Midway through my year as President of our Division, I am pleased to report that we are making progress on a number of fronts. First and foremost at this time, the subcommittee on Branding has created a proposal for the name change of our Division that clarifies and accurately reflects our mission. You should already have received via email the information and ballot describing the change and the justification for it. It is also described in the box on this page. Please make sure that you send in your vote by July 18th, so that we may move forward on this important development. This name change will accurately reflect the broad range of activities in media psychology and technology that members of our Division have been involved in over the past several years. Hopefully, that will serve to expand our membership and revitalize our mission for all of us.

Speaking of our mission, one of the major aspects of that which I mentioned in my last Newsletter article is the area of media ethics. In this regard, we have started work on a Media Ethics Casebook and will continue to work on it throughout the rest of this year. If you are interested in contributing to this effort, please contact committee chairs Linda Berg-Cross or June Wilson, who have already begun to organize the project. More work needs to be done on this valuable and timely project, and we welcome your participation.

An important element of media ethics is civil discourse in all areas of the media. That will be the subject of my Presidential Address at the 2012 APA Convention. Our Past President, Pauline Wallin, and our President-Elect, Mary Alvord, along with a local journalist, will join me to discuss this important issue for our Division and for all of psychology. In working as a Presidential Trio this year, the three of us have been a living example of civil discourse in action. We have supported each other throughout the year on numerous topics, even when we disagreed. Our differences of opinion have only served to enrich our decision-making and contribution to the

Please Vote on the Proposed Name Change
Deadline for Receipt of Votes: July 18, 2012

The Board of Directors of Division 46 has approved changing the name of the division to Society for Media Psychology and Technology and changing the division bylaws to reflect this change (the name will be changed and the word “Division” will be changed to “Society” throughout the bylaws). Our bylaws require a vote of the membership for this to be approved. If approved by the Division 46 membership, the name change will subsequently be reviewed by the APA Council of Representatives and existing divisions before it becomes effective.

Please use the following link to vote:
https://app.icontact.com/icp/sub/survey/start?sid=1317&cid=864945

Justification for changing the division name to “Society for...”
1. The change to “Society for...” will enable us to be seen as an autonomous group rather than a division and will help us to attract affiliate members who identify professionally with Media Psychology but not necessarily with APA.

Justification for the change to “Media Psychology and Technology”
1. Although some of our members realize that Media Psychology includes technology (indeed, the Purpose statement in the Division 46 Bylaws highlights this), and technology has always been an integral part of Media, this concept has not been obvious to members of other divisions or affiliated professions.
2. Our past activities indicate how technology-oriented the Division has always been. Our members have been presenting symposia and papers on Media Psychology and the New Technologies for years and have been publishing articles and books and offering workshops in this area of interest.
   • In 1993, an article appeared in the Amplifier that discussed interactive media technologies and many technology articles have appeared in the Amplifier since then.
   • In 1996, the Division established a committee called Media and New Technologies.

(continued on p. 2)
**From the President**

(continued from p. 1)

Division. In that regard, we serve as a model of civil discourse. As a famous judge pointed out recently, civility is in the eyes of the beholder. We can’t rely on the government to regulate it. We must educate and regulate ourselves. Especially in this national election year, it is the responsibility of us as professionals to safeguard civil discourse in the media against media-induced polarization. Please join us at the Presidential Address and Panel Discussion on Friday, August 3rd at 4 pm at the Convention to explore this topic with us.

There are several other excellent programs being presented by our Division at the Convention. See the description of these events in this issue of the newsletter and in the convention program. Please also be sure to join us at our Business Meeting and Social Hour. I am pleased and proud to be able to present several well-deserved awards to our distinguished members at the Social Hour. Dr. Wallin describes some of them elsewhere in this issue of the newsletter. Thank you to all who nominated worthy individuals for these awards. We are proud of our members. Please keep nominating in the future. If you come to the Social Hour, you may also get to hear me sing a special song in honor of our Division. And join us as we continue the celebration at a lively restaurant across from the hotel.

I look forward to learning, celebrating, and sharing with you at the Convention and during the rest of this year. Best wishes.

---

**Bylaws Vote**

(continued from p. 1)

- The long-term standing committee Tele-health and New Technologies (originally called Media Psychology and New Technologies) was established in the mid 1990s.
- In 1999, the Division's membership brochure highlighted "Psychologists at the Forefront in Media and New Technologies.
- Most recently, in 2011 our Convention program featured symposia on such technology topics as "Innovative Technologies for Psychological Intervention, Consultation and Training," and "Psychological Services via Technology in Australia and the United States."  

3. We are not expanding our purview. We are instituting a name change to more accurately describe the scope of the Division as well as what our members do, to the outside world.

4. By making the implicit, explicit, those who are interested in what we do will be more likely to join our division.

5. By changing our name to reflect that "Technology," it will help to increase our collaboration with other societies/divisions within APA and relevant entities outside of APA.

6. The Society for Media Psychology and Technology is a unique name that is cutting edge, and more attractive to current and incoming members. Media has changed significantly since the Division began and the new name is more inclusive of members’ research and clinical interests (to date, 29 of APA’s 54 divisions have changed their title to “Society”).

---

**Inside This Issue**

We hope you will enjoy this issue with our regular columns, reports of member news and activities, film reviews, and articles from our colleagues and students. Among the highlights include articles by four of the 2011 Division 46 Award recipients: Frank Farley, Jonathan Grohol, Bernard Luksin, and Ryan Niemiec. You will also find interesting a response by Christopher Ferguson to Douglas Gentile’s article on Brown V. EMA Ruling (Amplifier, Fall/Winter 2011 issue) and a rejoinder by Douglas Gentile. Also included in this issue is the Division 46 program for the upcoming APA Convention in Orlando.

For our Bylaws and Meeting Minutes, please visit: http://www.apa.org/divisions/div46/newsletter.html

—Phyllis Koch-Sheras, President; V. Krishna Kumar, Editor; Kathryn Stamoulis, Associate Editor; Frank Farley, Consulting Editor; and Jillian E. Azorlosa, Student Editorial Assistant
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President-Elect’s Column

Focus on Technology: The Webcam

Mary Karapetian Alvord
malvord@alvordbaker.com

This year represents the 21st birthday of the webcam. It started back in 1991, when the first webcam was directed at a coffee pot in the Computer Science Department at Cambridge University. The motivation? Efficiency! One only needed to look at the image on his/her computer screen to determine whether the pot was sufficiently full to fill a cup and make it worth walking to the coffee room.

Seven years ago, I expanded my group practice and opened a second office across town. I wanted for us to remain cohesive – a challenge that would grow with 19 clinicians and 4 support staff. I also wanted to ensure that we used our time as efficiently as possible, and minimize travel time between offices. My IT consultant and I worked out several solutions. One involved installing a point-to-point T-1 line (different than an internet T-1 line) and one webcam at each office location. Since that time, we have upgraded and have added webcams in individual offices. Each month, our office invites a speaker to present a short CE program. Held via webcam, clinicians have the option of which office they wish to listen to and can interact with the speaker. The same is true with respect to staff meetings. The clinicians are able to save travel time and expense, affording greater flexibility to scheduling patients.

The webcam helps us with our clinical work, consultations, office practice, research, teaching, training, and supervision. What follows is not exhaustive. Rather, it provides an overview of some of the webcam’s uses.

Clinical and Consultation Work

Tele-health represents but one use of the webcam. Legal and regulatory issues are currently being clarified. Aside from these, face-to-face therapy via videoconferencing may reduce some barriers to health care and, perhaps, allow for a less threatening or less intrusive treatment. With webcam technology, for example, people who live in remote or rural areas, whose access to mental health providers or specialists is limited, can get treatment. The Veterans Administration has been providing treatment for PTSD, via video-conferencing with veterans across the country, for many years now. Other examples include continuity of care for established patients who, due to illness, injury, or sudden scheduling conflicts are not able, physically, to travel to the office. Or care for college students who are ‘in-state’ but who are far enough away such that they can’t travel.

Parent Child Interaction Therapy (PCIT) was developed using two rooms with a one-way mirror and headsets. The clinician is in one room while the parent and child are in the other. The clinician “coaches” the parent through the headset. Most psychologists do not have adjoining rooms with one-way mirrors. One solution? Rig up webcams in two offices and provide the parent with a headset through a phone system to communicate with the clinician. Another use—observe a child in his/her home. A less intrusive possibility is to activate the webcam in the home, at a set time, with the clinician able to observe from the office (or from another room in the house) and to be able to communicate with the parent.

Another possible use is for the individual diagnosed as a “hoarder.” The patient may not be willing to have the clinician come to the house. However, he or she might be willing to show the clinician a specific section of the “affected area.”

Webcam technology may be used in reducing barriers for patients who need interpreters. As an example, consider an individual who communicates with sign language. Or consider a person whose first language is not English and who might need assistance. In both of these cases, the interpreter can be patched in remotely, saving travel time and expense.

Research

Research is moving forward combining the webcam with assistive software. For example, webcams assist in research on attention and social relatedness. They can also aid those with physical disabilities by tracking gaze, eye movements, and facial expression recognition to advance keyboards and communicate.

Education

Universities are enabling students, who cannot attend a lecture, to tune in via webcam. Webcams at Georgetown University Hospital now link hospitalized children with their classrooms, teachers, and friends. Other universities are following suit.

Training and Supervision

Sessions recorded via webcam allow for immediate feedback from the supervisor (who might be in another room). At the University of Kansas, for example, doctoral internships require webcam recordings. Also, supervisors or content experts in remote locations can tune in and interact, thus providing feedback and education.

The webcam has become affordable, accessible, and useful for a wide variety of functions. Individuals, researchers, educators, and companies alike have become more creative in discovering new ways to put this technology to use. So, let’s celebrate technology to enhance and disseminate our work in the Media Psychology Division!
Billboards have a long history. According to F. Rolfe, their oldest use reportedly goes back 3000 years to Thebes in Egypt; apparently, they were used to announce a reward for the capture of a runaway slave. Since then billboards have come a long way, and in recent years gone smart.

Electronic developments have modified billboards from passive painted displays to dynamic digital interactive displays from multiple advertisers on one billboard. A Honda billboard in Dublin lets you watch the displayed car starting by sending an SMS text to a shortcode using your cellphone and download information. A McDonald’s billboard offers you free coffee, pie, or other items if you snap a picture of the item with your cellphone camera as it floats swiftly among other items. Another McDonald’s billboard lets you play pong using your smartphone. Lasting in the game for 30 seconds gets you coupons redeemable at the restaurant. I spotted one billboard that advertises itself as “monogamous,” perhaps looking for a long-term commitment and reflecting its owner’s intent for dedicated use by only one advertiser.

Billboards are universal—found displayed on highways, the sides of passing trucks, trailers attached to scooters, floating inflatables in the sky, and the inside and outside of buildings. Their diversity in varied forms reflects the true ingenuity of people who design them. Although their size, shape, and forms vary, they all contain just enough information to make a quick visual impact on the passerby, not unlike a semantic priming psychology experiment where you see a stimulus for only a few milliseconds. In fact, I can recall only a few of the many billboards that are on the 30-minute drive to the airport from my home. Yet, they seem familiar as I speedily pass them; clearly mere exposure is at work here.

Billboards do more than serve as ads for selling goods. They also enlist support for protests and causes, including those of political and religious nature. Indeed, the billboard is an influential social change tool, which can be used to inform and effect changes in attitudes, lifestyles, and fashions. Yet, they can also be very entertaining.

The APA resides in a beautiful building in Washington, DC. Perhaps a smart interactive billboard could be placed right outside it for people who walk by the building. Better still, a billboard could be strategically placed in the nearby Union Station for waiting passengers to learn from and enjoy. Perhaps some well-endowed psychology departments could install billboards in strategic locations on their campuses, such as the student union and/or library. A team of graduate students would probably enjoy managing such billboards. Many messages can be displayed during the day concerning how psychology is making a difference in the people’s everyday lives, including their mental and physical health. Messages can be about various psychological subspecialties and occupational possibilities. Links to the latest articles on the APA’s Monitor on Psychology can be put on billboards to be downloaded on smartphones for reading immediately or later. Smartphone activable links may be provided to videos on experiments demonstrating interesting phenomena in psychology or for soliciting support for such important causes as the petition against DSM-5 by the APA Division 32 Society for Humanistic Psychology. Using smart billboards may seem like a small step to make psychology public and to recruit support for important causes. Nevertheless, it is a very constructive one inasmuch as Lilienfeld (2012) notes, “Regrettably, Wood et al.’s (1986) 25-year-old conclusion that most laypersons have ‘virtually no understanding of the impact of psychology on their lives’ (p. 949) seem to hold today” (p. 122).

Reference
From the Associate’s Editor

Interview With Couple’s Therapy Start

Kathryn Stamoulis
kestamoulis@hotmail.com

As members of APA’s Division of Media Psychology, we are interested and invested in how psychology is portrayed in the media. Many of our members appear on television themselves, providing expert commentary and conducting therapy on TV. One of our long-time members, Dr. Jenn Berman, is quickly becoming one of the most recognizable psychologists on TV. She is the host and lead therapist on a popular new VH1 show, Couple’s Therapy (Wed 9 pm PST/EST 8pm CST), where she works with a group of 10 celebrities whose relationships need repair. Dr. Berman took some time away from her busy filming schedule and thriving private practice to give us an inside look at psychology on the small screen.

How did you get involved with VH1’s Couple’s Therapy?
I got a call from an executive producer at Irwin Productions who told me that he had seen my work and wanted to find a project we could work on together. He asked if I was interested in coming in and auditioning for Couples Therapy. I had seen Celebrity Rehab, one of their shows, and loved its honesty and grittiness. I could tell that this production company had a real understanding and respect for the therapeutic process.

They brought in two different couples for me to do therapy with on camera. Before my first session, the EP told me, “I will never interrupt you doing therapy. Take all the time you need to do what you do.” Right then I knew that this production company “got it.” They have kept their promise and have always put the therapy process before the production; this has allowed me to engage in deep, meaningful work and also created a safe environment for the cast as well.

What is taping like?
Doing this show has been like a dream come true. You know when you are with a client who is talking about an ex-boyfriend or mother for whom she still has unresolved feelings and you think to yourself that you wish you could bring that person into the session. Working with a great production company is like having a therapy fairy godmother. You can say, “I really need to do a session with her ex-boyfriend or his mother,” and they can make it happen. It is also amazing to be able to play back a fight for a couple and have them see how they really spoke to each other. Doing a show like this allows you to utilize tools that you would never have in your office that are incredibly helpful.

Taping can be extremely stressful and grueling, but also rewarding. I feel a great sense of responsibility for all of the participants. This is my chance to make a difference in their lives and to offer them a positive therapy experience. My goal is always for each person to walk away better for having had the experience. I am proud to say that I think that I accomplished that with this show.

How do your “normal” clients respond to your TV presence?
When people first come into my office I let them know that I do a lot of work in the media. I let them know that it may bring up feelings for them and that it is really important to discuss those feelings with me in session.

My television work brings up different feelings for different clients. As you know, the therapy relationship is very intimate. It can be very difficult to see your therapist sharing that kind of experience with another client. I think it is really important to normalize any feelings that come up so they can be processed in session. Some clients feel jealous, afraid they will be abandoned, or protective of me. Other clients think it is really “cool” and exciting. I am always prepared to talk about any feelings that come up.

Some mental health professionals believe it’s not ethical to showcase therapy on reality TV. How do you respond?
I understand and respect those colleagues’ opinions; however, I feel differently. To me, that is an outdated model. I don’t see anything wrong with consenting adults participating in therapy on a show. Often, doing therapy on television allows people who would never otherwise consider therapy to have a positive therapeutic experience. I still get emails from people I have worked with years ago telling me how our on-camera therapy sessions changed their lives. I also think that doing therapy on television is a great opportunity to bring therapy to the mainstream. I hope that this show helps open people’s minds to therapy and helps them to think differently, to develop insight and learn a few tools that they can bring to their own relationships. It is a shame when therapists dismiss legitimate work that is being done because it was done in a media format. The reality is that healing took place, tools were gained, life lessons learned, and communication skills acquired which is good enough for me.

Dr. Jenn Berman is in private practice in Beverly Hills. She is the host and lead therapist on VH1’s Couple’s Therapy. She has appeared as a psychological expert on hundreds of television shows. She hosts a daily call-in advice show called The Love and Sex Show with Dr. Jenn on Sirius/XM’s Cosmo Radio. She is the author of the LA Times best-selling books SuperBaby: 12 Ways to Give Your Child a Head Start in the First 3 Years and The A to Z Guide to Raising Happy Confident Kids. She is the co-author of the baby board book Rockin’ Babies. Dr. Jenn is also on the Board of Advisors for Parents magazine. She is the creator of the No More Diets iPad app. Visit her at http://DoctorJenn.com.
Dr. Suzanne Bennett Johnson, APA president, updated the Council on her three presidential initiatives: interdisciplinary practice and science, education, or public policy. Rather than voting on agenda items, members were requested to discuss the substantive issue of how technology will impact psychology and APA over the next decade. Council was provided with a background document developed by staff for its discussion. The discussion and recommendations focused on the use of technology more effectively between meetings to facilitate more timely decisions, streamline Council agenda, and increase decisionmaking speed. Also discussed were the use of social media in public education, the need to train psychologists in new technologies, the role of new technologies in data-sharing, and the creation of innovative psychology apps. The remainder of the two and one half days of the Council meeting was conducted in the usual manner.

Dr. Suzanne Bennett Johnson, APA president, updated the Council on her three presidential initiatives: interdisciplinary practice and science, attracting more early career psychologists to APA, and the obesity crisis in the US.

**Actions of Council**

- Approved funding for the continuing work on the APA/Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards/APA Insurance Trust Task Force for the Development of Telespsychology Guidelines.

- Approved a proposal to include an APA teacher affiliate member on the Board of Educational Affairs. Bylaws amendment will be put before a vote of the membership this fall.

- Rejected a proposal to eliminate the dues discount for APA members who are also members of the Canadian Psychological Association.

- Approved the elimination of the APA practice of invoicing members for back-year dues on the annual dues invoice.

- Approved forwarding to membership for a bylaws amendment vote that a member who has served as president shall not be eligible to serve as president-elect for a period of 10 years beginning immediately after the past presidential year. Council voted to approve sending pro and con statements with the Bylaw amendment ballot.

- Approved the addition of $14,400 in the 2012 Budget for one face-to-face meeting of the BEA Task Force on Psychology Major Competencies in 2012.

- Council voted to approve the 2012 Proposed Budget with total operational revenues of $105,172,100 and operational expenses of $104,893,900 with an operating margin of $278,200. Electronic Publication Licensing Revenues (2011) are growing (9%) while print products revenues are declining (-13%). Publications and Databases contribute approximately $80 million of revenue annually. The 2012 Membership Dues Revenue budget is assessed at $11.7 Million. This is down from $14.2 million in 2010.

- Approved a Division 54 journal: * Practices and Services Delivery in Pediatric Psychology.

- Approved an American Psychological Association of Graduate Students journal: * Translational Issues in Psychological Science.

- Approved that the Board of Educational Affairs shall consist of not fewer than twelve Members of the Association, one of which may be an APA Teacher Affiliate member.

- Adopted as APA policy the * Education and Training Guidelines: A Taxonomy for Education and Training in Professional Psychology and approved February 2019 as their expiration date.

- Adopted as APA policy the * Guidelines for Preparing High School Psychology Teachers: Course-Based and Standards-Based Approaches and approved February 2019 as the expiration date for the guidelines.

- The item “Seating the Four National Ethnic Minority Psychological Associations on Council” was withdrawn from the agenda.

- The item “Recognition of Psychotherapy Effectiveness” was withdrawn from the agenda. Melba Vasquez, PhD, provided Council with an update on the status of the item.

- Adopt the revised CARE Guidelines for Ethical Conduct in the Care and Use of Nonhuman Animals in Research as APA policy.

- Approved extending the contract with the International Union of Psychological Science (IUPsyS) through the anticipated completion of the International Classification of Diseases and Related Disorders (ICD) in 2014 and requested that the performance under the contract continue to be reviewed annually by the Board of Directors through the projected completion of the ICD revision in 2014.
Articles by 2011 Division 46 Awardees

Media Psychology: A Life

Frank Farley, PhD
frank.farley@temple.edu

Frank Farley received the Division 46 2011 Distinguished Lifetime Contribution to Media Psychology Award.

Probably my first contact with media occurred when I was about 4 or 5 years old. I was born and grew up in Alberta, Canada, and one day I decided I wanted to see the big world beyond our small house and immediate neighborhood. So I packed a little bag of treasures, figured a clever escape, finessing me dear old mum, and got on a bus nearby. I apparently had some money so paid to go to “the end of the line.” I think I may have said something about seeing my grandmother! Surprisingly, the bus driver let me on and at the end of the line I got off and started walking away in the direction out of town, a little blond-haired boy determined to see the world. The local radio stations had notice of my journey and a lost child all over the dial, and the bus driver seeing me disappearing alone down the road, went I understand to a phone booth (some of you will remember those!), and phoned the police, who found me well beyond the bus line, heading out of town, moving sturdily and confidently into the future! I was a media celebrity all over town, but of course one who had caused his beloved parents some major grief!

Since that first encounter with the media, I’ve found myself as an adult and psychologist quite enmeshed with it, either via media interviews or as a researcher studying media and writing about it. I now do many interviews, op eds, or other coverage in the media each year, and much of my research is directed at media issues. Some professional contributions have included being the only twice-elected President of the Division of Media Psychology, in 1999 and 2008, and being recipient of the Division’s highest award, the Award for Distinguished Lifetime Contribution to Media Psychology.

One of my favorite encounters with the media was when People magazine came to my university to profile my work on heroism. My two young daughters came with me to campus for the interview, and suggested I pick up a Superman t-shirt en route to the shoot. It resulted in my picture in People gazing up to the sky with my hands ripping open my dress shirt to reveal the Superman logo and tee beneath, psychologist as Man of Steel.

Over the years my scholarly interests have moved increasingly from the offline to the online world, and increasingly my doctoral students are doing their research there.

A long-time concern has been the quality of the psychology that gets into the media, all forms of media. This issue has in my view become a defining problem for the future of our field. Much of what the media reports as psychology is flawed or questionable, leading to invalid understandings by the public. The public needs to know that our science is reliable, valid, and applicable to their lives in one way or another if the media is going to report it. I have proposed The Seven Sins of Psychological Science Plus or Minus Two, researching this with a group of doctoral students, that involves the problems of small, unrepresentative convenience samples, almost total lack of direct replications, over-generalization, confirmation bias, file-drawer effects, etc. As noted, media is the conduit to the public understanding and use of our science, and things are messy these days on both the science and media sides. We can’t continue to be involved only in “Giving Psychology Away” when we also need to be involved in “Taking Some Of It Back!” So the Seven Sins Plus or Minus Two is one of my current intellectual adventures. It’s not flying a hot-air balloon over parts of China and Russia or whitewater rafting in the Andes, adventures of an earlier time in my studies of risk-taking and heroism. But it’s highly relevant to how media psychology can hold authentic value for the public, what I call public psychology, that is so important for the future of our field. I am still working extensively on risk-taking and heroism, and I’d like to close with a credo I try to follow, from one of my personal heroes, Helen Keller, “Life is a Daring Adventure or it is Nothing.”

I’m still pushing beyond the bus-line! Maybe I’ll see you there!

The Minefield of Social Media

John M. Grohol
docjohn@gmail.com

John Grohol received the Division 46 2011 Distinguished Professional Contribution to Media Psychology Award.

The Internet offers psychologists a wealth of opportunities as well as a minefield of potential conflicts, as virtually everyone online has embraced one form or another of social media—Facebook, LinkedIn, Pinterest, or Twitter. But just because patients and potential patients are online, you shouldn't be
dissuaded from embracing the opportunities offered by increasing your use of these tools.

I’m not talking about just putting up a website and calling it a day. With billions of websites available, such efforts are nearly always lost. Same with a LinkedIn profile, a Twitter stream, or a blog.

Today, being online means becoming more and more connected— with other professionals, with old colleagues and friends, and yes, even with your patients. Just as most people would consider it rude to not acknowledge a patient you run into at the local grocery, it may be considered by some to be equally as rude to not acknowledge social media invitations or requests.

This may be especially true for younger generations, who have grown up as connected with social media as previous generations were connected to the television or telephone. Where many see a distinct line between being online and being offline, teens and young adults see no differentiation—their online world is simply an extension of their offline world, and vice versa. Smart phones have further blurred the line, allowing people to connect to their online friends wherever, and whenever, they are.

Younger generations also look for and expect online social connections that reflect their offline ties. So while young adult patients “friending” their therapist may have not yet become the norm, it may be within a few years’ time.

This blurring of such distinctions can lead to unintended problems. Suddenly you get a friend request on Facebook from a young client. What do you do?

The solution to the awkwardness of engaging with people who are also your clients online is to simply head off the problem at the pass. For instance, Division 46 member Keely Kolmes, PsyD, has an excellent social media policy that can serve as a template for your own practice policies (noted in the Spring/Summer 2010 issue). Sharing a social media policy once you’ve implemented it, even for existing clients, can help deal with such issues elegantly.

Relationships and our social connections are only to get even more complicated online. Social gaming and interest-sharing are the latest hot online applications. While accepting a request from a client to play Words with Friends may seem harmless, it’s a choice you need to carefully consider—long before you get your first invite.

And what about past clients, who you no longer have direct access to, but who are imbued with the ordinary human curiosity that causes them to Google their old therapist to see how they’re doing? Once they’ve made contact with you for a friend request, game request, or sharing their Pinterest board, you can send them a brief but friendly email that explains how you interact with past clients, including an attachment of your social media policy. It could be as simple as:

Thanks for getting in touch with me and I’m glad to hear you're doing well. Due to the ethical guidelines for my profession, however, I don’t feel comfortable playing Words with Friends online with you. I hope you'll understand.

Furthermore, you can limit your visibility for social gaming applications (“apps”) and other social media. Familiarize yourself with Facebook's privacy settings (in the dropdown menu next to your name, under “Privacy Settings”) and take the time to customize each item listed on that screen. You may want to have a strict “No friending clients” clause in your social media policy, also helping to keep your visibility on Facebook limited to your actual friends and family.

Keep in mind that social gaming apps thrive on sharing and playing games with friends from other social networks (like Facebook). It’s helpful to be aware of this component going into them, because then you can understand why you may receive a “play this game with me” request from a client. They aren’t necessarily singling you out—it may just be the mechanics of the game.

It’s naive to believe that we can lead somehow separate lives online and offline. They are irretrievably intertwined, and will only get more so as more and more online services become available.

I don’t think this is necessarily a bad thing. However, clinicians do need to ensure they’ve considered this territory long before the first awkward incident resulting in unintended hurt feelings has occurred. Active management of your online profiles—no matter where they may be—is key, as is ensuring your clients are well-informed of your policies as soon as you’ve implemented them.

**Media Psychology: The Past is Prologue**

The work of the Division 46 Taskforce was completed during the terms of three Division 46 Presidents—Drs. Elaine Rodino, Irene Deitch, and Marion Gindes. Lilli and I interviewed and surveyed more than two hundred leaders in education, government, business and technology. The study’s findings helped to shape the vision and mission of Media Psychology Division 46 and validate potential career opportunities and importance of media psychology.

The eleven specific areas of application revealed in the 1998 study are:
The Amplifier

1. Writing or being expert guests in various media
2. Consulting with media personnel
3. Researching ways to improve media communications
4. Making new technologies more effective and user friendly
5. Using new technology to enhance the application and delivery of clinical psychology
6. Working in education or training
7. Developing media psychology standards
8. Working in commercial fields related to media
9. Studying media effects on society and psychology
10. Developing material for challenged and underserved populations
11. Working with deviant or criminal populations

In 1999 the study took me to Fielding Graduate University, where I was offered the opportunity by Psychology Dean Ron Giannetti to develop and teach their first course in Media Psychology. We expanded this in 2002 by launching the first MA and PhD programs in Media Psychology and an EdD program in Media Studies.

In 2007, Fielding partnered with UCLA Extension to start the first MA degree program in Media Psychology and Social Change. In 2009, at Touro University Worldwide, we moved forward again by launching the first MA degree program in Media and Communications Psychology with a PsyD program in Media and Communications Psychology now being readied to premier in 2013. In addition, a course in media psychology is now required in every master’s degree program offered by Touro University Worldwide. Related programs at other institutions have also emerged and I have had the privilege of working on some of them.

At the Media Psychology Division 46 board meeting on February 23, 2012, held at APA headquarters in Washington, DC, it was discussed and agreed that the time for Media Psychology is now. The acceptance of media psychology as an area of specialty is now acknowledged, opportunities have arrived, and a solid foundation for the future has been laid.

The board discussed that “the past is prologue.” The task force study’s results represent a milestone and we should look ahead to an important future for the field of media psychology and the division. The Media Psychology Committee has developed an exciting and significant program for the 2012 convention.

To describe the potential of media psychology in the future we should look at some current developments in the field that include:

• Increased inclusion of theories and courses in media psychology in university graduate programs.
• Significant growth and developments in online-based education that spotlight the need to understand principles of media psychology to optimize those programs and make them robust.
• Growing experimentation and progress in programs for telemedicine, telehealth, and teletherapy grounded in foundational theories in media psychology.
• Growing recognition of the importance of media psychology in media products, film, and television.
• Growing understanding of how media, psychology, and behavior are connected and their importance to communication.
• Application of theories and methods in media psychology in helping to enhance public understanding of important social needs by fostering a wide understanding of the implications of such social concerns as obesity, cholesterol, smoking, PTSD, autism and Asperger’s, and other health, family, and public policy concerns.

The future of media psychology is bright and the convergence of media, technology, communication, art, and science is transforming our world. With the proliferation of mobile devices and applications there is now opportunity for universities to include fresh approaches to help professionals prepare for emerging career opportunities. New positions are emerging within burgeoning media industries and there is an accelerating need for capable media programmers, solutions architects and highly developed practitioners of media psychology. These include writers, producers, programmers, engineers, designers, directors, artists, cinematographers, public relations and advertising specialists with the 21st century knowledge to perform their jobs with state-of-the-art understanding of psychology and its connection media.

My experience tells me that the study of media psychology is growing because of an increasing understanding of how specific theories, applied singularly and in combination, can make programs better and more compelling. Media psychology is an art and science with a future that will take us to new levels of artificial intelligence and help us to better understand the physical and emotional functions of the brain. Studies of behavior include expression, persuasion, sexuality, gender, cognition, learning, mastery, persistence, success, failure, and many more areas that may be applied directly to the production of programs through the use of media psychology. This knowledge also helps us to demystify and predict audience reaction to programs to a great degree. New academic programs will benefit from the inclusion of research from the field of media studies and from scholar-practitioners able to teach students how to integrate those theories into areas of education, commerce, public policy and government, and health care.
Coupling university programs to occupational applications is the way of the future but the concept is not new. Thucydides, author of The History of the Peloponnesian War, written in 431 B.C.E., synthesized what is now needed when he wrote:

A nation that draws too broad a difference between its scholars and its warriors will have its thinking done by cowards, and its fighting done by fools.

Media psychology is an important specialty that is central to the field of psychology and thereby, the work of the American Psychological Association, led by its Media Psychology Division.

The past is prologue. We are pioneers together sharing the opportunity to help shape a positive future for America and the world.
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Cinematic Elevation and Cinematic Admiration: Can Watching Movies Positively Impact You?

Ryan M. Niemiec
rmjn@sbcglobal.net

Ryan M. Niemiec received the Division 46 2011 Early Career Psychologist Contributions to Media Psychology Award.

Cinematic elevation occurs when the viewer observes a portrayal of goodness or a character strength, the viewer experiences the tingling and warming sensations of inspiration, and is motivated to do good. E.g., Ben Kingsley in Gandhi (1982) personifying a symphony of strengths of fairness, leadership, humility, hope, bravery, and perseverance.

Cinematic admiration occurs when the viewer observes nonmoral excellence in a character, feels physiological sensations relating to feeling energized and “chills,” and is motivated to improve oneself or copy the model. E.g., sport movies such as Rudy (1993) and Remember the Titans (2000), films about musical prodigies such as The Soloist (2009) and Amadeus (1984), and other types of genius and creativity as seen in The Social Network (2010) and Temple Grandin (2010).

Cinematic elevation and cinematic admiration may manifest in a number of ways after a viewer observes an inspiring character or theme from a movie. The viewer then becomes:

1. Motivated to copy the protagonist’s core strengths to improve oneself or help others. E.g., observing Andy Dufresne’s hope and perseverance in The Shawshank Redemption (1994) leads the viewer to use more hope and perseverance in their own life.

2. Motivated to express a strength or positive quality different from what was expressed in the film. E.g., observing the protagonist in The Artist (2011) express zest and enthusiasm for life, lose his zest, and then recover it again leads the viewer to not express the strength of zest but to express deeper gratitude for life.

3. Motivated to “do good” or improve oneself, however, specific action is not taken. Instead, the viewer has been primed by the movie and positive action may be taken at a later date. To support this point, I consider both Bandura (1977), who has noted that observed material is coded for future use, and Fredrickson (2001), who coined the broaden and build theory of positive emotions. This theory states that positive emotions broaden one’s responses in the moment and build resources for positive coping in the future.
For several years I led a monthly movie group that showed a popular or independent film followed by discussion of its key themes and life impact. In the moment, people reported feelings of inspiration. Years later when I asked people to name any positive changes they made that they believe were directly caused by a movie, I received a variety of responses. Some stated the movies had no memorable impact other than pleasure in the moment. Others spoke of latent effects where weeks after having viewed the film they were daydreaming and the movie popped in their mind and they replayed particular scenes and images that were positive. They seemed to relive parts of the film, e.g., replaying the scene in *Batman Begins* (2005) where the protagonist systematically faces his fear of bats through flooding; the random acts of kindness exhibited in *Amelie* (2001), or the outlandish story Guido tells to outwit a Nazi guard in *Life is Beautiful* (1998). The latent effects tended to have a positive but nonspecific effect on their day.

For other individuals, the movie prompted a short-term change, such as temporarily giving up alcohol after viewing *Tender Mercies* (1983) or *Crazy Heart* (2009). In other cases, a long-term change occurred in which the movie inspired and empowered a deep change that the individual sustained. Examples of the latter include a young man who viewed the Oscar-nominated documentary *Food, Inc* that the individual sustained. Examples of the latter include a young man who viewed the Oscar-nominated documentary *Food, Inc* (2008) and became a vegetarian, sustaining this change when queried a couple years later. An older woman shared that she viewed *All is Quiet on the Western Front* (1930) around the time it was made and immediately became a peace activist, which she maintained for over seven decades.

Probably any viewer can immediately come up with a handful of examples of their favorite films and in many cases the movie lead to a positive change that could be accounted for by cinematic elevation and/or cinematic admiration. Ultimately, there are more questions than answers about these processes. Until sciences bears out further findings, we the viewers can sit back, be inspired, and allow the positive effects of movies to impact ourselves and the people around us.

For over seven decades.
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**Rethinking and Thinking Again**

### Another Look at Brown v EMA: Rethinking the Science

Christopher J. Ferguson
cferguson@tamiu.edu

I enjoyed reading Doug Gentile’s essay on the Brown v EMA violent video game (VVG) case (*Amplifier, 2011* Fall/Winter issue) wherein the US Supreme Court struck down a law regulating the sale of VVGs and (in the majority opinion) repeatedly criticized the validity of the research field. While I respect Dr. Gentile and his opinion, I disagree regarding what it means for media psychology. We should indeed consider this event to be a “wake-up call” about our evaluation of this field, but one in which we are more conservative in recognizing the equivocal nature of the results and serious problems regarding validity and methodology.

It is worth noting that Brown v EMA is not an isolated event. Recent reviews of VVG research by the Australian (2010) and Swedish (2011) governments came to similar conclusions: The research is inconclusive and suffers many methodological flaws. Further, during the video game epoch, youth violence plummeted to 40-year lows (childstats.gov, 2011). Increasing longitudinal (e.g., Ferguson, San Miguel, Garza, & Jerabeck, 2012; von Salisch, Vogelgesang, Kristen, & Oppl, 2011) and experimental (e.g., Adachi & Willoughby, 2011; Przybylski, Rigby, & Ryan, 2010; Valadez & Ferguson, 2012) research questions links between VVGs and aggression. Taken together these three lines suggest it is time that we rethink VVG effects.

It is no longer possible to ignore methodological problems in much of the literature. Adachi and Willoughby (2011) and Przybylski et al. (2010) point to systematic failures to match video games carefully on variables other than violent content and how this introduced confounds (imagine comparing Modern Warfare 3 versus Tetris, for instance … aside from violence they differ regarding competitiveness, difficulty, story line, complexity of the controls, etc. … many experiments make similar uneven comparisons). We now know that unstandardized aggression measures which allow scholars to select among potential outcomes those that best fit their hypotheses inflate effect sizes. If one looks carefully through experimental studies using the “noise blast” test, for instance, it becomes evident that authors (even sometimes the same author) measured aggression differently using this instrument from one study to the next. Given that this kind of “methodological flexibility” (Simmons et al., in press) is being discussed as a problem for Type I errors in psychology, we should not ignore it as a problem in
VVG research.

Of course we might continue to debate the issue of VVGs and aggression (and no doubt Dr. Gentile and I will do so for the foreseeable future!) My point is that if there ever was an era in which scholars could claim that the evidence against VVGs was unequivocal, that era has now passed. Following Brown v EMA and the other unfavorable government reviews, I suggest that we reevaluate this field and downgrade our causal attributions (and certainly outlandish statements such as comparisons with smoking and lung cancer research) to something far more conservative than has been typical.

Moving Forward

The issue is that the media violence research historically experienced ideology and hyperbole stretching far back beyond my lifespan. The Sacks et al. (2011) article Dr. Gentile mentions comparing the Gruel and Millett amicus briefs in Brown v EMA is symptomatic. Written by two prominent signatories to the Gruel brief (Anderson and Bushman), the Sacks et al. paper purports to examine the “expertise” of scholars on the two sides and, by happy coincidence, finds that Anderson, Bushman, and their colleagues are the true “experts” (a colleague has joked that signatories to the Millet brief should add “expert” with airquotes on our business cards). Dr. Gentile did not mention the Sacks et al. paper has been analyzed by scholars not involved in either amicus brief and found wanting on both methodological and theoretical grounds (Hall, Day, & Hall, 2011).

To paraphrase their argument, that two signatories to the Gruel brief would declare themselves and their allies the “true experts” is neither surprising nor illuminating. Furthermore they appear to have miscalculated the expertise of the signatories to the Millet brief by not adequately including journals the Millet scholars published in. As one example, Constance Steinkuehler, an expert on the Millet brief, has authored 49 peer-reviewed publications, but only 9 would have been found by the methodology of Sacks et al. Despite being labeled a non-expert by Sacks et al., Dr. Steinkuehler has gone on to become the US Presidency’s leading expert on video games. I wonder if this is how we really want science to be done. Even if we accept the conclusions of “expertise” in the Sacks et al. paper at face value, it is no different than what we’d expect during a period of paradigm change which typically involves differences between older and younger scholars. For instance, in the 18th century a group of young medical doctors discovered that surgeons ought to wash their hands prior to cutting open patients, a revelation that was furiously attacked by the medical establishment at the time. Had the debate rested on the kinds of arguments advanced by Sacks et al. we would all still be dying in surgery in droves.

Arguably, the field has spent too long as two “sides” with each side trying to “win.” Dr. Gentile stated, “Psychological research demonstrates that we often let our biases influence our thinking and are not good evaluators of our motivations.” I couldn’t agree with him more … of course this is a sword that cuts both ways! I have always been concerned that the argument against VVGs in the psychological community was an emotional one, a problem exacerbated by the methodological flexibility which as Simmons et al. (in press) note “allows presenting anything as significant.”

Undoubtedly, we could debate this indefinitely with good points on both sides. With that in mind, I would like to invite Dr. Gentile and all of Division 46 to work together to make the debate fun, educational and illuminating. Too often it has been vicious, ideological, and ad hominem. This will inevitably require learning to respect the opinions of those on the “other side” and, of course, fundamentally acknowledge debate and evidence from both sides. It’s normal and healthy that scholars will try to argue their “case.” But to the degree we can agree to disagree I believe the entire field will benefit.
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Dr. Ferguson’s essay (Amplifier, this issue) on rethinking the science has many excellent points. Most notably, I think it is critical that scientists focus on methodology when examining the literature and that there is always room for methodological improvement. I also think the tone of the “debate” is a similarly critical issue. The acrimony that has sometimes accompanied both scientific and non-scientific discussion on this topic is driving several talented scholars out of the field, which can only be a serious loss for media psychology. This is particularly distressing to me because the differing points of view both have merit, and in general, I think neither is “right.” Instead, the areas of disagreement are areas that beg greater examination, both of the science and of the rhetorical approach used to describe the science. I therefore take the liberty here to examine some of the areas that Dr. Ferguson has noted.

When stating apparently contradictory evidence, it is important to examine the nature of the contradiction and the assumptions on which it rests. For example, he notes that recent reviews by the Australian and Swedish governments conclude that the research “is inconclusive and suffers many methodological flaws.” One critical assumption is that these reviews were independent, thorough, and unbiased by either prior beliefs or influence from the video game industry. My reading of these reviews suggests that none of these assumptions are correct. For example, although there certainly are studies with methodological flaws demonstrating what we might call an aggression effect, the studies that don’t show such an effect also have flaws—but the reviews do not review the studies equally critically.

The described link between video game violence and criminal youth violence rates rests on an assumption that correlation implies causality, or at least should represent a link if it exists. Dr. Ferguson and others rightly criticized people who used these statistics when youth violence was increasing, but now that it is decreasing, now they use it. There are many reasons no one should be using this statistic, no matter what it shows. One reason is that there are hundreds of factors that come together to influence youth violence (e.g., laws, the legal system, number of police on the streets, the economy, genetics, etc.), and therefore the violence rate will never be sensitive to any one factor. It is also a straw man argument—media violence researchers do not argue that violent video games should be related to youth violence. In addition, the effect is an individual psychological level, and youth violence is a societal or population level statistic. These are different levels of analysis, and it seems unfair to mix them without a clear theory of how they should be related to each other. We should retire this statistic, as it really is largely irrelevant to the studies that have been conducted.

I think the meatiest part of Dr. Ferguson’s essay is about methodological issues. This is a place where people of good conscience may disagree. For example, although I agree with Adachi and Willoughby (2011) that competitiveness is an important dimension to control, they are incorrect in their assertion that almost all other studies have ignored this issue. Anderson’s work, in particular, has usually controlled for competitiveness and several other dimensions, sometimes directly and sometimes indirectly. Similarly, my studies usually match games on about 12 dimensions other than violence, sometimes through pretesting, sometimes through post-hoc statistical control. Therefore, the recent studies noting that it is important to match games carefully do not call into question all of the prior work. Instead, they raise the bar to continue improving methods rather than invalidating what has been done to date.

Similarly, regarding the issues of “methodological flexibility” with the noise blast aggression paradigm, there is room for differing opinions. From Dr. Ferguson’s point of view, it seems he worries that different researchers or studies using it differently represents a serious problem. From my point of view, I am impressed with the robustness of the effect regardless of how it is used. These differing points of view, however, mask the real issue, which is that there often are valid reasons to use a given paradigm differently. It is not fair to assume that the methodological flexibility implies that researchers are just fishing for a way to find a significant effect. With my own use of this method, for example, there are times when the theoretically most interesting issue is the participants’ first response rather than all 25 (demonstrating an unprovoked behavior), sometimes it’s most interesting to look only at the number of high intensity blasts, sometimes it’s most interesting to look at intensity times the length of time it was delivered, sometimes it’s most interesting to look only at the trials following a provocation, etc. It is completely fair to expect that researchers should describe their choices and the theoretical reasons for them, and reviewers (in my experience) usually do pay attention to these issues. It is not fair to assume that different measures means invalid results. Again, in my studies, I usually find the effect no matter what way I measure it. Due to journal constraints, I usually can only report one approach and I pick the one that seems to tell the most accurate story or the one that fits the theoretical question I am concerned with for that study.

Regarding the Sacks et al. (2011) study (with which I was not involved), I think it unfair to belittle the results because they ultimately favor the authors. What I found interesting is that the analysis would be easily replicated no matter who did it. The fact that it missed some references is the nature of any literature search, but the search terms seemed reasonable, and the issue they raised was not really how many publications anyone has, but whether the signers had conducted empirical studies of media violence. What was at the heart of my argument was that when asked to take sides (as a court case requires), it is a good time to try to examine our own biases, especially if we have not conducted our own studies on a topic.
Ultimately, I believe that Dr. Ferguson and I actually don’t disagree nearly as much as we agree. Our foci are different. I believe that he cares most about criminal level aggression, whereas I care most about playground level aggression. The data are much weaker for criminal aggression than for low-level aggression, and we have both become convinced by our own data. We both cringe when people try to oversimplify the debate (although we have each been guilty of that too). I believe we agree about the size of the effect (somewhere between \( r = .10 \) and .20), but we interpret differently how important that effect is. Thus, the “debate” is really far less polarized and serious than it appears.

One place where I think we do disagree is whether different researchers want to “win” the debate. I think that almost all of the researchers in this domain are credible, serious scientists, who do what they should do – they conduct studies, interpret the results, and form conclusions based on the evidence they have. Dr. Ferguson notes that he has “always been concerned that the argument against [violent video games] in the psychological community was an emotional one.” I disagree with this assessment. I know almost all of the researchers in this domain, and most of them play games. Their reasons for caring about this issue are varied (some are aggression researchers, some are social psychologists, some developmental, etc.), but none has an emotional vendetta against games or media violence in general. Instead, they are dedicated researchers who understand that we learn from what we view and do, and want to understand how seriously parents should take this issue and what parents should do. What parents should do is a value judgment, and one about which people would disagree even if we agreed on all aspects of the science.

If my assessment that we agree far more than we disagree is accurate, then it is crucial to change the tone of the debate as Dr. Ferguson notes. As my father says, “There are two types of people in the world—those who divide the world into two types of things and those who don’t.” The science and the scientists are both more complicated than just being “for” or “against” the effects of violent games. Once we break out of this dichotomous approach to thinking about the effects, the science and the field will both benefit.

---

**From Our Film Critics**

**Time for a Hunger Games Videogame?**

*Christopher J. Ferguson*
cferguson@tamiu.edu

*Mary B. Gregerson*
oltowne@aol.com

The Hunger Games (HG), a story of a teen girl who must fight to death 23 other teens in an arena, currently enjoys top spots as a movie (Ross, 2012a), book (Collins, 2010), and CD (Ross, 2012b). How long until videogames appear? Technically already The Hunger Games: Girl on Fire (Saltzman, 2012) exists for the iOS (iPhone and iPad), with this fairly simplistic freebie commonly accepted as marketing. With cash gushing around HG, can a commercial videogame be far behind, and, in what form? How would society react? Since entertainment both reflects and contours society, social responsibility attaches to the production and consumption of such videogames (Gregerson, 2010).

For the uninitiated, HG is a young-adult novel (Collins, 2010) and movie (Ross, 2012) featuring a fair amount of teen-on-teen violence. Showing violence per se is nothing terribly new in entertainment. The HG movie version, for instance, is far less violent than Wrath of the Titans (Liesbesman, 2012; also rated PG-13) released a week later to no murmurings of controversy. But HG specifically features teen-on-teen violence. Although our culture’s moral arbiters sputtered smatterings of concern, the general public largely ignored the controversy, with producers raking in over $150 million dollars in the US in its opening weekend, an impossible feat without at least some parents bringing tots along. When inviting the senior author to write a commentary, *Time* magazine (see Ferguson, 2012) particularly inquired if he was bringing his own child to see the film (he did).

We know videogames more than movies come under an exacting scrutiny (see Ferguson, 2010; Gregerson, 2010). The imprudent, hysterical, and incorrect perspective that videogames are uniquely harmful to minors is only now evaporating; see reviews by Australian National Government, 2010; Brown v EMA, Swedish Media Council, 2011, all of which critique as methodologically unsound the research showing a videogame/aggression link. As Bennerstedt and colleagues (2012) point out, this field is plagued with *petitio principia* or “begging the question” in which the absolute certainty of videogames’ harmfulness drives the scholarly field to try to jam square data pieces through round theoretical holes. So how would an HG videogame version work without setting off the usual knee-jerk paroxysms?

First, hopefully any HG videogame version does not suffer the usual curse that most videogames made from movies are awful. Long stretches of the story go without any action. For example, it’s hard to make a compelling videogame out of the fashion travails Katniss must endure early in the story. Commercial videogame makers seem faced with the difficult choice of designing a videogame featuring teen-on-teen violence, or somehow altering the story and blatantly
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“caving” to the moral arbiters.

Should videogame makers refrain from making an HG game because some members of society will be morally offended? Naturally their moral concerns are framed as a public health issue, but let us remember that media issues tend to have more to do with moralization and culture wars than any legitimate public health concern (Ferguson, 2010). Moral outrage, not mental health, propels these objections.

To some extent it would be amusing to try a Lego: HG! Such a game would spin concerns on their head by turning HG into whimsical satire (giving a poke as well to HG pretentions to social commentary). Similarly the cartoon nature of the Lego series would highlight the absurdity that children are “harmed” by exposure to controversial material.

Perhaps more realistically, however, an HG videogame could follow the model set down by games such as Treyarch/Activision’s 2010 Call of Duty: Black Ops with their own pretentions to social commentary. Black Ops was, in some ways, the Apocalypse Now (Coppolla, 1979) of videogames, that is, a fun war game that doesn’t make war look fun. An HG videogame, safely rated T (Teen > 13 years) or M (Mature > 17 years), could similarly make an action-oriented game with a compelling storyline that nonetheless invites the player to consider the same social issues as the book. Such an approach has the advantage of a moral high ground … the automatic condemnations of such a game would be rather easy to reveal as reflexive and uninformed.

Of course many parents might allow a younger child to play a T- or M-rated game based on the HG (just like the many parents who elected to allow their under-13-year-old kids to watch the movie or read the book). And that’s fine. Ultimately it is optimal for the individual parent to decide what is best for their child, not the government or the American Psychological Association. The ratings systems are valuable as a form of information for parents but we go too far to insist parents are beholden to them.

Perhaps that will be HG’s contribution to our society: To compel reconsidering our reflexive bubble wrapping of childhood, and to encourage us to consider more sophisticated ways to interact with our children and the media they wish to consume. This can be done! Within hours of posting a positive psychology consideration of HG and heroine Katniss, psychologist Ryan Niemiec’s (2012) blog Character Strengths on the PsychCentral website received hundreds of hits. It’s refreshing when doing the right thing is also the popular thing.
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Jung and Freud in a Hollywood Movie? Repress It!

Frank Farley, Alison Bloomfield, Gina Forchelli, Brian Jeans, Laura MacMullen, Melissa Oyer, Maureen Ryan, & Deborah Seiple
frank.farley@temple.edu

We are students and professor (Farley) in a doctoral course at Temple University on History and Systems of Psychology/Know the Profession/The Great Psychologists. We of course cover psychoanalysis as part of the class, and biography and autobiography are a big piece of the course, so we leapt at the chance to see the recent movie A Dangerous Method when it appeared.

We had high expectations for A Dangerous Method. It is directed by David Cronenberg, a skilled director of such memorable films as The Fly, Scanners, and A History of Violence. The cast included Cronenberg favorite Viggo Mortenson (Freud), as well as Michael Fassbender (Jung) and Keira Knightly as Sabina Spielrein, who becomes Jung’s patient, and ultimately lover and professional
mentee. But this is a most atypical offering from Cronenberg, with an attempt to connect heavy theory with interesting characters and activities, an ambitious undertaking.

Let’s state at the outset that the movie is a psychological soap opera, that if the names of Freud and Jung were Dr. Smith and Dr. Jones, it would only warrant a soap opera’s attention. It’s an undisciplined presentation. Two of the most interesting minds of the 20th century seem to be missing here. Not much is learned about Freud’s new theory and therapy called psychoanalysis or Jung’s significant departures from it. Freud’s major emphasis is on sex in the theory and therapy as depicted, though the man himself is painted at one point as a relatively sexless person, despite the evidence of his fecund marriage and the possibility not noted in the movie that his sister-in-law Minna Bernays, living much of her life with his wife and him, was also his lover. Freud is also made to be a rather arrogant man, focused almost entirely on the promulgation of his own theory, speaking of “Our Movement” using the royal “our,” and being a candidate for confirmation bias. But Mortenson’s limpid portrayal, and the absence of much presentation of his psychoanalytic method, left little to be learned. A layperson would remember sex as central, but little more.

The main figures are Jung and his patient Sabina, and they, and Jung’s wife, define the soap opera. Keira Knightly does an over-the-top portrayal of a very disturbed individual, who Jung agrees to treat, via talk therapy, of which we learn little, both seated upright on chairs, he directly behind her (clearly rejecting Freud’s couch…), and ultimately engaging her sexually including extremely vigorous spankings replete with high decibel screams reflecting her own desires and source of sexual arousal based presumably in part on her own father spanking or beating her as a girl which she claimed aroused her greatly. One hopes Jung did not do this to many other patients, which would have certainly increased the collectively unconscious. Jung’s wife learns of this ongoing BDSM affair. One wonders if the movie should be more appropriately titled A Dangerous Therapist.

Jung’s orientation comes across rather incoherently for a lay audience, as some amalgam of spirituality, religion, paranormal or some shreds of psychoanalysis, or who knows what. One wonders whether his sexual contact with his patient was real or fictional. She got involved in his research, and begins to show amazing progress, almost unbelievable progress, ultimately getting well, going to medical school, becomes a psychiatrist, gets married and at the end of the film is pregnant. Her remarkable improvement remains a mystery. It is entirely unclear what led to her dramatic improvement, and Jungian therapy does not seem to be a credible candidate because we are shown so little of his work with her or of any possible influence of Freud. The movie closes not with Freud and Jung in some sort of interaction or more likely conflict, but rather Jung and Sabina, in love but parting for separate lives, almost suggesting that this is really a love story with these two interesting figures at the center, not being a docudrama about two of the most influential and provocative thinkers of the 20th century.

Soap opera, sensational psychodrama, elegant costume drama, true story or fiction?, generally boring, and unclear in the psychology and the therapeutic methods, this film does the fields of psychology and psychiatry no good. Indeed, it could be argued that it threatens the integrity of the discipline of psychology, let alone psychiatry. For the public this movie may reinforce any perceptions of an unscientific and unethical field. And it might have helped if the two famous principals, Freud and Jung, were presented as at least somewhat likeable, which didn’t happen. Lay viewers’ main memory will probably be of a famous therapist/shrink powerfully spanking his semi-naked patient as she screams in ecstasy. An unfortunate depiction, hopefully untrue, and best repressed! Our field gets very little marquee movie time from Hollywood, and when it does, we would like it to be authentic, ethical, understandable, comprehensible, and with perhaps some positive takehome about mental health and illness. Is that too much to ask? This film doesn’t do it.

**Nobility: The Descendants**
*(Director Alexander Payne, 2011)*

Mary Gregerson
oltowne@aol.com

In the 2011 movie The Descendants George Clooney’s award-winning portrayal of common Hawai’ian lawyer and family land trustee Matt King epitomizes noblesse oblige in an era and culture apparently absent of aristocrats. A descendant of the ancient ruling family and missionaries in Hawai’i, Matt himself has two descendant daughters. He must navigate their development within the shoals of their family life. These shoals start with a hospitalized wife, comatose after a boating accident off Waikiki which thrusts Matt into unaccustomed parenthood. Matt is now a single parent. Other riptides include a family clan eager for expedient rescue from their idle poverty by reaping an anticipated inheritance gleaned from selling an immense 25,000-acre Kaua’i landscape held in trusteeship by Matt’s family. Matt is the sole trustee.

Is doing the “right thing” ever easy? Beware, Matt King, of the costs of noblesse oblige. The French describe doing “the right thing” as noblesse oblige, or the aristocratic obligation to rise above personal reward to perform one’s duty to society. This obligation to “take the high road” typically rests upon those of higher social status.
Commoners serve themselves usually. In Robert Heinlein’s *To Sail Beyond the Sunset* (1988), the character Dr. Johnson queries:

> Does your common man understand chivalry? Noblesse oblige? Aristocratic rules of conduct? Personal responsibility for the welfare of the state? One may as well search for fur on a frog.

So, *noblesse oblige* embraces a double standard as the noble way is not the common self-serving way. What are the rewards of *noblesse oblige*?

Make no mistake—during the French Revolution the common self-serving rabble overthrew the high-minded aristocracy. Those steeped in *noblesse oblige* literally lost their heads. In another literary reference, Englishman Charles Dickens’s *A Tale of Two Cities* contrasts English and French *noblesse oblige* when dissipated Englishman Sydney Carton says:

> It is a far, far better thing that I do, than I have ever done; it is a far, far better rest that I go to than I have ever known.

Is Matt King’s civility about to override his own self-preservation? This film dips into Matt King’s life in modern day Hawai’i at the moment he faces family challenges and pressures both of a personal and national character. Matt must decide whether to withdraw life support from his wife. As sole trustee for his clan’s land trust he must also decide the fate of this 25,000-acre tract of beautiful Kaua’i land which reverts to eminent domain in only 7 years. The counterpoint between deciding these two family terminations reveals nobility infusing Matt. He must, and does, do “the right thing” in each instance—not always what he personally wants.

Make no mistake, Matt is human. When his eldest daughter Alexandra vituperatively alerts him that her coma-ridden mother Elizabeth cuckolded him, Matt’s clumsy, urgent run down the winding hill ends by him demanding of neighbors “Who is he?” Matt does not deny his human impulses; he simply fails to realize them into actions, or does he? He does stalk his wife’s paramour. Stalking is a punishable offense in many states.

Yet, all too human foibles and faux pas make Matt King likeable and identifiable to the typical viewer. Identification is key to entertainment that changes viewers prosocially (Singhal, Cody, Rogers, & Sabido, 2004). That his impulses are human is very important. He rises above them. Matt permits his wife’s paramour’s wife to pay final respects to his bed-ridden comatose wife. He repels the easy cash offered by land developers.

The story of Matt King’s nobility has garnered kudos from many corners. Clooney won a Golden Globe and was nominated for an Academy Award. Almost without his own involvement, Matt King’s nobility raises its crown. It’s in his blood. Yet what makes viewers most receptive to Matt King may be that very vulnerability of the “everyman.”

Redemption comes almost haphazardly in the *deus ex machina* of the wife’s lover being one of the local realtors that would benefit most from the outlanders’ land developers purchase of the King family land. Will this personal wedge compel Matt to halt the pell-mell intrusion of land developers into this pristine land trust? Such “serendipity” Jung (1952) would call synchronicity, or the meaningful confluence of seemingly unrelated events. Is it only by such divine plot intervention that noble action overrides Matt King’s own humanness result?

Some might say kismet. Others might say dumb luck. Whatever one calls it, the character Matt King has it. King leads. The power of ancestry, of progeny, and of attachment to land conveys tangibly in *The Descendants*. Through history, today determines the future.

References


Join the Division 46 Listservs!

Looking for a forum to join with others interested in a dialogue about Media Psychology issues? Join the listservs by sending an email to listserv@lists.apa.org and typing the following in the body of the note: subscribe listservname

Insert the name of the listserv you want to join. Write a separate note for each one.

`div46announce` — news from division leadership
`div46-mediapysch` — discussion among members
`div46research` — research forum

You may also join and manage listserv subscriptions via the site http://listserv.apa.org/. You must be either an APA or Division 46 member in order to join.

Florence Kaslow (Florrie), a Past President of the Division, will be delivering the opening plenary address at the International Family Therapy Association’s 25th annual Conference/20th World Family Therapy Congress in Vancouver, British Columbia on March 21, 2012. She is also doing a one-half day invited Super Saturday workshop on Divorce Around the World. Florrie is editor of the Division’s book series and is open to receiving proposals for additional books.

Bernie Luskin has announced that Touro University Worldwide has established the practice of including a course in Media Psychology in all graduate degree programs in the university. It has been agreed by the faculty that media psychology is a 21st century subject to which all graduate students should be exposed. In addition, TUW has launched an MA degree program in Media and Communications Psychology. The rationale is that all media manifests its effectiveness through communication and is based on an understanding of media psychology. These programs are examples of the way media psychology is expanding across the curriculum and being included in new degree programs based on the recognition of its importance.

Toni Luskin, PhD, has been appointed chair and professor in the Media & Communications Psychology MA degree program at Touro University Worldwide.

Dr. Thomas Plante organized a national conference entitled Sexual Abuse in the Catholic Church: A Decade of Crisis (2002-2012), on Friday, May 11, 2012 at Santa Clara University. Dr. Plante and Dr. Kathleen McChesney (former FBI and U.S. Conference of Catholic Bishops’ Office of Child Protection executive) served as editors on a recent book project on this topic. Event details are available at http://www.scu.edu/cpd/clergyconference/

Dr. Danny Wedding, the California School of Professional Psychology Associate Dean for Management and International Programs, has been invited to present on “Movies and Bipolar Disorders” at the 12th International Review of Bipolar Disorders, May 21-23, 2012, in Nice, France. The talk will be based on Dr. Wedding’s book *Movies and Mental Illness: Using Films to Understand Psychopathology*, coauthored with Ryan Niemiec and Mary Ann Boyd. Danny and Ryan are currently working on the 4th edition of this book and welcome nominations by Division 46 members for films to be discussed in the new edition. Dr. Wedding will also be presenting on films and psychopathology at the 2012 International Congress of Psychology in Cape Town, South Africa in July.

Gregory F. (Greg) Zerovnik, EMBA, PhD, took over as Director of Business Programs at Touro University Worldwide in May 2011.

---

**Join Our Facebook Group**

Media platforms like Facebook provide us with additional ways to build and maintain our network. Thus, Division 46 has developed 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 at joannebroder@aol.com if you would like more information.
From Awards Committee Chair:
Congratulations to Division 46 Award Winners

Pauline Wallin
drwallin@drwallin.com

Every year we recognize outstanding members of our Division. Here are the current winners, along with highlights of their accomplishments.

Distinguished Professional Contribution To Media Psychology:
Elizabeth Carll, PhD

- Established the Division 46 Committee for an APA Resolution on Violence in Video Games and Interactive Media, which was subsequently adopted by APA.

- Testified before the New York State Legislature, the U.S. Congress and regional legislative bodies on mental health and media issues.

- Established the Disaster/Crisis Response Network of the New York State Psychological Association in 1990, the first statewide volunteer network in the nation and the only disaster response network to include a media outreach component from the inception. Also developed the first electronic database to include specific skills of volunteer psychologists, such as language proficiency and trauma experience.

- 2003 U.N. World Summit on the Information Society (WSIS): Served as the only mental health professional participating on the drafting team for the civil society outcome document and Declaration. Successfully lobbied to include language for global access to mental health information and services via traditional and newer information and communication technologies (ICT), and continues to advocate internationally regarding access to mental health information via media and ICT.

- Developed the APA Public Education Campaign in the New York State Psychological Association, which evolved into the number one in the nation, based on the number of news interviews and community talks given by NYSPA members.

- Work with the United Nations: Founded and currently co-convenes the Media/ICT Working Group of the U.N. NGO Committee on Mental Health. Participated for five years on the Media Committee and the Internet Committee of the U.N.

- Interviewed and quoted by major news media to help the public cope with the psychological aftermath of crises, disaster, and world events.

Media-related publications:


**Distinguished Lifetime Contribution to Media Psychology:**
**Philip Zimbardo, PhD**

- World-renowned spokesman for psychology and how to apply it in our lives.
- His extensive bibliography includes 50+ books and 400+ professional and popular articles and chapters. His user-friendly writings span topics including shyness, persuasion, cults, madness, violence, vandalism, political psychology, and evil.
- His Stanford Prison Experiment is being made into a movie.
- Wrote, narrated, and hosted a ground-breaking public television series of 26 episodes, *Discovering Psychology*. It has aired nationally on PBS and internationally in 10 countries (from 1989 to present) has been seen by millions of students and general public. He now regularly leads Skype lectures to classes around the globe, most recently in Lebanon and Russia.
- Was chief Scientific Advisor to the London-based TV show *The Human Zoo*.
- His 4 TED talks (ted.com) have been viewed by millions, and his animated lecture on *The Secret Powers of Time* has been viewed by more than 2 million people worldwide.
- Established PsychologyMatters.org for the public (now folded into the APA website) to document the ways in which psychological research, methods, and theories have had significant practical applications.
- Division 46 Fellow, Past President of APA

**Early Career Scientific Contribution to Media Psychology:**
**Dana Klisanin, PhD**

- PhD 2003 in Psychology from Saybrook University, San Francisco
- Founder of Evolutionary Guidance Media R&D, Inc., a research organization focused on exploring the social and psychological impact of new media on individuals and society, particularly its ability to promote pro-social aims and facilitate the emergence of planetary consciousness
- Pioneered research in the area of “digital altruism,” exploring the idea that people conscientiously and repetitively engaging in this behavior are harbingers of a new form of heroism.

**Media-relevant publications:**

News Media, Public Education, Public Policy Committee Report

Jerri Lynn Hogg, Chair
hoggjl@aol.com

For 2012, the News Media Committee has a few projects currently in process to continue to promote excellence in the reporting of psychological information and research and to develop programs and helpful information for Division members concerning news interviews and media issues.

In recognition of the importance of news reporting to benefit the public, the News Media Recognition Award for excellence in the reporting of psychological information and research was launched in 2002 by the News Media, Public Education, Public Policy Committee. The recipient of the 2011 News Media Recognition Award was Kelly Kennedy, health-policy reporter with USA Today.

At the time of this writing, nominations are being evaluated for the 11th Annual News Media Recognition Award which will be presented at the 2012 APA Convention.

A symposium for the 2012 APA Convention on News Media and A Psychologist’s Guide to Working with The Media has been organized by the Division 46 News Media Committee.

We would like to thank the members of the News Media, Public Education, Public Policy Committee for their ongoing work and participation.

Committee members for 2012 include Jerri Lynn Hogg, chair; Elizabeth Carll, founder; Mary Alvord; Linda Berg Cross; Sharon Brennan; Helen Friedman; Pamela Rutledge; Paul Scheinberg; June Wilson; and Bernie Luskin.

Media Watch Committee: A Report From the Movie Domain of the MWC

Jeremy Clyman
clymanj@gmail.com

To what degree does our understanding of mental health/illness come from movies? Research has yet to offer a definitive answer to this question, and yet it is clear that we live in a world in which film is a dominant source of information. Consequently, our vision of mental health practitioners, our impression of pathological disorders, and our grasp on psychological concepts are all very much informed by what we watch in theaters—whether we’re aware of it or not.

And if we were to frame our movie-watching experience as a learning process that informs our beliefs about the mental health industry then we might have cause for concern. After all, filmmakers are rarely trained psychologists, and most viewers are not informed consumers of psychological research. Thus, the risk for misinformation, inappropriate stereotypes and other forms of counter-productive information is high.

The Media Watch Committee (MWC) tracks, examines, and disseminates information about films that make significant comments on psychological issues. The MWC notes what themes of mental illness and positive psychology exist in the narrative, particularly portraits of mental health figures, and discusses the accuracy and value of these ideas. The MWC seeks to applaud high-quality films that accurately and insightfully discuss such phenomena, while providing a reality-check on films that relay stigmatizing or misleading information.

Some 2011-2012 films that have already made it onto the MWC radar include: Young Adult (borderline personality disorder), Martha Marcy May Marlene (the psychology of cults), The Grey (resilience), The Hunger Games (bravery/courage; see discussion here), and We Need to Talk About Kevin (conduct disorder).

To varying degrees these movies jump start important discourses on psychology, which the MWC strives to shape in maximally effective ways. For instance, We Need to Talk About Kevin is about a troubled teen who engages in a tragic and bloody high-school shooting spree. Kevin seems to suffer from Conduct Disorder. Commenting on this film allows us to highlight some important truths about this disorder (i.e., there is a strong biological component to the disorder) as well as some sensationalized myths (i.e., that the disorder is immune to intervention). The MWC also actively examines the various functions that movies serve. We Need to Talk About Kevin, for instance, reflects our societal concern with school shootings and makes empirically validated comments on predictors/risk factors for violence.

A movie like Young Adult serves a different function that more directly links to the world of psychotherapy. By creating a nuanced portrait of a young woman suffering from symptoms associated with Borderline Personality Disorder, viewers have an opportunity to learn about the disorder’s complexities and perhaps develop a more empathic stance toward this unique form of emotional suffering. And although this film does not show a psychologist or “treatment” figure, the film notes triggers (e.g., invalidating parents) and curative mechanisms (e.g., the development of a loving, trusting friendship).

The MWC will continue to aggregate and disseminate data with the goal of making movies a useful and entertaining tool for consumers and practitioners of mental health.
Happy Spring! I hope you are doing great in every way. It’s that time of year again when we map out itineraries and plan meetings for the annual APA convention in Orlando, Florida. I will be there and hope to meet and reconnect with you!

The Executive Board of Division 46 aims to meet the needs of individual members. Two years ago, the Division administered a Membership Satisfaction Survey to our members. Based upon the feedback, we are adding more opportunities for members to learn, network, and share their expertise. More information regarding all of these exciting opportunities are forthcoming.

The data from the Division 46 Membership Satisfaction Survey revealed that members supported the idea of a scholarly journal in media psychology. APA has since launched its newest journal, Psychology of Popular Media Culture, which was founded by James C Kaufman (Editor), Division 46 member and President of Division 10, and me. This interdisciplinary journal publishes scholarly papers on how popular culture and general media impact individual, group, and system behavior. Media psychology and popular culture have such a strong presence in our lives that this journal has a little something for everyone.

The inaugural issue, which is currently available, features articles on topics that impact us in our roles as psychologists, parents, educators, and everyday people. We learn more about Facebook users through an extensive literature analysis by Anderson, Fagan, Woodhutt, & Chamorro-Premuzic (2012) as well as the relationship between Facebook users’ personality traits and online behavior (Ivcevic & Amabady, 2012). Mayer and Leichtman (2012) highlight the application of ethics as psychologists in the event we offer our opinion to the public. In addition, this issue includes three articles about how the media influences behavior, such as the perception of presidential candidates (Hehman, Graber, Hoffman, & Gaertner, 2012), young men’s communication styles (Ben-Zeev, Scharnetzki, Chan, & Dennehy, 2012), as well as youth and video games (Gentile, Swing, Lim, & Koon, 2012).

The articles in the upcoming second issue continue to bridge the gap between empirical data and real life. The studies featured in this issue heighten our understanding about the quality of social networking relationships (Davila, Hershenson, Feinstein, Gorman, Bhatia, & Starr, 2012), patterns in movie ratings (Simonton, Graham, & Kaufman, 2012), media biases (Babad, Peer, & Hobbs, 2012), cell phone use and reading proficiency (Hofferth & Moon, 2012), as well as the influence of video games on delinquent attitudes (Fischer, Aydin, Kastenmüller, Frey, & Fischer, 2012).

Psychology of Popular Media Culture is now available online and in print. Use your member journal credit and subscribe today! In addition, the journal is currently accepting manuscript submissions and expanding the editorial board. For more information, go to www.apa.org/pubs/journals/ppm/ or email any questions to me at joanbrodersumerson@gmail.com.

Do not forget that Division 46 also has a Facebook group for students, called APA Media Psychology Division 46 Student Committee. Our student members are our future leaders so it is essential that we connect and mentor them. Please support this group by liking it on Facebook. Psychology Today bloggers learned that this group’s Wall is a great place to post the links to their latest blogs.

Finally, APA Division 10, The Society for the Psychology of Aesthetics, Creativity, and the Arts, is offering our members a free membership in Division 10 for one year. Division 10 is committed to interdisciplinary scholarship encompassing the visual arts, poetry, literature, music, and dance. Their three main interconnected topics are creativity (including developmental, motivational, affective, and cognitive processes), the arts (including aesthetic content, form, and function), and audience response to the arts (including preferences and judgments).

I look forward to seeing you in Orlando!
The 2012 Division 46 Convention program theme focuses on social media and technologies for the psychologist. This year’s program includes topics in emerging technologies for the psychologist such as using social media in mental health education and augmented reality as a change agent; using diversity of films, narrative media, and transmedia storytelling for personal growth and mental health; humanizing technology and understanding the relationships; making media that matters; and guiding psychologists on how to effectively communicate mental health issues using media with traditional and social media channels. Dr. Koch-Sheras in her Division 46 Presidential Address will challenge the viability of Ethics and Civil Discourse in the Media.

The final program includes a variety of symposiums, a conversation hour, a skill-building session, and a research robust poster session with 41 posters in all. Awaiting the final assignment it appears several of the sessions will be identified for continuing education and possible APA Presidential track additions. We are looking forward to a great convention and seeing you all in Orlando.

**THURSDAY, AUGUST 2**

**9:00 AM-9:50 AM**
*Symposium: Psychology in Emerging Technologies: Social Media, Augmented Reality, Social Change*
Chair, Jerri Lynn Hogg; Participants, Michael Neal, Sean Thoennes, Shane Pase, Leah Smeenk Enrique

**10:00 AM-11:50 AM**
*Symposium: Psychological Diversity in Film*
Chair, Ryan M. Niemiec; Participants, Danny Wedding, Stephen Dine Young, Patricia R. Owen; Discussant, Ryan M. Niemiec

**12:00 PM-12:50 PM**
*Symposium: Effective Use of New and Social Media in Increasing Mental Health Education and Awareness*
Chair, Jina Carvalho; Participants, Lisa A. Firestone, Jina Carvalho; Discussant, Mary Gregerson

**1:00 PM-1:50 PM**
*Symposium: Heroism Now and Media That Matters*
Chair, V.K. Kumar; Participants, Frank Farley

**3:00 PM-3:50 PM**
*Board Meeting*
Jaime L. Rice, Fran C. Blumberg, Noreen A. Stewart

Emotion and Control As Determinants Between Social Media and Mainstream Media As Online Platforms for News
EunRyung Chong, John E. Newhagen

Practiced, but Not Perfect: Multitasking Frequency and Skill Within the Net Generation
Mike Kersten, Mark Carrier, Larry D. Rosen, Murat Arikan

College Students Tethered to Parents via Cell Phones: Does It Influence Adjustment to College?
Samantha L. Gray, Christi L. Culpepper, Nicholas Bishop, Rachel M. Holmes, Deborah P. Welsh

Sex Based Differences in Emotional Reactions to Playing MMORPGs
Toni Richardi, Jessica L. Ketterer, Benjamin Greenberg

Education and Personality As News Filters: The Agenda Setting Hypothesis
Miriam T. Aparicio

Institutional Identity and the Role of Gender As News Filter
Miriam T. Aparicio

Facebook and Pornography As Predictors of Relational Outcomes
Brianne L. Friberg, Leonard Hanson, Michelle Brown

The Beat Goes On: Exploring Messages on Adolescent Sexuality in Hip Hop Music
Jill S. Castro

Professionalism and Social Networking: Implications for Psychologists
Sabina R. Glab, David Renjilian

Body Image and Reality TV Consumption: College Student Reactions
Gina Roussos, Roger D. Klein, Elaine N. Rubinstein

Analyze This: Ethical Behavior of Mental Health Clinicians As Portrayed in Film
Allison P. Otto, David P. Borsos

College Student Opinions About Video Games, Television, and Parental Behavior
Gabriela Huffman, Roger D. Klein, Elaine N. Rubinstein

Online Self Disclosure: The Role of Synchronicity, Time, and Relationship Context
Melanie Nguyen, Andrew J. Campbell

Redefining Documentary Practice: Media, Strategies, and Impact
Beth Karlin

Risky Business: How Going Online Changes Your Risk Taking
L. Mark Carrier, Ludivina Vasquez, Alexander O. Spradlin, Larry D. Rosen

Presentation of Self in Face to Face and Virtual Environment
Ramezan Dowlati

Conceptualization: Smart Technology Restricting the Democratic Deliberation of the Poor
Timothy P. Cross

Trait Reactance Moderates the Impact of TV Viewing on Adolescents’ Beliefs About Drinking
Dale W. Russell, Cristel A. Russell, Wendy Boland

Cyberbullying and Self Esteem in Mexican Adolescents
Patricia Martinez Lanz, Mariana Blanco Montoya, Ana Maria Colinas Fuertes, Rachel Sayag Beso, Monserrat Villa Fernández

10:00 AM-11:50 AM
Symposium: The Tumultuous Relationship Between Athletes and the Media
Chair, Mitch Abrams; Participants, Mitch Abrams, Glenn Pfenninger, Jon Weislow; Discussant, Stephanie Shields

4:00 PM-4:50 PM
Presidential Address and Panel Discussion: Ethics and Civil Discourse in the Media: An Oxymoron?
Chair, Phyllis Koch Sheras

5:00 PM-6:50 PM
Social Hour

SATURDAY, AUGUST 4

11:00 AM-12:50 PM
Invited Address: Psychologist’s Guide to Working With the Media
Chair, Pamela Rutledge; Participants, Mary Alvord, Elizabeth Carll, Jerri Lynn Hogg, Pamela Rutledge, Linda Berg-Cross

1:00 PM-1:50 PM
Symposium: Twitter As Parasocial Interaction
Chair, Sharon Brennan; Participants, Gayle S. Stever

SUNDAY, AUGUST 5

10:00 AM-11:50 AM
Symposium: Portrayal of Psychology Across Media Forms
Chair, Ryan M. Niemiec; Participants, Michelle E. Ronayne, Christopher J. Ferguson, Susan Birne Stone; Discussant, Phyllis Koch Sheras

11:00 PM-11:50 PM
Symposium: Blogging, Popular Press Writing, and Self Publishing
Chair, Daniel J. Tomasulo; Participants, Linda Sapadin, Daniel J. Tomasulo
Protecting You and Your Practice is Ours

Whether you're providing psychological services independently or with a group, you can be confident that Trust Sponsored Professional Liability Insurance* will be there when you need it most.

The Trust Program is closely monitored by psychologists with insurance expertise and independent insurance experts to ensure that coverage is customized for the profession and keeps pace with evolving areas of practice… and risk.

Program benefits include free Advocate 800 consultations, ethics and risk management continuing education seminars, premium discounts, and more.

Apply Today!
Get answers, check rates, and apply for coverage at www.apait.org, or call us at 1-877-637-9700.

* Underwritten by ACE American Insurance Company, Philadelphia, PA. ACE USA is the U.S.-based retail operating division of the ACE Group headed by ACE Limited (NYSE: ACE) and rated A- (Superior) by A.M. Best and AA- (Very Strong) by Standard & Poor’s (ratings as of July 22, 2011). Administered by Trust Risk Management Services, Inc. Policy issuance is subject to underwriting.
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