enough information relevant to the public that we could write a trade book if we complemented our own research with information on the history of moral panics over new media, the use of these issues as political tools, and a primer for non-researchers on how media research is done.

The response to the book has been intense, and occasionally overwhelming. In some ways, it’s been a projective test that reveals more about the readers than the authors. We’ve been lauded by some critics and pundits; others have accused of everything short of kidnapping the Lindbergh baby. The shifts from traditional to new media in how people receive information—and the misconceptions about and problems with those shifts—became apparent.

Lessons Learned

Blogs are powerful, ubiquitous and notoriously inaccurate. Just before *Grand Theft Childhood* was published, Cheryl did an interview with the proprietor of a small, specialized blog named gamecouch.com. It was a quiet way, we thought, to test the response of the gamer community to our findings and to find out what questions we hadn’t anticipated so that we could better prepare to answer them. The interviewer did an excellent job of presenting our nuanced findings and recommendations.

Within a matter of hours, excerpts from that interview appeared on dozens of blogs. By the end of the week, that number had grown exponentially to many hundreds. Unfortunately, some of the bloggers cherry-picked our data to support their agendas; a few “embellished” our findings, sometimes to the point where we did not recognize them. Like the childhood game of Telephone, these distortions got repeated and further distorted with each iteration.

The anonymity of most websites allowed posters to make wild claims about our work and the work of other researchers without being held accountable. Some of the comments were cute. (At least one young poster said to Cheryl, “I’d like you to bear my children!” Another wit claimed, “I’d buy this book—if I could read!”)

Television and radio are no longer time-dependent broadcast media. I used to tell my graduate students that when I was a television reporter, I sometimes thought about how my words and image were being beamed forever into space, but that when I started writing for the *New York Times* my work could be used to wrap fish. Electronic media were thought of as transitory and ephemeral; print media were permanent. That’s not the case today.

Television in particular has taken on a new life through video on demand and such services as YouTube. An on-camera interview that I did six months ago can crop up on a new website or blog. Radio interviews are available as podcasts.

Similarly, the notion of broadcasting—that is, sending out a message to a large and diverse audience—is quickly being replaced by narrowcasting. When we were plotting our media strategy, we realized that we didn’t want to get on ABC-TV’s Good Morning America as much as we wanted to be on G4 network’s X-Play. It’s a smaller audience, but they’re intensely interested in the topic. Similarly, we tried to promote the book in magazines and websites that, a few years ago, neither of us had heard of.

The book market is international, even if you’re only published in English. We managed to sell some foreign rights to our book, including Japan, Korea and Lithuania. But we also received a lot of publicity in non-English speaking countries throughout Europe, South America and Africa. Cheryl did live talk radio in Ireland and Germany; she was profiled in newspapers in France and the Netherlands. I was approached by reporters from as far away as Zaire. Clearly, neither language nor distance are a major factor in outreach.

So yes, “the book biz ain’t what it used to be.” That’s not such a bad thing, if you’re ready for it.

---

Call for Fellow Nominations

Please submit nominations for Initial and Current Fellows to Alan Entin at adentin@earthlink.net or 804-359-0109.
The Best Guest: Lessons Learned about How to Be Asked Back for Media Interviews

Judy Kuriansky, PhD
DrJudyK@aol.com

Being asked to do a media interview for the first time can lead to a longer relationship with that outlet—depending on how it goes. My first experience being interviewed on television presented unexpected but valuable lessons about how to be a “good guest” who is asked back. Other lessons have evolved over decades of being a guest on TV, radio and for print outlets and now new media. This article presents examples of those first and subsequent lessons which colleagues may find useful in their experiences.

The first experience
Sometimes acting on instinct turns out to be the best approach. Back in the late 1970s, while a Senior Research Scientist at the New York State Psychiatric Institute, I was also co-executive director of the Scientists Committee for Public Information dealing with topics like toxic waste and TV advertising. Our study on the latter—which found some violations of FCC guidelines—led me to testify at government hearings and became a news story. A TV station in New York asked me to come on their news show to discuss the topic. The first question I was asked was, “Tell me, does Crest toothpaste really make you more kissable?” Thrown a little bit by the casualness of the question when I was prepared for an academic discussion, I instinctively answered, “Well, my father was a dentist and he recommended Crest toothpaste, but that could have resulted from TV advertising which would want you to believe that their product makes you more attractive…and that is exactly why we did this study about how TV advertising often misleads the public into believing product claims which are not proven, and which violate FCC guidelines.” And then I went on to describe the guidelines, the study, and the Scientists Committee.

As a novice, I was worried at the end that I had not done what they wanted or insulted the interviewer by not answering her question in a casual manner. But to my surprise, the producer said, “What a great job. I know we threw you a somewhat silly question, but you answered it without making my host look bad, and then you swung into talking about what you wanted to say.”

Then she asked, “You were such a good guest, is there any other topic you can talk about?” I described other projects, adding as an aside, our hospital pioneer project about the effectiveness of what was then new sex therapy techniques. This peaked her interest, and became a defining beginning of my “media psychology” career.

The lesson from this comprised a gold standard of being interviewed by the media—know what you want to say and work it into the beginning of the interview, no matter what is asked. Do this smoothly, to address—and honor—the interviewer’s question first, before switching to your own agenda. Also, have another subject handy which you can address which would appeal to the outlet.

Do your homework
A good student is prepared. So it should be for a media psychologist since you never know the direction in which an interview will go. I always do extensive research about the topic, to be accurate and to know not only what to say, but what not to say.

In this computer age, it is not enough to just check a few websites for background on a subject; you have to be sure information is up-to-date, applicable and accurate. Recently, I was asked to comment about breaking news that charges were dropped against former New York governor Elliot Spitzer caught paying thousands of dollars for prostitutes. On the Internet, I found many articles about the Mann Act, which had been used against high profile figures to allege “sex trafficking.” Fortunately, I decided to call a lawyer friend, who told me that the Mann Act is rarely exercised in these days and had been used for more morality arguments in earlier times. I was grateful to know I should not bring up that Act, and even when the lawyer on the program did, to know that I should not pursue it, but turn the discussion to another angle.

Be flexible, keep time in mind, and give up having to say it all
Many shows now (in their rush) do not prep guests with the questions, and even if they do, the interviewer does not always follow a prepared script. This requires being prepared knowing all aspects of the topic. In the situation about the disgraced former governor accused of using government funds for prostitution, before the interview, the producer said I would be asked about the psychological impact of such exoneration (like women’s anger that such men are not punished or the negative outcome of reducing men’s fears about the ramifications for using prostitutes). The psychological messages would have been interesting for the public. But instead, the interviewer asked about why a man in a high position would do such things, which required a different psychological response—one which had been the topic of media discussion when the case was first exposed months earlier. While I could have applied my first-ever lesson and answered the question and then raised a new angle, the time left for an response (about 15 seconds) would only allow for answering the question, so I had to give up adding another point that could have been psychologically interesting, and just discuss what the host wanted to address. While I also could have interrupted the other guest’s response to add these points (some shows like guests doing that), it is wise discretion to know whether the particular show’s format and timing welcomes that.

(continued on p. 8)
Deciding to agree or disagree and what to say when your point is pre-empted

Media likes controversy and it is always compelling for programs if guests express opposing views. Be cautious about creating artificial disagreements, and be willing to agree. This can be important in cases where a psychological point you were prepared to make as the psychologist is stated by another guest who is not in the field, but who, like many people, like to be an “armchair” psychologist. For example, a lawyer also guesting on a program with me discussing a murder case, “analyzed” the motives of four men who pled guilty to a murder. At first I wondered to myself what was left for me to say; but fortunately psychology is rich in its dimensions, so when the interviewer turned to me, I mentioned how the lawyer raised valid points in her hypothesis, and added, “from group psychology, we know that when people act in numbers, they can be mutually supported to commit acts—even if vile—by the others.”

Use prior experience

When the former governor was first exposed as Client #9 using a prostitution ring, I had been called out of the blue for an interview by a major news wire service, to address why men with happy marriages use such services and why women provide them. The quote mentioned how sad I thought it was that women sell their bodies. I received a number of emails (the public has greater access these days to findings anyone’s contact information through the Internet) criticizing me for “blaming the women” when it is the man’s fault for using them. While clearly not all my comments were printed, I include the criticism in my next interview on TV on the topic, starting with anticipating the resistance: “People may disagree with me...”

The interview doesn’t have to be just about you

While we think we are asked to be on a show to discuss our view and our research, the focus does not always have to be about us and our work. A “good show” might be about the host or whatever direction the host wants to take the discussion. As a result, it is a good idea to learn about the interviewer, his/her approach, style of interviewing, potential involvement in the subject matter and point of view, as well as the style of the show.

For example, one radio show I often do is not based on the traditional style of interviewing authors or movie directors and giving them all the time to describe their project. Instead, it is more like a “salon” where any topic can be brought up and where the interviewer likes to talk about his own political views or travels. Some guests become angry about not getting their expected “air time.” Producers have told me these guests will never be asked back because they did not “fit in” with the show. Knowing this particular style of show, I always go on with no expectations, and rarely promote anything—letting the host mention any book or appearance—realizing that developing a relationship and coming back is more important.

Another example occurred on an Internet radio show. In speaking to the interviewer beforehand, I knew she was taking a group of people to India on a special guided tour. During the interview instead of discussing my views and my book, I interviewed her about her trip. She was most grateful, saying “No one has ever interviewed me on my show, they are always pushing their things.” And she added, “That was so much fun for me. I would love to have you back talking more about your work next time.”

On another radio show with a host known for passionate views and self-disclosure, we were supposed to discuss recent research findings about the prevalence of affairs. This only required a few minutes. Since the host had mentioned his flirtation with a married woman, I used some remaining time to challenge him about his response in terms of gender roles—an approach he found refreshing by allowing him to expound on his views and be an example to the audience. Both host and producer appreciated the opportunity.

Keep up to date with the media outlet

Reporters like guests who are familiar with their outlet and what they have been reporting. For example, I regularly read a celebrity newsmagazine, which interviews me often. Recently, the reporter called me to discuss the potential impact on a celebrity of her current boyfriend meeting with his ex. The reporter said, “I know you know what we’ve been reporting about Jennifer’s possible pregnancy...”

Be patient and creative when re-interviewed on same subject

Seasoned reporters ask questions which show they know your work, and lead you into stimulating and in-depth questions. But many others ask sweeping, general, open-ended questions that no matter how reasonable, are frustrating since you might have answered them hundreds of times before, or feel you have to respond with an entire course in Psych 101. For example, I’ve been asked, “What is true love?” “What is good sex?” and “How do you make a relationship work?” The answer could take days, but I’ve learned to accommodate and enjoy challenging myself with new points. In a recent interview about my book, The Complete Idiots Guide to a Healthy Relationship, I was asked a reasonable—yet overwhelming-question, like “What are the secrets to a healthy relationship?” which is what 300+ pages are all about, but I resolved instead to enjoy the challenge of selecting only a few characteristics to provide a useful, yet short and clear answer. When interviewed by a website about divorce, and asked “How is a couple a good team?” I made a sports analogy, where you are unified in your goal (e.g., in how to bring up children) but can play different roles to get there (i.e. accept and appreciate your differences in views or styles).

No doubt as you do interviews, you will learn many lessons yourself about what works well in sharing the valuable expertise we as psychologists have to offer and being asked to continue providing such a valuable service.
Dr. Kuriansky is a Fellow of Division 46 and one of the founders of the Association of Media Psychology which became Div46. She has been involved in all aspects of electronic and print media for three decades. This includes writing columns and being quoted in newspapers and magazines worldwide (e.g., in New York, Singapore, Japan, and China). She has pioneered radio call-in advice shows in the U.S. and Japan and Internet advice programs. The host of several TV shows and specials, and a feature reporter for local and network news shows, she has also been an expert commentator on innumerable TV news and talk shows as well as many international programs, like China's CCTV. She has also produced various specials and documentaries, and has received awards for her work including the First International Outreach Award for the American Women in Radio and Television (AWRT) and an Accolade Award recently for co-producing a documentary on international psychology. She has been President of AWRT in New York and on the Foundation Board, and is a Director on the Board of the Library of American Broadcasting.

The Media Research Lab at Iowa State University

Douglas Gentile
dgentile@iastate.edu

Iowa State University has had a strong program in Social Psychology for many years. In the past decade, it has also been known as one of the top departments for research on the effects video games can have on people. The Media Research Lab helps to support this reputation.

Directed by developmental psychologist Douglas Gentile, the lab’s mission is to study the complex effects that media can have on children and adults. Currently eight graduate students and 20 undergraduates are conducting research in the MRL. Although the lab is best known for its work on the effects of violent video games, all media and all media effects are of interest. Some recent and ongoing studies include:

- Two three-year longitudinal studies of violent and prosocial video game effects in the U.S. and in Singapore. The effects under study include cognitive effects, attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors, as well as other measures of social functioning, cognitive and school functioning, pathological video gaming, and individual difference variables. Early results suggest that the cognitive effects of violence exposure are similar for both Singaporean and American children.
- In collaboration with researchers in Italy and Singapore, we have been studying what is being called computer and video game "addiction." The early results suggest that there do seem to be some gamers who show pathological tendencies in their play (e.g., damaging their social, occupational, school, and psychological functioning). Nonetheless, it is still unclear whether this is a distinct taxonomy, or whether it is secondary to other comorbid pathologies. We are therefore beginning work with clinical samples to be able to test the critical questions of risk, etiology, course, and treatment. (Look for a national prevalence study coming out in Psychological Science soon.)
- Childhood obesity is at epidemic proportions in the United States, changing dramatically since 1990. When asked why, most people suggest factors such as genetics, poor diet, and lack of exercise are responsible. Yet these factors haven't really changed much since 1990. What has changed, however, is children's total screen time. In collaboration with the National Institute on Media and the Family (www.mediamwise.org), we are conducting studies of the efficacy of the Switch™ program—an obesity prevention intervention. The Switch program is set at multiple ecological levels (including individual, family, school, and community), and is designed to decrease children's total screen time, increase their fruit and vegetable consumption, and increase physical activity. The early results are that the intervention was successful immediately and that the gains made were maintained for at least six months after the intervention stopped.
- Studies of how television portrayals of psychologists and mental health professionals may influence viewers’ attitudes about psychologists, stigma about mental health problems, and willingness to seek help. The results of the first study to be published (in the Journal of Clinical Psychology) demonstrated that higher levels of viewing TV predicts poorer attitudes about psychologists and lower willingness to seek help. Studies are underway to see how we could reverse this effect.
- In collaboration with researchers in Japan and Singapore, we have conducted correlational, experimental, and longitudinal studies of prosocial video game effects. The early results show that children who play more prosocial video games behave more prosocially, both in the short term and in the long term (including changing to become more prosocial over time in the longitudinal studies).
- We have several studies of music underway, including a recently published study demonstrating that babies as young as 9 months can reliably discriminate happy music from sad music. In addition, we are studying whether violent music has the same effects as screen media. The early results suggest that the effects of music only are very different from the effects of the same songs with a video component.
- We have conducted studies on beer advertising and youth drinking, how individual differences in movie processing may moderate the effects of violent movies, how experts are portrayed may influence the effects of news stories, how video games with violence against women may affect men and their relationships with women, how relationally aggressive media (rather than physically violent media) may affect children's relational and indirect aggressive behaviors, studies on cyberbullying, and many others.

(continued on p. 10)
The Media Research Lab...
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As can be seen from this partial list, all media and all types of effects are of interest. Furthermore, multiple theories serve to guide our research, including broad social psychology and learning theories, domain specific theories (e.g., general aggression model), developmental theories, and media theories (e.g., uses and gratifications, cultivation). Why do we choose to study what we do? There are two general guiding principles of the work we do. First, the research question usually needs to cross the basic/applied research boundary. Although we conduct basic theoretical scientific research, I am most interested in studies that also have a real-world application. This leads to the second principle—I am most interested in studies that can provide information about what leads to better outcomes for children. In short, how can we maximize the potential benefits and minimize the potential harms of media?

It is important to note that this is not the same as ideologically driven research. The goal of our graduate program is to educate world-class scientists. The science comes first, the questions we ask are empirical, and the data tell us the answers. Sometimes these conflict with our original expectations, but that's the nature of science. Everyone has an opinion about the media, but good science can separate opinion from fact.

How to Talk to Your Kids About the Financial Crisis

Lawrence Balter
lawrence.balter@nyu.edu

Your job and financial status have psychological meaning that goes beyond just practical matters,” says Dr. Lawrence Balter. “These are parts of our identity. When they are jeopardized, it is natural to feel apprehensive and worried.” Children are aware of parental anxiety. Financial crises also have a direct impact on children if they have to forgo services and goods they were counting on.

According to Balter, author of “Not in Front of the Children: How to Talk to your Child about Tough Family Matters,” there are practical ways to help your children weather the financial storm you are navigating. Don’t pretend that nothing is wrong or lie about the situation. The key is to design your explanations for your child’s age and level of comprehension.

- Explain truthfully what happened without becoming overly explicit. “The company closed or didn’t need as many people, and I lost my job.”
- Avoid burdening children with financial details. It is enough to say, “We won’t have the same amount of money as before.”
- Spell out the steps you are taking and why. If you are moving to a smaller home, prepare kids in advance and explain the reasons. If a stay-at-home parent will be returning to work, or if a parent is taking on a second job, explain why he or she won’t be around as much and how this will affect your child’s routine.
- Report on your progress with a job search and other aspects of your game plan.
- Avoid emotional outbursts in front of the children, although expressions of concern are, of course, appropriate.
- Don’t deprive yourself and your family of all enjoyment during tough times. Plan innovative ways to enjoy time together without a large outlay of money.

Balter adds, “Let them know you will pull together as a family. Be reassuring and point out that there are obstacles and setbacks in life, and we will get through this one.”

Member News

Dr. Lawrence Balter was appointed to the Advisory Board of the Future of Children (Princeton U & Brookings Institution).

Balter was interviewed by MSNBC.com and BusinessWeek.com and appeared on WCBS radio on “How to Talk to Your Kids About the Financial Crisis.”

Dr. Frank Farley has recently appeared, on a range of psychological topics including aspects of current U.S. and global political and economic changes, in The Washington Post, Wall Street Journal, USA Today, U.S. News and World Report, Entrepreneur Magazine, Business Week, Forbes, Philadelphia Inquirer, NBC, CBS, Al Jazeera, public radio, talk radio, more. He just completed a term as President of APA Division 32—The Society for Humanistic Psychology.

Jerri Lynn Hogg is a PhD student at Fielding Graduate University. She presented a workshop in October entitled “Online Teaching: Do’s & Don’ts” in Longmeadow, MA, at the Professional Educators Conference.
APA Division 46 Board Meeting Minutes

Feb 21, 2008 (Approved August 13, 2008)

Present: Frank Farley, PhD, President; Rochelle Balter, PhD, Past President; Danny Wedding, PhD, President-Elect; Pauline Wallin, PhD, Secretary; Lillian Comas-Diaz, PhD, Member-at-Large; Mary Gregerson, PhD, Member-at-Large; David Baker, PhD, Member-at-Large; Lenore Walker, PhD, APA Council Rep.

Absent: Irene Deitch, PhD, Member-at-Large; Roger Klein, PhD, Member-at-Large; Lita Schwartz, Editor, The Amplifier

I. Meeting was called to order at 9:55 a.m.

II. President’s remarks: Frank Farley, PhD
Dr. Farley announced his theme for his presidency: “Moving Div 46 into the 21st century—Bringing Internet Technology into Div 46.” The theme for the APA convention is “Humanizing an Inhumane World.”

III. Past president remarks: Rochelle Balter, PhD
Dr. Balter reported that a major accomplishment last year was implementing the Strategic Planning Group. This group is looking at the “digital age” and anticipating psychological problems—cybersex, cybercrime, accuracy of information, which can lead to death; impact of Internet on the courtroom; online sexual predator issues; privacy issues; legal ethical issues; ethical issues related to telehealth; Internet teaching; virtual classroom.

Although these issues are not necessarily visible to the membership, they will have impact on all areas of psychology.

IV. President Elect’s Remarks: Danny Wedding, PhD
Dr. Wedding is enthusiastic about serving as President-Elect. Although he has not been active in Division 46, he welcomes the opportunity to make a contribution.

V. Approval of Minutes, Aug 17, 2007: Pauline Wallin, PhD, Secretary
Minutes were approved after minor amendments.

VI. APA Council Rep—Lenore Walker, PhD
Council agenda:

◊ Torture of detainees at Guantanamo Bay: There is a proposed amendment to replace the amendment passed last summer. The language is more specific. There was discussion about the role of APA in influencing public policy.

◊ Four minority psychology associations: Asian, Latino, African American, Native American—have been on the Council for 3 years as an experiment. The last vote to amend APA bylaws to include them as permanent voting members did not pass. This issue is coming up for a vote again.

◊ Dr. Farley supported their acceptance, but stated that the larger issue is that the APA Council of Representatives is not representative of the members themselves. He gave examples of how the structure of APA Council is not a democracy.

◊ Dr. Comas-Diaz moved to support the amendment. Motion was carried unanimously.

◊ APA Council received the report from the task force on sexualization of girls.

◊ There was discussion about the revamping of the APA website, costing $8 million, which has commenced without the authority or oversight by any APA governing body.

◊ There was discussion about efficient use of time during Council meetings.

◊ There was discussion about proposing a new Board of Media Relations with APA, which would oversee all of media functions.

◊ Dr. Farley discussed the proposed new Division—“Qualitative Methods.” Dr. Comas-Diaz moved to support the new Division. Motion was carried unanimously.

VII. Convention Program Report: Frank Farley, PhD

◊ Many quality program proposals were accepted. Those that could not be fit into symposia were accepted as posters. There was discussion of creating student poster award certificates. Dr. Comas-Diaz recommended that we have an APAGS liaison.

◊ Dr. Farley recognized Krishna Kumar, PhD, co-chair of the Program committee, in his role in selecting program, allocating hours, and getting the programs submitted on time to APA.

◊ Dr. Farley has spoken with Noam Chomsky about presenting at the convention. He could not commit at the time, but may be able to participate in a conversation hour by speaker phone. He is also waiting to hear back from Daniel Goleman.

◊ The social hour is scheduled on Friday at 6 p.m.

◊ The business meeting is scheduled on Saturday at 4 pm

VIII. Strategic Planning Group: Rochelle Balter, PhD, Chair

◊ Dr. Balter submitted a written report. The Strategic Planning Group formed an Internet committee to explore all area that the Internet touches in media psychology regarding teaching, academics, practice, research, and multicultural communications.

◊ The Group reviewed the failed attempt at a name change for Division 46, and decided to further explore this option. This issue was addressed later in this Board meeting. (See “Other Business, p. 6.)

◊ Dr. Balter also noted that the Division 46 website needs updating. See additional information about the website under Website Committee.

IX. Committee Reports

◊ Awards Committee: No report.

◊ Membership Committee: Frank Farley, PhD, Chair

◊ Nominations Committee: Frank Farley, PhD, Chair

◊ Nominations for APA Boards and Committees were discussed.

◊ Div 46 nominees were discussed for President and Member-at-Large.

(continued on p. 12)
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Div. 46 Board Meeting Minutes
(continued from p. 11)

• **Program Committee**: Frank Farley, PhD, Chair
  See Convention Program report in item VII above.

• **The Amplifier**: Frank Farley, PhD for Lita Schwartz, Editor
  ◊ Dr. Schwartz has asked for members to submit content—
  reports, member news, reviews
  ◊ Dr. Comas-Diaz recommended that we could have a Div 46
  blog with commentary on current events.

• **Membership Committee**: Frank Farley (for Joanne Broder-
  Sumerson, PhD, membership chair)
  ◊ We have 430 members, 47% men, 53% women.
  ◊ Dr. Wallin suggested that we build an alliance with the
  Division of Consumer Psychology. Dr. Wedding agreed to
  contact the President-Elect of Consumer Psychology.
  ◊ Dr. Wallin noted that membership of Division 46 could be
  boosted via better marketing.

• **Fellows Committee**: Frank Farley PhD for Alan Entin, PhD,
  Chair
  ◊ Nominees: Danny Wedding, Sharon Lamb, and Tom Plant
  ◊ All nominees were approved unanimously.

• **Listserv/Website**: Pauline Wallin, PhD
  ◊ Dr. Wallin presented cost estimates from Rick Weiss, web
  developer to upgrade our website.
  ◊ There was some discussion about the functions needed. It
  was recommended that Dr. Wallin get three estimates.
  ◊ Dr. Wallin requested to join the Website committee of the
  Strategic Planning Group. Dr. Balter agreed to include
  her.
  ◊ The Strategic Planning Committee will form a listserv
  committee.
  ◊ Listserv etiquette was discussed. Dr. Farley will consult
  with other divisions to develop policies and procedures for
  monitoring and enforcement of listservs.

• **Division 46 Book Series**: Florence Kaslow, PhD, Chair.
  Presented by Mary Gregerson, PhD
  ◊ Accepted for publication by Springer, was the tentatively
  titled book: “...and They Lived Happily Ever After”: A Guide
  to Movie Magic for Clinicians and Life Coaches.
  ◊ Dr. Gregerson noted that Dr. Walker’s chapter was too
  long for the book, but so full of valuable content that she
  recommended that the chapter be published as a separate
  monograph. Dr. Gregerson indicated that some chapters,
  including Dr. Walker’s on “Myths and Mental Illness,” were
  substantive enough to warrant a monograph series, which
  the Division might like to consider.
  ◊ There was discussion of how to support members who write
  books and share royalties with Div 46. It was recommended
  that Drs. Kaslow and Gregerson talk with one of the APA
  legal staff (e.g., Jesse Raben) to determine the Division’s
  role in this book, given that this is not published by APA,
  yet is part of the Div 46 Book Series.

Dr. Carll submitted a written report, in which she outlined the
history, mission and activities of this committee. The committee
is seeking nominations for the News Media Recognition Award,
and a budget allocation of $175 for the Lucite award trophy.

• **Interactive Media Committee**: Elizabeth Carll, PhD, Chair
  No Report—[as Dr. Carll had not received confirmation of
  reappointment of the Interactive Media Committee which is an
  ad hoc committee, reappointed each year by the president.]

• **Media Watch Committee**: Harriet T. Schultz, PhD, Chair
  ◊ Dr. Schultz submitted a written report. This committee
  will present a symposium at the 2008 APA convention:
  “Psychologists on the Screen: Sex, Humor and Videotape.”
  ◊ The Committee will also explore opportunities to
  communicate with TV producers on the portrayal of
  psychologists in the media.
  ◊ The Committee requests $150 for the Golden Psi Award
  trophy. Currently under consideration for the award is the
  HBO series, In Treatment.
  ◊ The Media Watch Committee is considering whether to
  expand or change its goals, given the paucity of good
  portrayals of psychologists in the media.
  ◊ It was noted that many committees are not active and do
  not have sitting chairs.

X. Treasurer’s Report: James Bray, PhD

• Our account continues to dwindle. It is currently $29,227.43.
• Our income is about $7,000/year. $5000 of that is budgeted for
  The Amplifier. In order to increase income we must attract more
  dues-paying members.
• Dr. Bray said that if travel expenses of Board members are
  covered, it will have to come from the reserves. Dr. Farley had
  decided that no travel expenses would be reimbursed.
• Now that Dr. Bray is President-Elect of APA, the position of
  Treasurer is now vacant.
• Dr. Wedding moved to accept the budget. It was accepted
  unanimously.
• Dr. Walker commended Dr. Bray on his election as APA
  president-elect.
• Dr. Farley suggested having a hospitality suite in conjunction
  with another division, (e.g., 32).

XI. Other Business:
**Name change: Frank Farley, PhD**

• The name change for Division 46 was discussed. Suggestions
  included:
  ◊ Society for Internet and Media Psychology
  ◊ Society for Media Psychology
• The Board voted unanimously for Society for Internet and Media
  Psychology
• These names will be put to a vote by the membership.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:14 pm.

Respectfully submitted,
Pauline Wallin, PhD, Secretary

Other Committee reports submitted but not reported in
person:
• **News Media, Public Education, Public Policy Committee**:
  Elizabeth Carll, PhD, Chair
Media Watch Committee Annual Report

August 2008

1. For 10 years, since 1998, we have been “media watchers” looking at portrayals of fictional mental health professionals in TV, film, and books, always on the lookout for one that meets criteria for our award. We maintain an active email exchange, including alerting members to relevant portrayals, and we encourage discussions. We use our rating system (attached) to rate the professional/ethical behavior of the mental health professional as well as the manner in which the show’s producer or book’s author portrays him/her. A portrayal that shows excellence in the responsible portrayal of professional standards may earn the award, now titled the “Shirley Glass Golden Psi Media Award,” to honor the committee’s founder.

2. Our current members are: Chair, Harriet T. Schultz, Mary Gregerson, Armond Aserinsky, Betsy Caril, Nancy Kalish, Keri Heitner, Shirley Maides-Keane, Eileen Mager, Rochelle Balter, Richard Harris, Mark Komrad, Mustaq Khan, Angie Lipsitz, Stephen Dine Young, Michael Fenichel, Otto Wahl, Joseph Ganz, Sue Ann Lewan, Jamie Lontz, & Danny Wedding. It is noteworthy that these members have remained with the group for several years.

3. Our annual symposium was accepted for the 2008 convention entitled “Psychologists on the Screen: Sex, Humor, and Videotape.” Chair Harriet Schultz. Presenters Nancy Kalish and Harriet Schultz; discussant Rochelle Balter. Focus was to be contrasts between couples’ therapists on two HBO programs—Tell Me You Love Me—depicting an ethical therapist (and explicit sex)—and Curb Your Enthusiasm—with two wildly unethical therapists (and humor). However, Drs. Kalish & Schultz were unable to go to Boston and had to cancel the presentation.

4. Two HBO shows—In Treatment and Tell Me You Love Me—were nominees for the Golden Psi. Although both had positive aspects, in the end neither was considered award-worthy. The therapist in the first did some excellent therapy, especially with a teenage girl, but there were also serious boundary violations. The therapist in the second had good boundaries, but her therapy was not stellar. Overall neither would have been good showcases of psychology.

5. This will be the 4 year with no award. This is a serious problem for the committee since the media attention surrounding the award has become our main venue for public education about appropriate/inappropriate psychologist behavior. The award has never been given bearing Shirley Glass’ name.

6. Considering the above, committee members have come up with recommendations for reorganizing and revitalizing our work. Some of these are:
   a. Grading shows as they appear throughout the year, utilizing the rating system we devised.
   b. Seeking publicity for these ratings, which could focus on both positive and negative aspects of a show (e.g., In Treatment’s excellent therapy and its ethical lapses). With these “grades” we could educate the public about the good, bad, and ugly of psychology without compromising the award’s standards.
   c. If a show meets the standards we set originally (and these should follow APA ethical guidelines), the award could still be given—if warranted.
   d. The grading could be publicized starting with The Amplifier, moving to the Monitor. We could also join the 21st century and start a blog with links to other sites where movie lovers could view our ratings and critiques of shows.

7. Something new we did last summer was communicate with the producer of Law & Order: Special Victims Unit (he had received our award a few years ago) to ask his opinion about why psychologists are portrayed as they are. In the past we had contacted producers only after they had won the award. It is recommended that we continue these contacts in the future to understand more about producers’ motives.

8. Armond Aserinsky has continued to be our listserv manager.

9. Harriet Schultz will be stepping down as committee chair following this convention. Below is the resignation letter she submitted to Division President Frank Farley.

Respectfully submitted,

Harriet Schultz, Chair

Dear Frank.

I’m writing to tell you that I plan to step down as Chair of the Division’s Media Watch Committee, effective right after this year’s APA convention.

I’ve been a member of this committee, founded by Shirley Glass in 1998, almost from the beginning and Chair since 2000. The group has been active, collaborative, challenging—and fun. I’m attaching an updated review (including the original goals) listing all we’ve done.

One of our main efforts has been to give, at least try to give, our Golden Psi award annually to the producers of a show that has shown excellence in depicting a fictional mental health professional with high ethical standards. Unfortunately, there’s been a paucity of such portrayals, and we’ve not been able to identity an award-worthy show since 2004. A few years ago the Board voted to honor MWC’s founder by renaming the award the Shirley Glass Golden Psi, but so far we haven’t been able to give the award under this new title.

One of our main goals has been to educate the public about appropriate and inappropriate psychologist behavior, and the media coverage of our award has helped achieve this in past years. But no award—no coverage, at least the way we’ve been operating.

Committee members have come up with some ideas to remedy this, including: (these have been covered in #6 above-HS.)

I think the committee would benefit from ‘new blood’ starting with a new Chair who could implement these suggestions and find other creative ways to forward our goals.

Most sincerely,

Harriet
Elizabeth Carll, Chair

NBC News correspondent Dawn Fratangelo and The Boston Globe columnist and contributor Barbara Meltz were honored during the 2008 American Psychological Association’s Annual Convention for their outstanding work reporting on psychological information and research.

Dawn Fratangelo, a three-time Emmy Award winner, received the 2008 News Media Recognition Award for Broadcast Excellence for her poignant stories covering a wide range of social issues, including post-traumatic stress and women in the military, coping with bullying, and the basic elements of happiness. Fratangelo’s stories have appeared on “NBC Nightly News,” “Today,” MSNBC, and “Dateline.”

Barbara Meltz, The Boston Globe’s child-caring columnist for 20 years and news contributor, received the 2008 News Media Recognition Award for Print Excellence for her informative articles covering the gamut of children’s issues, including building confidence, bringing out the best in children, coping with divorce, and preventing teen suicide.

The many years of outstanding stories by Dawn Fratangelo of NBC News and exceptional articles by Barbara Meltz of The Boston Globe have helped to keep the public informed about important psychological information to benefit their well-being.

The News Media Recognition Awards were created by the News Media, Public Education, Public Policy Committee of APA’s Division of Media Psychology to recognize excellence in the reporting of psychological information and research in order to promote community well-being.

I would like to thank the members of the committee who participated in the selection process: Drs. Joanne Cantor, Jina Carvalho, Alan Entin, Steve Hampe, Helen Friedman, Roger Klein, and Dorothy Singer, and students Scott Kaplan and Lynn Temenski.

If you would like to nominate a journalist for the 2009 News Media Recognition Award, contact Dr. Elizabeth Carll, chair, at ecarll@optonline.net.

To All Division 46 Student Members

In today’s information hungry society, it’s imperative that psychologists remain at the forefront of the information streamline. The media looks to our profession to provide them with accurate and sound information which can be understood by the public. As students in the profession, it is our responsibility to provide the profession of Psychology the tools and information necessary to provide a clear picture of important events the media will cover. Questions which cover violence through a variety of medium can be augmented with ideas on how to use the different modalities of media to improve grades in school, improve social skills, and reduce stigma and prejudice. Through participation in the student committee, we can share ideas, collaborate on research projects, extend our network of professionals and strengthen the partnership we have with other divisions in the American Psychological Association. Please join us in our venture to expand the division to include fresh ideas, networking opportunities, and a stronger sense of unity with the division of professionals dedicated to the advancement of Media Psychology. Please submit any questions or concerns to Diane at dianhern@nova.edu or Kathryn at kestamoulis@hotmail.com Thank you and we look forward to a fantastic and exciting year!

Diane Hernandez & Kathryn Stamoulis, Co-Chairs, Student Committee
I would also like to convey the gratitude of the Division to Harriet Schultz, Chair of our Media Watch Committee since 2000 who is retiring from that post. Harriet has done a superb job with this Committee and deserves our heartfelt thanks. Her Committee Report is found elsewhere in this issue of *The Amplifier*.

Let me bid au revoir to our two retiring Board members, Mary Gregerson and Roger Klein, whose terms ended in 2008. What great stalwarts for the Division they have been, giving selflessly and creatively of time and effort. They are both deeply committed to the cause and I hope to see them back in D46 action in some capacity soon!

The Division of Media Psychology should be one of APA’s largest divisions with its central role in “giving psychology away,” but for many years it has been one of the smallest. If we don’t communicate effectively what we do and what we know to the media and the many publics, we will continue to have restricted impact and be less helpful to that big world outside of our own professional community. The final stage of creating new knowledge should be improving life using that knowledge. Psychology is not too good at handling that final stage, and our Division can help by showing APA the way to engage media in that effort. I hope we can bring more APAers into our work. The revised Division name will help broaden our identification inside and outside of APA. A very attractive Annual Program and *The Amplifier* also help. (One issue coming up will be whether the *The Amplifier* should go online exclusively with no mailed hard copy. If you have thoughts about that issue please send them to our 2009 President Danny Wedding.) Recruiting colleagues and graduate students to join the Division is most helpful and each one of us can contribute here. I hope you will help with this!

Well, I hope I am leaving the Division in good shape! I have worked all year with a wonderful cast of Board members and Division leaders. I encourage you dear readers to consider getting involved in Division activities and leadership through volunteering or through the nomination and election process.

Thank you all for the great privilege of serving this important division!!

---

**Join Our New Facebook Group**

Media platforms like Facebook provide us with additional ways to build and maintain our network. Thus, Division 46 now is developing its own Facebook Group, “APA DIVISION 46.” You must be a member of Facebook to join this Group. Facebook membership is free, so there is no cost to network, ask questions, interact, and discuss issues that are relevant to Division interests such as Internet and media psychology. This differs from the Division listserv in that it can for some be a more appropriate place for discussions, since they stay between discussants, as opposed to involving everyone on the list. Please contact Joanne Broder Sumerson, Division 46 Membership Chair, at joannebroder@aol.com, if you would like more information.

---

**Please Vote on a Proposed Name Change for Division 46**

The Board of Directors of the Division of Media Psychology has recommended that the name of the Division be changed to “Society for Internet and Media Psychology (Division 46 of APA).” 2008 Division President Frank Farley in his Presidential Column in this issue of the *The Amplifier* has outlined the Board’s reasons for this change. Please indicate your vote, Yes or No, for this Bylaws Change and sign and mail the ballot to APA at the address below, to be received by February 17, 2009.

You can copy the ballot or tear it off.

VOTE: ___ Yes ___ No

Signature: ___________________________________ Print Name: ___________________________________

Mail to: Keith Cooke, Division Services, APA, 750 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20002

Thank You!
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