Fifty years later: What have we learnt from the 1964 Kitty Genovese tragedy?

What is the moral legacy of the Catherine "Kitty" Genovese murder, 50 years later? It was back on March 13, 1964 at 3 am that petite 28-year-old Kitty repeatedly screamed for her life when she was brutally attacked on her way home, but none of the reported 38 neighbors who heard Kitty’s screams so much as phoned the police, as the psychopath brutally sliced Kitty to death in two attacks over an excruciating half-hour. The neighbors’ inaction was so inexplicable that New York Times Editor A.M. Rosenthal was moved to write his classic book, Thirty-eight witnesses, which transformed Kitty’s tragedy from an unreported incident to a front-page headline around the world— that still impacts our society a half-century later.

In his book, Rosenthal asked a series of behavioral scientists to explain why people do or do not help a victim and, sadly, he found none could offer an evidence-based answer. How ironic that this same question was answered separately by a non-scientist. When the killer was apprehended, and Chief of Detectives Albert Seedman asked him how he dared to attack a woman in front of so many witnesses, the psychopath calmly replied, "I knew they wouldn’t do anything, people never do" (Seedman & Hellman, 1974, p. 100).
Fifty years later: What have we learnt from the 1964 Kitty Genovese tragedy?

Though Ms. Genovese surely felt horribly alone and unheard that final night, it is hard to overestimate the immense and diverse impacts her unanswered cries have had on western society: the national 9-1-1 phone system, victim services, rape prevention, community self-help groups, Guardian Angels, Good Samaritan and duty-to-aid legislation, anti-stalking programs and, of course, new research in the behavioral sciences. Thanks to Thirty-eight witnesses, Kitty's tragedy is now part of our popular culture, as even those not yet born in 1964 know of the "38 witnesses" and the "Kitty Genovese syndrome." Any social psychology textbook is incomplete if it omits the "bystander effect" and the Genovese tragedy.

“Any social psychology textbook is incomplete if it omits the "bystander effect" and the Genovese tragedy.”

Now, looking back 50 years later, we see at least four ironies about this Genovese tragedy, and its moral implications for society today.

1. Known yet unknown. As the Times has often reported, Kitty has become an icon recognized around the world, and her name is cited each time a person is not helped by inactive onlookers. Moreover, for years, journalists and scientists have meticulously examined those final minutes of Kitty's life. Yet at the same time so much is unknown, and new facts continually emerge about her tragedy. In March of 2014, two new volumes by Kevin Cook and Catherine Pelonero examine the same case and reveal dramatically different conclusions about her death. And what do we know about the first 28 years of Kitty's life? In a nation full of talented authors, it is simply inexplicable that it took 50 years to see the first biography in 2014, of this mysterious young woman with the soulful eyes looking at us in that 1964 Times "mug-shot" photo.

2. Common yet unique. Thanks to Thirty-eight witnesses in 1964, we quickly learnt that the Genovese tragedy was not unique, but probably occurs daily--people injured in front of inactive witnesses. Behavioral science has identified and probed examples of the "Kitty Genovese syndrome"--like the infamous 1984 "New Bedford bar-room rape," or the needless death of homeless hero Hugo Tale-Yax in Jamaica, NY in 2010, and other tragedies of bystander inaction across places and years:

- Esmin Green at Kings County Memorial Hospital in Brooklyn in 2008.
- Angel Arce Torres in Hartford, CT in 2008.
- Jayna Murray in Bethesda, MD in 2011.
- Ilan Halimi in Paris, France in 2006.
- Raymond Zack in Alameda, CA in 2011.
- Shanda Sharer in Madison, IN in 2009.
- Bonnie Bush in Manhattan in 1978.
- Andrew Mormille in Brooklyn NY in 1965.
- Baby Wang Yue in Foshan, China in 2011.

Continued on page 34...
President’s Column
Joan C. Chrisler, Ph.D.

It is a pleasure to assume the presidency of the Society for General Psychology, but I do so with some trepidation as well. I am following in the footsteps of some very famous psychologists – and some colleagues whom I respect and admire. I hope to live up to the high standards they set!

Let us begin at the beginning – with the changing of the guard. On behalf of all members of Division 1, I extend sincere thanks to the outgoing members of our leadership group. Janet Sigal was an energetic and dedicated president, and I enjoyed working closely with her over the past year. She devoted a lot of her time to rebuilding the Division’s Executive Committee, which had a number of open positions, and she chose well when she made her appointments. Jan also successfully launched her presidential initiative – a mentoring program for Division 1, which she placed in the capable hands of Dana Dunn and Nicole Hamilton. Thanks also to Gina Brelsford, our wonderful secretary (and prior to that our wonderful newsletter editor!), who has finished her term and plans to pursue other projects. But don’t think you have seen the last of us, Gina; we will want you back some day! Thanks to Josephine Tan, Member-at-Large and Awards Coordinator. Her (usually) gentle prompts kept all of the award committee chairs on track, and her attention to detail means that Division 1 has the most up-to-date website and handbook of any division. We appreciate all of her efforts. Thanks to Rosie Philips Bingham, our Council Rep, who has completed her term of office. Rosie is a leader on the floor of Council; when she goes to the microphone to speak, everyone listens. We are so lucky to have had someone of her stature as our representative. Thanks to our newsletter editor Marissa Harrison and our 2014 program chair Grant Rich for their work. Those are big jobs with tight deadlines, which they handled with aplomb. Thanks to Carrol Perrino and Avis Jackson for organizing and staffing our hospitality suite program and the successful events held there. Thanks also to Emilio Ulloa, who served as our treasurer this year. He resigned for personal reasons, but has been working graciously to ensure a smooth transition. Thanks to Eric Charles, who served as our ECP representative, a post he claims he has been trying to resign from for 2 years. We have relieved him of those duties, but we won’t let him go away entirely (see below). Finally, we will miss our past-past president, Dean Keith Simonton, who completed his presidential cycle by chairing the Staats Award Committee this year. I hope he will take my phone calls!

Our program theme for 2015 is “Unified in Our Diversity: Multiple Perspectives on Psychological Science and Practice.”

I welcome all of the new members of the Executive Committee, and I look forward to working with you all. Anita Wells is our new secretary, Deborah Johnson our new treasurer, Nancy Baker our president-elect, Mindy Erchull, our new member-at-large, Clare Porac our new council rep, Alicia Trotman our newsletter editor, Maria del Pilar Grazioso our 2015 program chair, Jocelyn Turner-Musa our awards coordinator, and Avis Jackson our webmaster. They are all on the job already (except for Clare, whose term begins in January), and all are off to a strong start. Just look at this newsletter for supporting evidence!

Thanks to our continuing members of the Executive Committee, who are all working hard on our behalf: Richard Velayo, Member-at-Large and Fellows Committee Chair; Mark Sciotto, Membership Committee Chair; Emily Dow, student representative; John Hogan, historian; Gerianne Alexander, editor of our journal, the Review of General Psychology; Dana Dunn and Nicole Hamilton, coordinators of our mentoring program. All of us are at your service, and we welcome questions and suggestions about the division. We also welcome volunteers who would like to be active in the Division; all committees need members, you know.

Now, let us look ahead. Although it may seem like only yesterday that we were in Washington for the 2014 APA convention, it is time to plan for the 2015 convention in Toronto. You have already received an email message (on page 9) from our program chair to remind you of the due dates and to encourage you to volunteer to review proposals. Our program theme for this year is “Unified in Our Diversity: Multiple Perspectives on Psychological Science and Practice.” Symposium proposals that address a topic from multiple perspectives are especially welcome, but any high-quality proposal of interest to general psychologists certainly will be acceptable.

Continued on page 4...
Members of the executive committee will meet in Washington, DC on Saturday, February 28th, 2015 to do some strategic planning and brainstorm about possible new initiatives we might try. I would be very glad to hear from our members – especially long-time members and former division leaders – about items that should be on our agenda. Please write to me with your ideas.

Division 1 will have a (rare) midwinter meeting this year. Members of the executive committee will meet in Washington, DC on Saturday, February 28th to do some strategic planning and brainstorm about possible new initiatives we might try. I would be very glad to hear from our members – especially long-time members and former division leaders – about items that should be on our agenda. Please write to me with your ideas. Thanks to the editors of our excellent journal (are you reading this, Doug Candland?), the division has more financial stability than ever before, and we now have the opportunity to try new things and find new ways to move the division forward. Members who live near DC (or can fund their own travel) who would like to join us on the 28th should let me know of their interest.

Last, but not least, my presidential initiative is a task force in collaboration with Division 2 (Society for the Teaching of Psychology). At the suggestion of Sue Frantz, Division 2’s Vice-president for Resources, we will form a group of teachers of general psychology whose goal is to produce a “white paper” to provide advice to textbook authors and publishers about what topics should be covered in general/introductory psychology textbooks at the college level. Sue has had conversations with editors at publishing houses who have spoken of the difficulties that arise when draft chapters of new and revised textbooks are sent to both instructors of general psychology and content experts for their review of particular chapters. Instructors tend to want historical and classic material to be covered, whereas experts want the focus to be on cutting-edge research and new findings. Can we provide some guidance? Susan Dutch, Eric Charles, and Josephine Tan have expressed interest in serving on the task force. We need more members, especially those among you who belong to both divisions. Let me know if you can make time for this important project.

Best wishes to all faculty and students for a productive and interesting fall semester and to everyone for a happy and healthy autumn and winter! I’ll be back in touch with you in 6 months or so to update you on the Division’s progress. Meanwhile, you know where to find me: jcchr@conncoll.edu. I hope to hear from you.

President’s Column - Joan C. Chrisler, Ph.D.

As you may know, APA has been reducing the number of programming hours each division gets. So far, Division 1 has not been unduly affected by the changes, but we do not yet know how many hours we will be allotted for 2015. Divisions have been encouraged to work together on collaborative and innovative programs, which are sponsored by one or more divisions and include speakers from several divisions. These are not counted against the divisions’ hours. There is an earlier deadline for these proposals – October 15th – than for the regular proposals with which we are all familiar.

Contact María del Pilar Grazioso at mpgderod@uvg.edu.gt if you have any questions or suggestions for collaborative programs. She is eager to hear from potential reviewers as well. By the way, I have heard from a colleague who is program chair for another division, that María del Pilar is considered a leader among the program chairs. She knows everyone, and everyone knows her. Since the program chairs’ training in January, she has been in touch with many other chairs, actively pursuing collaborative program possibilities for us. Kudos to her!

One of the things we will do at the convention is celebrate the 70th anniversary of the founding of Division 1. Our anniversary theme is “Division 1: 70 Years of Bringing Psychology Together.” We will celebrate at our social hour and during some regular and suite program events. We would like to have some programs that concern the Division’s history and contributions, and we count on you to propose them. Please contact María del Pilar with program-related suggestions and me (at jcchr@conncoll.edu) with social and other fun-related suggestions – and plan to come to Toronto to celebrate with us.

Division 1 will have a (rare) midwinter meeting this year. Members of the executive committee will meet in Washington, DC on Saturday, February 28th to do some strategic planning and brainstorm about possible new initiatives we might try. I would be very glad to hear from our members – especially long-time members and former division leaders – about items that should be on our agenda. Please write to me with your ideas.

Continued from page 3
2014-2015 Board Members of The Society for General Psychology

The following profiles feature some of our new in-coming members for the 2014-15 year. We will highlight more Board members in the Spring edition of the newsletter.

Avis Jackson - Webmaster

Hello, Division 1 members, I am pleased to be the new Webmaster. Initially, I will be coordinating with President Joan Chrisler and the other Division 1 Board members to update our website with current information from our recent 2014 Convention in Washington, DC. Many of our web pages need updating including News & Events, Awards, and of course the Leadership Roster. I am looking forward to my term as Webmaster and keeping our website updated! Also please email any suggestions or updates to the website.

I am in the last phase of completing my doctoral dissertation in the Psychometrics Program, within the Psychology Department, at Morgan State University in Baltimore, Maryland. My topic is Engagement and Satisfaction of Adult African Americans at Historically Black Colleges and Universities and Adult Hispanics at Hispanic Serving Institutions. My professional interests are in validity and test construction with a focus on non-traditional and minority populations. I am interested in using my psychometric skills to improve the use of formative testing to inform learning and research.

Currently, I hold two part-time research positions. The first with the Morgan State University, Office of Institutional Research (MSU-OIR) where I recently submitted an article with Carrol Perrino, Ph.D. and the MSU-OIR Director, Cheryl Rollins on First Year STEM Student Success and Persistence: Impact of Developmental Classes. The other position is with Prince George’s County Health Department, Adult and Geriatric Division, where I created a survey, and I am writing an article on daily water consumption to impact health disparities programming and policy at the county level.

John D. Hogan, PhD - Historian and Archivist

John D. Hogan, PhD, has been appointed the new historian and archivist for APA Div. 1. He succeeds Donald A. Dewsbury, PhD, professor emeritus of the University of Florida who has been the Div. 1 historian since 1996. At the August 2014 Board meeting, the Executive Committee of the Division asked John to initiate a "psychology trivia" column for The General Psychologist in addition to his duties as historian. The first installment can be found in this issue.

John is Professor of Psychology at St. John’s University in New York. He received his doctorate in developmental psychology from Ohio State University. His major areas of research interest are the history of psychology, international psychology and developmental psychology. He is the co-editor/co-author of three books, and is currently working on a book on the history of psychology. He has written more than 200 chapters, articles, book reviews and encyclopedia entries on various topics. In addition, he has presented more than 150 papers at professional meetings.

John is a past-president of APA Division 1 (2010) and a past-president of APA Division 52 (International Psychology, 2011). He is a fellow of both divisions, as well as a fellow of APA Division 2 (Teaching of Psychology). He is also the Section Editor, in charge of history and obituaries, for the American Psychologist. He has been active in many professional organizations, including the American Psychological Association, the Eastern Psychological Association, the New York Academy of Sciences, and the New York State Psychological Association, and has held offices in each of these organizations. He is a licensed psychologist in New York State.
I am pleased to begin service as the membership chair for Division 1. I am currently Department Chair and Professor of Psychology at Muhlenberg College in Allentown, Pennsylvania. In an era of increased specialization, I have greatly appreciated Division One’s goal of creating coherence among psychology’s diverse subspecialties. The division’s commitment to unifying psychology through theory, research, and practice has been invaluable in my development as a teacher and as a scholar. As membership chair, I hope to showcase that commitment in ways that attract new colleagues and retain our strong membership base. In the coming year, we will form a membership committee that will be tasked with developing innovative partnerships with other divisions, soliciting feedback from members, and exploring strategies for reaching out to psychologists who share the division’s mission. We will also work collaboratively with the new Division 1 mentoring program. Please feel free to email me (Sciutto@muhlenberg.edu) with ideas for membership or if you are interested in getting involved with membership issues. Finally, I encourage you to send me some of the reasons you value being a member of Division 1. We would like to showcase the many benefits of being part of Division 1. Please click (here) for a link to our membership brochure and feel free to share it with colleagues.

Introducing the 2014-2016 Division One Awards Coordinator Dr. Jocelyn Turner-Musa. Jocelyn is an Associate Professor and Interim Chairperson of the Department of Psychology at Morgan State University in Baltimore, MD. She earned her B.A. in Psychology from the University of North Florida, Master’s and Doctorate degrees in Social Psychology from Howard University, and completed a post-doctoral fellowship in Mental Health Services from Johns Hopkins University School of Public Health. Jocelyn is the former Co-Director and current faculty affiliate of the Maternal and Child Health Careers/Research Initiatives for Student Enhancement-Undergraduate Program awarded to the Kennedy Krieger Institute in Baltimore funded by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. She has also served as the Principal Investigator of the Morgan State University Undergraduate Training Program in Prevention Science funded by the National Institute of Mental Health (2003 – 2008). Her research focuses on understanding the role of psychosocial factors on disease management, health promotion, and disease prevention. Recent research includes examining the role of religiosity, spirituality, and social support on health behaviors of college students. She has received numerous awards including an American Fellows Award from the American Association of University Women and the Promoting Psychological Research and Training on Health Disparities Issues at Ethnic Minority Serving Institutions (ProDIGs) award from the APA Office of Ethnic Minority Affairs. She was also recently selected to participate in the APA Leadership Institute for Women in Psychology (LIWP-Class 7).

In her role as Division 1 Awards Coordinator, she plans to continue the precedent set by Dr. Josephine Tan, 2011-2014 Awards Coordinator, to ensure that the focus of the awards is on “the quality of the contribution and the linkages made between the diverse fields of psychological theory and research” (Division 1 2014 Awards Handbook, pg 6). Jocelyn thanks President Dr. Joan Chrisler, Past President Dr. Janet Sigal, and last but not least Dr. Josephine Tan for helping to make this a seamless transition.

On a personal note, Jocelyn enjoys spending her free time with husband Adel and daughter Shadia Imani.
A new academic year is on its way, and as your student representative I would like to personally welcome you to Division 1! Congratulations to all of the student winners of our Division 1 poster session and research award at Convention this past August.

This is the 70th year of Division 1 and I would like to take this opportunity to find out the needs of Division 1 student members. Below you will find a link to a quick survey (3 minutes, at most!) with questions to help us better develop programs for students. Please take time to complete the survey at your earliest convenience.

Survey link: https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1Iv9Q8Sgks09J_2H8PgL_FbzntPg6Hm7Ap_XtdryKxnAs/viewform?usp=send_form

There are many benefits to being a student member of Division 1, including free membership the first year! You also have a subscription to the Division 1 journal, Review of General Psychology (http://www.apadivisions.org/division-1/publications/journals/index.aspx), as well as a subscription to the Division 1 newsletter, The General Psychologists (http://www.apadivisions.org/division-1/publications/newsletters/index.aspx). Additionally, Division 1 is a great place to network and meet senior faculty from all disciplines – an opportunity to collaborate on any project. Please encourage your colleagues and peers to join Division 1 as you move through your academic training (http://memforms.apa.org/apa/cli/divapp/).

As a student member, be sure that you are signed up for the Division 1 Student listserv [DIV1STUDENT]. You can subscribe to the listserv using this link: http://listserv.apa.org/. This is a great place for you to ask questions, share information, seek others to co-author a convention proposal, etc.

Additionally, there are two student awards supported by Division:
1. The Anne Anastasi General Psychology Graduate Student Research Award
2. The Raymond Corsini Award (Poster Award)

Any student who submits a poster to Division 1 is automatically considered for the Raymond Corsini Award. The deadline for the Anne Anastasi Research Award is usually in the spring. Both awards are given at the APA Convention. Stay tuned (or subscribe to the student listserv) for future announcements about these awards.

We hope that many of you will join us at APA in Toronto next year. There are several opportunities to present your research, including:
- Collaborative Programs (deadline: Friday, Oct. 15, 2014)
- CE Workshops (deadline: Monday, Nov. 10, 2014)
- Division Submissions (deadline: Monday, Dec. 1, 2014)
- Film Festival (deadline: Friday, Dec. 26, 2014)

Click here to find out more information about the different submissions: http://www.apa.org/convention/proposals.aspx

Many of you joined us at APA this past August in Washington, DC and we hope many more of you will join us in Toronto next August (don’t forget to bring your passport, non-Canadian students!). Keep a look out for student announcements about submission deadlines for presentations and awards. Have a great year!
I am honored to serve as the newsletter editor for Division 1. I would first like to thank our previous editor Dr. Marissa Harrison for guiding me thoroughly through this process. She addressed all my concerns especially with handling the increased influx of information (especially through emails) that I received from members. As a result, I created an online form (through Wufoo) to organize all the information. Members alerted me to some issues which will be fixed for the Spring 2015 newsletter.

Secondly I would like to thank Dr. Joan Chrisler and Dr. Janet Sigal for first considering me for this position. Reviewing previous newsletters for Division 1, I recognize that the work that was carried out by past newsletter editors was analytical, delicate and discerning of a tradition that has been maintained for 48 years. I hope to follow in the footsteps of these past editors and I look forward to working with current members as they chart the path for Division 1 in these modern times. Two such members are Dr. Harold Takooshian and Dr. Donald Dewsbury. Dr. Harold Takooshian has assisted me greatly with photos and the recognition that Division 1’s impact has reached beyond US shores. Also, our division is a forerunner in discussing popular psychological phenomena as he demonstrates in his article about the Kitty Genovese tragedy. Dr. Donald Dewsbury has provided us with a condensed version of the characteristics of past presidents of Division 1 which communicates the primary pledge to psychology from a generalist point of view but also how other characteristics have changed in lieu of current times.

Thirdly, I would like to thank all the members who submitted to this Fall issue of TGP. The time for submissions was shorter than usual so thank you for committing to the tighter deadline. I would especially like to thank Dr. John Hogan for complying with our request for a Historian and Archivist column that features a trivia quiz! And please note that profiles of Board members not seen in this issue of TGP will be in our Spring issue.

Finally, I would like to thank my three mentors who brought me to the discipline of Psychology. Dr. Paul Echanida and Dr. Janet Jackson were both graduates of Fordham University (as told to me by Dr. Harold Takooshian!) – may they both rest in peace. My third mentor, Dr. Richard Velayo has been simply incredible and continues to grow younger every time I see him. I am uncertain how I will keep up with that but I will try! Dr. Velayo (University of Michigan) and I (Michigan State University) are both graduates of Big 10 Universities. However I was introduced to these three mentors at my undergraduate alma mater, Pace University. I graduated with degrees in Computer Science and Applied Psychology. Upon finishing, I was accepted into a doctoral program called Learning, Technology and Culture (an interdisciplinary program combining cognitive, educational and social psychology, educational technology and disability studies). So I clearly do not have a specific expertise in psychology – I am a generalist at heart.

American Psychology Association (APA) Society for General Psychology

Why should I become a Member of Division 1

Because we are number 1!!! (literally…)

Contact Emily Dow if you are a student! She is featured on page 7!
Otherwise if you have any questions, check out our membership brochure on page 6 designed by our Membership Chair, Mark Sciutto!
Memo from Wade Pickren, PhD

We were very fortunate to have strong slates of excellent candidates for our three of our elective offices this year. Nancy Baker, Fielding Graduate University, was chosen as our President-elect. Mindy Erchull, University of Mary Washington, was chosen as one of our Members-at-Large, and Clare Porac, Penn State, Erie, was elected as our incoming Council of Representatives member.

We are very appreciative of all those who stood for election and of our members who voted.

Report from the 2015 Program Chair

Maria del Pilar Grazioso, Ph.D.
Email: mpgderod@uvg.edu.gt

We are fast approaching our 2015 Convention programming deadlines. As the program chair for the Division’s 2015 convention, I would like to invite you to participate actively in our Div 1 activities.

2015 will be a special year for Div 1: We will be celebrating our 70th Anniversary. This is a special time to recognize and honor the committed and devoted work of founders, their legacies, and our new developments. We would like to bring our Psychology together through our theme: "Unified in Our Diversity: Multiple Perspectives on Psychological Science and Practice”

We are looking forward to wonderful convention programming at different levels: collaborative proposals, divisional proposals, and general programming. Recognition and awards ceremonies, social time, business meetings, networking opportunities, and other encounters as well as professional development will take place in Toronto next summer.

We would like to invite every one of you to send us your suggestions, ideas, and experiences for a scheduling and programming that will represent and engage us all. If you are willing to serve as a proposal reviewer, please let me know.

As a start, I would like to share Important Deadlines to Remember:
Submission of Collaborative Proposals—Must be received by Wednesday, October 15th.
These proposals have to be submitted by program chairs, so please contact me if you have ideas or requests, and send your proposals to me as email attachments.

Submission of Divisional Proposals to Divisions—Must be received by Monday, December 1. These proposals will have to be submitted through the APA web page no later than midnight on Dec 1st.

We will also have programming in our hospitality suite, which is a great place for committee meetings, informal programs, and social events (e.g., for students, for ECPs). We will send out a call for these later.

We are looking forward to hearing from you and to seeing you in Toronto in 2015.
I have been asked to consider briefly the origins and development of Division 1 (now called the Society for General Psychology). I have chosen to structure my piece in two brief sections. The first is a condensed discussion of the origins of the division structure in general, and of Division 1 in particular. This can be brief because much of this information has already been discussed in some detail, with numerous relevant references provided by Doll (1946), Capshew & Hilgard (1992) and Benjamin (1997). Wertheimer & King (1996) provided a general history of the division. In the second part I will summarize highlights of a kind of biographical analysis of the 70 or so presidents the division has elected.

Origins

Founded in 1892, the American Psychological Association has generally been regarded as the primary organization of American psychologists. However, at various times in its history, assorted interest groups have founded separate organizations judged better to meet their specific needs. Prior to 1950, these included, among others, the Society of Experimental Psychologists (1904), the American Association of Clinical Psychologists (1917), the American Association for Applied Psychology (AAAP) (1937), and the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues (SPSSI) (1936).

As the United States was engaged in World War II the National Research Council charged an Emergency Committee in Psychology of its Division of Anthropology and Psychology, chaired by Karl Dallenbach, to find ways of reforming and integrating psychology so it might be more inclusive and be a more effective national tool during the war and to plan post-war psychology as a science and profession.

A Sub-Committee on Survey and Planning for Psychology, chaired by Robert Yerkes, first met at the Vineland Training School in 1942 to consider various plans. At the broader Intersociety Constitutional Convention of 1943 it was decided to adopt a divisional structure incorporating the various existing groups and analogous to the organization of the United States, complete with a Council of Representatives analogous to the U. S. Congress. Ernest Hilgard chaired the continuing group.

A ballot was sent to members of various groups in 1944. The ballot listed 19 proposed divisions arranged alphabetically. A proposed division of general psychology was the fourth most popular first choice among the 19 proposed divisions, although a dozen others received more total votes than it did. The list was restructured as a function of the ballot results and 19 (soon to be 17) charter divisions were formed and the revised bylaws were approved. The division of general psychology had been the fourth most popular single choice (212 votes) on the ballots but was finished just 12th (877 votes) in total choices.

The final structure moved from an alphabetical organization to one probably designed to reflect, to some degree, the historical evolution of the field and moved from basic academic and scientific interests to the more applied. Thus the Division of General Psychology became Division 1. Further, it initially was decided in the bylaws that all APA members had to belong to at least one division. Those not specifying a preference were placed in Division 1, which served as the default division. That portion of the bylaws was soon abandoned by vote of the membership upon recommendation of the Committee on Elections. More specifically, the members voted “to delete Article VII, Section 3, which reads ‘Members of the Association not expressing a preference for a special division shall be members of a Division of General Psychology...” by a vote of 1,024 to 128, with 16 abstaining (Marquis, 1946, p. 503).

The first real division membership totals are from 1948. However one can get an idea of the impact of that deleted bylaw item from data on the divisions chosen by the 301 new APA associates elected in 1945 (Marquis, 1946). Approximately 71% of new associates were placed in Division 1. In contrast to the 215 new Division 1 associates, there were just 25 new associates in Division 17 (Counseling) and 24 in Division 12 (Clinical). It is interesting that just three of the 301 new associates listed more than one division. Division 1 grew gradually from 543 members in 1948 to 1,137 in 1965 to peak at 6,234 in 1988 and decrease to 1,245 in 2013.”

Division 1 grew gradually from 543 members in 1948 to 1,137 in 1965 to peak at 6,234 in 1988 and decrease to 1,245 in 2013.”
Presidents

I turn now to the division presidents. I will gloss over many of the decisions I have had to make in order to conduct my analyses. There have been 71 presidential elections with 3 individuals, Edward Tolman, Robert Leeper, and Delos Wickens, elected twice; one, Virginia Staudt Sexton, was elected but was too ill to serve so her responsibilities fell to president-elect Charles Brewer. Where the availability of data permits, then, my N is 68. The Division Organizing Committee initially appointed Richard M. Elliott as a temporary chairman; he is not included as he was not elected.

Note that there are missing data in some categories. The APA has replaced its printed directories with an on-line directory. This may respect privacy but provides significantly less information than the older publication, thus making projects such as this significantly more difficult. I filled in missing data by contacting individuals where I could. However, not all were available and two past presidents refused to provide missing information.

Gender

Elections as president have been strongly male-biased; just 13 presidents have been women (19%). Analyzing by halves, just 3 of the first 34 presidents (9%) were women contrasted with 10 of the last 34 (29%), including the last 3 elected. As with a number of my analyses, this is consistent with broader trends, in this case toward increased representation of women, in APA and even more broadly in society as a whole.

Affiliation When Elected

The home institutions at the time of election were fairly evenly distributed with 50 different universities represented among 67 different presidents. As best I can tell, one was unaffiliated. The Yale faculty could boast 4 presidents; Michigan and Penn had each, and 10 schools two presidents each.

If one groups the universities by system, one finds that 7 were from the University of California system; 2 each from the University of Massachusetts, City University of New York, and University of North Carolina systems.

Viewed geographically, there has been a northeastern prevalence. Thirty four of the presidents have been from northeastern schools; 14 were from the West; 9 each from the South and the Mid-West. One was from Canada.

I expected the stronger East coast hegemony in the earlier years but found the Big East and the Southeastern Conference 2 each.

The diversity of PhD schools increased with time. The first 34 presidents were from 16 universities; the 34 serving after that time were from 27 schools. All three who were elected twice served during the earlier period. Six of Harvard’s 8 presidents served during the earlier period. Five in the earlier group were from Columbia and four from Iowa. During the later period there were just two from Iowa and one from Columbia.

Undergraduate Institutions

As might be expected, the distribution of undergraduate schools was more widespread than for graduate schools. There are many more undergraduate than graduate programs. The 66 presidents for whom I have information graduated from 52 schools. Leading was NYU with 4 future presidents. Penn and CUNY each produced 3 and seven schools produced 2 each. Remarkably, 15 of the presidents obtained undergraduate degrees from 8 schools within the 5 boroughs of New York City.

Approximate Age at Start of Term

The ages of the various presidents were calculated using an on-line program. This, like some other estimates, required some assumptions. I calculated age as of January 1 of the first year of each president’s term. I had data for just 66 individuals as two refused to prove their birth dates.

“**The mean age for the 66 presidents was 57.4 (SD=7.1). The youngest president, Carl Hovland, was 39 when elected; the oldest was George Albee, who was 84.**”

Continued on next page...
The mean age for the 66 presidents was 57.4 (SD=7.1). The youngest president, Carl Hovland, was 39 when elected; the oldest was George Albee, who was 84. Sorted by decades, of course there were one each in their 30s and 80s, and there were 16 in their 40s, 19 in their 50s, 25 in their 60s, and 4 in their 70s.

The first 34 presidents had a mean age of 53.7; the last 32 of 62.1. I speculate that during the first half there were many relatively new PhD psychologists who attended graduate school as fellowship programs expanded. The presidents in the second half waited their turn as the earlier group filled the presidency. It may also be that recent psychologists turned to general issues later in life as they matured after working in more specialized areas earlier in life. Further, the data are consistent with the general graying of the APA.

**Field of Interest**

Classifying fields of interest requires many decisions that may be partially subjective and vary from person to person. I relied most on the statements in the APA directories over the years but added some other considerations as well. Many of the presidents have had multiple interests but I tried to classify each according to a primary field. I came up with 24 different fields of psychology. The study of learning both human and animal, led all fields with 19 presidents. There were 8 social psychologists, 4 each from clinical, cognition, developmental, and history; and 3 each from motivation and sensory psychology.

I tried to combine similar fields of interest. With my lumping, 39 of the 68 presidents worked in the broad, traditional field of experimental psychology. Eight were in various applied fields; 8 were social psychologists. Six were in various academic fields, 4 in developmental psychology, and 3 had to be listed as miscellaneous.

There were some substantive changes over time. There were 16 subfields listed for the first half of the presidents and 15 in the second half. Fourteen of the 19 students of learning were in the first half, consistent with the dominance of that field during that phase of psychology. By contrast, 6 of the 9 social psychologists were from the second half. All 4 clinical psychologists, historians of psychology, and cognitive psychologists were from the later period. When combined, 26 first-half presidents were from the traditional experimental fields and just 13 in the second half. All but one from the more applied fields were from the second half.

**Conclusion**

The Division of (or Society for) General Psychology has generally functioned as originally conceptualized by the founders of the division structure of the APA. It has provided a home for a diverse array of psychologists, most of whom seek an integrated approach to psychology that is not found in the other, more focused, divisions. As can be seen in the elections of its leaders, it has been, to some degree, a microcosm of psychology at large and of society in general over the past decades of its existence. The shifts in leadership mirror, in a microcosm, changes in the APA that have taken place over this period. Women have played an increasing leadership role. The backgrounds of its presidents have generally become more diverse, with respect to affiliations and educational backgrounds, over time as the field has spread and proliferated. The presidents have become somewhat older, on average, as has the general membership of the larger organization. Other factors may have played a role in that change. The changing fields of interest have been substantial as the presidents elected have become less tied to traditional experimental approaches and moved toward more applied, social, and other fields. The division/society continues to provide a home for those seeking to work in their own fields of interest but in a broader context of psychology at large.
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The Division 1 Fellows Committee is seeking nominations and applications for Fellow status in the Division.

Self-nominations are welcome.

There are two paths to Fellow status in the Division:

First, members of Division 1 who are APA members, but are not Fellows of APA, may apply for Fellow status in Division 1. They are known as “New Fellows” applicants and must meet both APA criteria and Division 1 criteria for fellow status.

Second, any member of Division 1 who is already a current Fellow of APA may apply to become a Fellow of the division. These applicants are known as “Current Fellows.” Current fellows are only evaluated by the Division Fellows Committee. Current Fellows are good resources for information about being and becoming a Fellow. Letters from current Fellows are also required for those applying for New Fellow status.

APA Fellow Criteria include:

1. Five (5) years of acceptable professional experience beyond receipt of the doctoral degree.
2. Membership in APA for at least one year.
3. Unusual and outstanding contributions that have had a national or international impact in general psychology.

Division1 Fellow Criteria include: [http://www.apadivisions.org/division-1/membership/fellows/index.aspx](http://www.apadivisions.org/division-1/membership/fellows/index.aspx)

**Process for New Fellows:**
The process to apply to be an APA Fellow is now done via the APA Fellows Online Application Platform. This new system will allow nominees, endorsers, and Division Fellows Chairs to submit all required documents online.

The online system will replace the previous, paper-based process and all fellows applications must be added to the system to be considered by the Fellows Committee.

Applications for New Fellow status require letters from three current Division 1 Fellows and completion of other materials described in the APA Fellows Online Application Platform. Please visit the Fellows webpage for more information and to access the new online system: [http://www.apa.org/membership/fellows/index.aspx](http://www.apa.org/membership/fellows/index.aspx)

**All materials, including letters of reference, must be completed by NOVEMBER 15, 2014.**

The candidates’ applications are reviewed by the Division Fellows Committee. Those receiving a positive recommendation will be forwarded to the APA Fellows Committee for their review. Fellow status is granted by the APA Fellows Committee. Please remember that there can only be one nominating division.

**Process for Current Fellows:**
Current Fellows of APA from other divisions may apply for Division 1 Fellow status by sending a current vita and a letter highlighting the reasons that one has met the criteria for fellow status in the Division. These candidates’ applications must be emailed to Richard Velayo (rvelayo@gmail.com). The due date for Current Fellows applications is APRIL 15, 2015. Current Fellows applications are evaluated by the Division Fellows Committee only.
The Division 1 awards program celebrates excellence in research and other activities that contribute to the integration of the different subfields of psychology. Books, articles, career contributions, and student research are all recognized through various awards. Division 1 also forwards nominations to APF for the Arthur W. Staats Lecture award. Details about the award program are available from [http://www.apadivisions.org/division-1/awards/index.aspx](http://www.apadivisions.org/division-1/awards/index.aspx).

Division 1 had a very successful award year. We received many outstanding nominations which kept our award committees very busy. The 2014 award winners were announced at the awards ceremony that was held in the division hospitality suite on Saturday August 9 at APA. We were delighted to have several of the 2014 and 2013 award winners and former Division 1 presidents joining us and whose presence was acknowledged.

This year, Division 1 launched the Raymond Corsini Student Poster award in honor of Dr. Raymond Corsini’s birthday centenary. Dr. Danny Wedding paid a tribute to his former mentor and collaborator at the awards ceremony and very graciously shared some fond memories. Dr. Corsini remains one of most prolific psychologists who exemplify general psychology.

My term as the Division 1 awards coordinator has come to an end. It has been a real privilege and pleasure to serve. Along the way, I have been extremely fortunate to meet and come to know many very talented and dedicated colleagues. I want to thank all the award chairs, committee members, and judges whose hard work ensures the success of the awards program.

I also would like to extend a very warm welcome to Dr. Jocelyn Turner-Musa who takes over as the Awards Coordinator. She is wonderfully competent, organized, effective, and efficient. I can really think of no one better to run the awards program, and look forward to an exciting 2015 awards year.

---

**Division 1 The Society for General Psychology 2014 Awards Announcement**

Division 1 is pleased to announce its 2014 award recipients who were recognized at the 2014 APA meeting that was held in Washington DC. For more details on awards, please go to [http://www.apadivisions.org/division-1/awards/index.aspx](http://www.apadivisions.org/division-1/awards/index.aspx).

**William James Book Award (2 winners)**


**Sendhil Mullainathan**


**Eldar Shafir**
Division 1 is pleased to announce its 2014 award recipients who were recognized at the 2014 APA meeting that was held in Washington DC. For more details on awards, please go to http://www.apadivisions.org/division-1/awards/index.aspx.

**William James Book Award (1 honorable mention)**


**George A. Miller Award for the Outstanding Journal Article in General Psychology**

The malleability of spatial skills: A meta-analysis of training studies by David H. Uttal (Northwestern University), Nathaniel G. Meadow (Northwestern University), Elizabeth Tipton (Northwestern University), Linda L. Hand (Northwestern University), Alison R. Alden (Northwestern University), Christopher Warren (Northwestern University), & Nora S. Newcombe (Temple University).

**Ernest R. Hilgard Award for Career Contributions to General Psychology**

Scott Lilienfeld, PhD. Emory University
Division 1 The Society for General Psychology
2014 Awards Announcement

2013 Arthur W. Staats Lecture for Unifying Psychology
(Staats Lecture presented at 2014 APA)

2014 Arthur W. Staats Lecture for Unifying Psychology
(Staats Lecture to be presented at 2015 APA)

2 or more years of graduate work

Reut Avinun, MSc
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

Amy J. Jeffers, MS
Virginia Commonwealth University

Jeffrey D. Shahidullah, EdS, NCSP
Michigan State University

Andrew M. Kiselica, BA
University of South Florida

Under 2 years of graduate work

Hannah C. Williamson, MA
University of California: Los Angeles

Mary Louise Woody, MS
Binghampton University

Anne Anastasi Graduate Student Research Awards

Peter Salovey, PhD
Yale University

Judith Torney-Purta, Ph.D.
University of Maryland, College Park

3 Honorable Mentions (in alphabetical order)

Leah A. Brown, & Merry J. Sleigh, PhD. (Winthrop University). The effects of drawing, listening, and writing on mood change.


Other 2014 Division 1 Awards

Recognition Awards for Dedicated Service to Division 1

Terece S. Bell, Raymond Corsini Student Poster Award co-Chair
Florence Denmark, Hospitality Suite co-Chair
Nicholas Noviello, Raymond Corsini Student Poster Award co-Chair

Presidential Citations for Outstanding Service/Achievement

Rosie Bingham (Division One)
Gina Brelsford (Division One)
Gordon Burghardt (Division One)
Emily A. A. Dow (Division One)
John Hogan (Division One)
Sarah Jordan & Staff (APA Division Services)
Carrol S. Perrino (Division One)
Dean Keith Simonton (Division One)
Josephine Tan (Division One)
Richard Velayo (Division One)
General Psychology Trivia Quiz: APA Presidents, Part 1
By John D. Hogan, PhD

The brief descriptions below all refer to past-presidents of the APA. How many can you identify? (Correct answers can be found on p. xx. Don’t peek! ;)

1. The only two individuals to serve as APA president twice.
2. The longest lived APA president – and he is still with us!
3. The only APA president to appear on a U.S. postage stamp.
4. The first woman to be president of APA.
5. These two presidents of APA held medical degrees.
6. The only president of APA known to have Native-American ancestry.
7. He coined the phrase “classical conditioning.”
8. As children, these two future APA presidents were chosen to participate in Terman’s gifted study.
9. The only APA president born in Italy.
10. This APA president received his PhD degree after serving his term as president.

Bonus Question: In addition to being an APA president, he was also president of Yale University. His wife was the co-founder of the Culinary Institute of America.

Answers on page 35

2013 William James Book Award Lecture
The Minnesota Study of Twins Reared Apart: The Science Behind the Fascination
By Nancy L. Segal, PhD

It is a great honor to have won the 2013 William James Book Award. James was not a twin researcher, but he had something to say about twins: “The earliest quarrels with each other are about questions of ownership; and parents of twins soon learn that it conduces to a quiet house to buy all presents in impartial duplicate” (James, 1980, p. 422). Based on my experiences with twins and their families, his observation has withstood the test of time. I also trust that James would have been interested in, and inspired by, the Minnesota Study of Twins Reared Apart.

Introduction
The Minnesota Study of Twins Reared Apart (MISTRA) was a comprehensive psychological and medical investigation of 137 reared-apart twin pairs, 81 monozygotic (MZ or identical) and 56 dizygotic (DZ or fraternal). The study took place at the University of Minnesota between 1979 and 1999. It was directed by Professor Thomas J. Bouchard, Jr., in the Department of Psychology, and engaged the efforts of numerous colleagues and graduate students in Minnesota and elsewhere. Findings from that study have been reported in over 170 scientific articles and book chapters. Given the wealth of data that accumulated over the years, papers are still being written.

Writing Born Together-Reared Apart: The Landmark Minnesota Twin Study (Segal, 6456) was important for several reasons. Above all, the findings spanned many fields, including but not limited to, general intelligence, special mental abilities, personality, cardiology, dental health, periodontology, religiosity and creativity. Many people, both inside and outside the scientific community, were unaware of the breadth and depth of this study.
Therefore, it was necessary to consolidate the different findings into a single volume. Additionally, the MISTRA is the fourth major reared-apart twin study to have taken place. Earlier investigations were conducted in Chicago, IL (Newman, Freeman, & Holzinger, 1937), London, England (Shields, 1962) and Odense, Denmark (Juel-Nielsen, 1965). All three previous studies published their findings in book form, so it was appropriate to continue this tradition within the history of psychology. Note that the books from these earlier studies all took a topological approach to the material. In contrast, Born Together-Reared Apart, was written chronologically to convey the progression of ideas, methods, findings and conclusions that emerged over its twenty-year period.

Twin Research Designs

The classic twin research design is simple and elegant. It was first defined by Sir Francis Galton (1875), prior to the time that the biology of twinning was known. Galton correctly reasoned that twins who looked alike shared all their heredity, while twins who looked different shared a portion of their heredity. Applying the classic twin method means comparing the degree of resemblance of MZ twin pairs to that of DZ twin pairs with reference to a particular trait. Greater MZ than DZ twin resemblance in intelligence, personality or weight would be consistent with, but not proof of, genetic influence.

Fundamental to twin research is the equal environments assumption (EEA), namely that relevant environmental influences are constant across the two types of twins. The EEA has been satisfied for the majority of measured traits (Plomin, DeFries, Knopik, & Nederhiser, 2013). It has been shown, for example, that MZ twins who shared a bedroom, were dressed alike and had the same teacher were not more like in behavior than those who did not (Loehlin & Nichols, 1976), a finding replicated by others (Morris-Yates, Andrews, Howie, & Henderson, 1990). It has been proposed that measurement invariance issues and the distribution of the underlying equal environments trait should be examined when assessing the EEA (Mitchell, Mazzeo, Bulik, Aggen, Kendler, & Neale, 2007).

Genetic influence has been demonstrated for virtually all behaviors. However, MZ twins are never exactly alike in any way. Differences between MZ twins are crucial to document because they reveal the effects of non-shared environmental events, i.e., experiences each twin may have had apart from their co-twin. Non-shared environmental effects may occur before, during or after birth. DZ twins differ due to both genetic and non-shared environmental factors.

Twins can resemble one another due to shared environments, as well as shared genes. Studying MZ twins reared apart (MZA) circumvents this issue, providing a direct estimate of genetic influence (heritability) on a trait because the twins were raised in separate environments. Studying DZA twins in addition to MZA twins offers an informative control. The MISTRA was the first reared-apart twin study to include DZA twins, an important step toward assembling more representative separated sets. The early investigators sought only MZA twins, raising the possibility that the more physically and behaviorally dissimilar MZA pairs were excluded. However, the Danish psychiatrist Juel-Nielsen obtained his reared-apart twins from a population register, so this would not have affected his sample.

The Tenor of the Times

The MISTRA inspired considerable controversy, especially during its early years. Understanding why this was so requires looking back at psychological theories of human behavior in the 1960s -1980s. Theorizing about behavior at that time was dominated by the environmental perspective of John B. Watson, captured in this comment by psychologist Walter Mischel: “Genes and glands are obviously important, but social learning also has a dramatic role. Imagine the enormous differences that would be found in the personalities of twins with identical genetic endowments if they were raised apart in two different families -- or, even more striking, in two totally different cultures ..” (Mischel, 1981, p. 311).

Environmentalist thinking prevailed during that period for several reasons as explained in the book. Prior to and during World War II, the Nazi regime had promulgated the misguided and dangerous belief in the genetic superiority/inferiority of some populations over others, leading to genocide. There was the 1960s Women’s Rights movement that argued for gender equality in the workplace and in educational settings, but downplayed (even denied) biologically based sex-differences in behavior. There was also the 1964 Civil Rights act that outlawed race-based discrimination and segregation. Given the foregoing, behavioral-genetic research was socially unpopular and academically risky.

At the same time, there were developments in some areas that challenged environmentalist perspectives. Research showed that rats could be bred to be maze-bright or maze-dull. Medical genetic advances linked an extra 21st chromosome to Down syndrome. Cognitive psychology was on the rise, focusing on how humans acquire, process and store information. A survey of general intelligence studies showed that IQ similarity between relatives varied positively with genetic relatedness. These developments explain why some researchers were becoming discontented with psychological theories that lacked a genetic component. In the midst of this fluid academic environment, an event occurred that captured the attention of many people, especially Professor Thomas J, Bouchard, Jr.
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Figure 1. MZA female twins reunited at age forty-five. Both twins were very religious, but of different faiths. Photo credit: Dr. Nancy L. Segal

...Continued from previous page

MISTRA
February 19, 1979 was the date on which the reunion of MZA twins, Jim Lewis and Jim Springer, in Ohio, took place. This event singularly that launched the MISTRA and the research that followed. The “Jim twins” displayed striking similarities, among them their work histories, nail-biting habit, recreational interests and mixed headache syndromes, all reported in the press. Bouchard invited the twins to the University of Minnesota to participate in a behavioral and medical assessment lasting several days. Following the widespread attention that the pair received, other reared-apart twin pairs contacted the university, transforming a single case study into an ongoing research program. A core team of investigators was assembled, consisting of Irving I. Gottesman, Auke Tellegen and David T. Lykken from the Department of Psychology, and Leonard L. Heston and Elke D. Eckert from the Department of Psychiatry. Many other faculty members and students were involved.

FINDINGS
Early findings from the MISTRA were qualitative and descriptive, but the identification of additional pairs enabled more quantitative analyses and results. A sampling of findings from several domains of study are summarized briefly below; the complete set of findings is published in much greater detail in Segal (2012), with supplemental materials (e.g., publication list and protocol descriptions) available at the book’s website (document gallery): http://www.drnancysegaltwins.org/index.php/born-together-reared-apart. A photograph of a pair of MZA female twins is shown in Figure 1.

Personality.
A major personality paper, published in the Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, was the first analysis to include data from four twin groups: MZ and DZ twins, reared apart and together (Tellegen, Lykken, & Bouchard et al., 1988). The reared together twins were drawn from the Minnesota Twin Registry (MTR) that Lykken had been assembling since 1983. All participants completed the Multidimensional Personality Questionnaire (MPQ) developed by Tellegen in 1982 (see Tellegen & Waller, 2008). The MPQ yields scores for 11 personality scales and three higher order factors. The median correlations for the eleven scales were .49 (MZA, .52 (MZT), .21 (DZA and .23 (DZT), a pattern showing genetic influence. The similar results for the MZA and MZT twins indicated that shared environments did not contribute to personality resemblance, with the exception of the trait Social Closeness. Biometrical analyses showed that the proportion of variance explained by genetic influence ranged between .38 and .58 across the eleven scales. Non-shared environmental events explained most of the remaining variance.

Some critics worried that the study diminished the role of the family in child-rearing, but this was not the case. Parents can help shy children feel more comfortable in social situations, and encourage rambunctious children to calm down. Fair parenting of two children may actually involve different practices, ones that are tailored to meet the particular needs of each child.

General Intelligence.
The first major IQ paper from the study appeared in Science (Bouchard, Lykken, McGue, Segal, N.L., & Tellegen, 1990). The MZA (n = 42-43 pairs) intraclass correlations for three general intelligence measures were .69 (WAIS), .78 (Raven/Mill-Hill Composite) and .78 (First Principal Component). These data are extremely similar to those from the three previous reared-apart twin studies, whose correlations ranged between .64 and .76. The consistency across studies is still striking, given the differences in investigators, tests, time of measurement and population. The MISTRA twins’ similarities in socioeconomic status indicators, physical facilities in the home and other family environment measures did not contribute to the twins’ similarities in their test scores.

Overall, the findings revealed that approximately 70% of the variance in general intelligence is associated with genetic factors. This result does not imply that people cannot improve their abilities, but it shows that everyone cannot perform similarly.
Religiosity.

Religiosity refers not to affiliation, but to religious commitment and engagement in religious activities. Previous twin studies did not find genetic influence on such measures. However, a plausible explanation for the earlier lack of genetic effects is that the twin participants were young and living at home under the guidance of their parents. More recent studies of older twins have shown genetic effects on religiosity, most likely because older individuals exercise greater freedom over their interests and activities.

MISTRA participants completed five religiosity scales, some embedded within larger inventories, such as the Religious Fundamentalism scale of the MMPI. MTR participants completed two of the scales, those concerned with religious leisure time and religious occupational interests. Genetic influence accounted for 50% of the variance in religiosity, while shared environmental effects proved negligible. These findings appeared in the journal Psychological Science (Waller, Kojetin, Bouchard, Lykken, & Tellegen, A. 1990).

Well-Being.

Both MISTRA and MTR twins had completed Tellegen’s Multidimensional Personality Questionnaire that included a Well-Being Scale. Intraclass correlations for the four twin groups were .52 (MZA), .44 (MZT), .02 (DZA) and .08 (DZT), demonstrating that genetic factors explain approximately 50% of the variance in well-being. Fortunately, the MPQ had been completed twice by a subset of twins from both sources, enabling genetic analyses of the stability of one’s happiness level. It was found that the stable portion of well-being has a heritability of about 80%. In other words, it seems that everyone has a particular level of happiness that may fluctuate periodically as a function of events; however, events do not alter one’s characteristic level of well-being. This study was published in Psychological Science (Lykken & Tellegen, A. 1996).

Social Relatedness.

Meeting one’s twin for the first time was a life-changing experience for most of the MISTRA participants. A study of twins’ social attraction to one another was set within an evolutionary psychological framework. Evolutionary reasoning predicts that MZA twins should feel socially closer to one another than DZA twins, given their relative genetic relatedness. This prediction derives more specifically from Hamilton’s (1964) theory of inclusive fitness, namely that natural selection favors alleles predisposing individuals to behave in ways that would favor the transmission of those alleles. Alleles predisposing individuals to direct altruistic acts toward others likely to carry copies of those alleles would indirectly transmit one’s own genes. A Twin Relationship Survey was created in Minnesota to test this idea.

As expected, the MZA twins indicated significantly greater closeness and familiarity than the DZA twins (Segal, Hershberger, & Arad, 2003). However, a more interesting finding was that reunited twins indicated greater closeness and familiarity toward their newly found co-twin than to the unrelated sibling with whom they had been raised. The mechanisms underlying social relatedness are not fully known, but it is likely that perception of similar behaviors work to attract people and to nurture that relationship.

Summary and Concluding Comment

Three key findings from the MISTRA are that (1) genetic influence is pervasive, affecting virtually every measured trait, (2) shared environments do not make family members alike and (3) non-shared environmental events are the environmental factors influencing behavioral traits. Of course, additional research is required for understanding how non-shared environments eventuate in observed outcomes. The earlier resistance to possible genetic influences on behavior has been largely, but not fully, replaced by a more balanced view.

In recent years, the behavioral genetics field has overlapped considerably with molecular genetics. There is great interest in, and efforts toward, identifying specific genes underlying specific behaviors. Despite these efforts, twin studies will always maintain a prominent place in psychological research because they highlight behaviors having a genetic basis. In fact, the heritabilities of all human behaviors have not yet been explored. For example, a twin study of children’s drawing skills has been completed only recently (Arden, Trzaskowski, Garfield, & Plomin, 2014). Furthermore, the MISTRA maintains extensive medical and behavioral data that have not been fully analyzed. Currently, analyses of cardiovascular characteristics, ophthalmological measures and applied creativity are ongoing. The MISTRA ended formally in 1999, but it is not yet finished.
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2014 Division 1 Conference Highlights

Award Recipients

Anne Anastasi Graduate Student Research Award
Jeffrey D. Shahidullah, John D. Hogan & Andrew M. Kiselica

Raymond Corsini Graduate Student Poster Award
Leah A. Brown & Merry J. Sleigh

Raymond Corsini Graduate Student Poster Award
Kasey Windnagel, Terece S. Bell & Nicholas Noviello

Raymond Corsini Graduate Student Poster Award
Josephine Tan, Alana Rawana & Terece S. Bell
2014 Arthur W. Staats Lecture for Unifying Psychology
Judith Torney-Purta & Dean Keith Simonton

Ernest R. Hilgard Award for Career Contributions to General Psychology
Scott Lilienfeld & Josephine Tan

2013 Arthur W. Staats Lecture for Unifying Psychology
Peter Salovey & Josephine Tan

Danny Wedding

Nancy Felipe Russo and Josephine Tan
Division 1 Past Presidents

Past Presidents of D1 (l to r): Peter Salovey, Harold Takooshian, Donald Dewsbury, Janet Sigal, Dean Simonton, John Hogan, Florence Denmark.

New Division 1 Fellows

Adele Diamond
Christopher Ferguson
Todd Shackelford

Richard Velayo and Janet Sigal
Recognition Awards for Dedicated Service to Division 1

Florence Denmark & Janet Sigal

Nicholas Noviello, Terece S. Bell & Janet Sigal

Presidential Citations for Outstanding Service/Achievement

Dean Keith Simonton & Janet Sigal

Carroll S. Perrino & Janet Sigal

Janet Sigal & Emily A. Dow
Presidential Citations for Outstanding Service/Achievement

John D. Hogan & Janet Sigal
Josephine Tan & Janet Sigal
Richard Velayo & Janet Sigal

Division 1 Celebrations
Memo from Grant J. Rich, PhD

This session was called “Indigenous Pathways to Resilience - A South African Perspective" and the participants traveled all the way from South Africa.

Liesel Ebersöhn, Janna De Gouveia, Funke Omidire & Raphael Akanmidu


Valeriya Lyanguzova (from Russia) with Philip Zimbardo
2013 William James Book Award Lecture
The Minnesota Study of Twins Reared Apart: The Science Behind the Fascination
By Nancy L. Segal, PhD
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Division 1 Conversation Hour: Ethnic Psychology Associations

Reema Baniabbasi (Northeastern University), reemabaniabbasi@gmail.com
Dr. Ani Kalayjian (ATOP Meaningfulworld, Teachers College, Columbia University), DrKalayjian@Meaningfulworld.com

In 2012 the American Psychological Association (APA) Council of Representatives asked the APA to vote to allow four Ethnic Minority Psychology Associations (EMPAs) official representation on the Council, thereby recognizing their importance and growing role within U.S. psychology. However, as it will be shown below, these four EMPAs are a subset of a larger network of Ethnic Psychology Associations (EPAs) in the U.S. and around the world that currently play, or have the potential to play, important roles in the development of psychology cross-culturally in the U.S. and globally.

On August 9th 2014, during the Annual APA Convention that took place in Washington DC, APA Division 1 (General Psychology) held a Conversation Hour in their hospitality suite entitled Ethnic Psychology Associations. The event brought together leaders of long-standing EPAs as well as individuals interested in EPAs both in the U.S. and abroad.

The Conversation Hour was moderated by Dr. Harold Takooshian and attended by Drs. Jeffery S. Mio, Thomas Mallios, Ani Kalayjian, Bernardo Carducci, Ray Palouztian, Avis Jackson, Carol Perrino, and masters-level international student Reema Baniabbasi. After introducing him or herself, each presenter briefly discussed the history, aims, current status, and future agendas of an ethnic psychology association he or she led or is researching.

Dr. Mio presented about the Asian American Psychological Association (AAPA). Since its founding in 1972, the association has been hosting an annual pre-conference before the APA Convention. In the early 2000s, AAPA received a 501(c)3, not-for-profit status. Its journal received an ISI rating and currently possesses the highest rating among ethnic psychology journals. The last edition was a special issue about leadership in Asian American Psychology.

The Italian American Psychological Society was presented by Dr. Bernardo Carducci. It was founded in 2005 with small group of psychologists. As the professional society continues growing, it currently has 250 members worldwide with membership not being limited to Italians or to Italian-Americans. While the society does not yet have a not-for-profit status, it is in the process of pursuing one. Aside from hosting conferences and informal meetings, the society meets every year at the APA Convention and in the European Congress of Psychology.

Dr. Thomas Mallios talked about the Greek American Behavioral Sciences Institute. The institute has an informal, non-hierarchal setup. It has an interdisciplinary focus with 100 members from the U.S., Canada, Greece, and, more recently, Cyprus. It was initially founded with a focus on education in response to the influx of Greek immigrants in the U.S. in the late 1960s into the 1970s, when the Board of Education was mandating that children be assessed in their native language. Therefore, counselors and educators recognized a need to connect with bilingual Greek psychologists and teachers to form a network of professionals who can create and run assessments in Greek and English. The institute later evolved to include a clinical perspective expanding the work with other age groups. All the events, which consist of lectures, meetings, and panels, are hosted in NYC.

Dr. Harold Takooshian and Ani Kalayjian discussed the Armenian Behavioral Sciences Association. The association was founded by six individuals in NYC in 1987 in recognition of the need to connect the many Armenian experts who did not know about one another. It is interdisciplinary in focus, incorporating the fields of Psychology, Sociology, Anthropology, and other behavioral sciences. The association works with Armenian organizations in NY and recognizes the historical and current struggles of Armenians worldwide with genocide, with systemic and individual racism, and with peacefully connecting with one another despite differing diasporan backgrounds.

Dr. Kalayjian presented about the Association for Trauma Outreach & Prevention (ATOP) Meaningfulworld, which is an interdisciplinary, not-for-profit charitable organization she founded in 1990. The organization is affiliated with the United Nations and works in 45 countries around the world with 20 interns, 50 volunteers, and four research teams. Meaningfulworld organizes five missions per year in 8 to 10 countries as well as annual essay contests and research to foster a generation dedicated to love, forgiveness, peace-building, genocide prevention, and meaning-making in the face of disasters and trauma. This year, the organization served in Jordan, Palestine, Israel, and Haiti and will be serving in Armenia at the end of August and in India in November. In terms of publications and productions, Meaningfulworld has four books, a meditation CD, and five films related to humanitarian outreach projects. While the successes are many, the organization currently faces challenges with raising funds for humanitarian outreach projects around the globe.

Continued on next page..
Finally, Reema Baniabbasi presented an introductory review of professional psychological organizations in the Middle East under the supervision of her mentor, Dr. Kalayjian. Reema reviewed the websites and social media profiles of nine psychological associations, some of which identify themselves as pan-Arab. The Middle East Eating Disorders Association (MEEDA) identifies itself as an interdisciplinary pan-Middle East organization while the Middle East Psychological Association (MEPA) is currently a national psychological organization based in Kuwait with a vision to have a pan-Middle East focus. Three other organizations are national ones from the UAE, Lebanon, and Iran. Reema plans to work on a comprehensive review to include more national psychological organizations in the region and information beyond what was gathered from websites and social media. The latter two media are limiting given the fact that the Internet may not be the best medium to gather information in some parts of the world.

All of the organizations reviewed were founded in the 2000s with the exception of the Iranian Psychological Association (IPA), which was founded in the early 1960s. The IPA had a period of inactivity before being revived in the early 1990s. Attendees of the discussion suggested that the Iranian Revolution coincided with those years of inactivity. Unlike the other organizations, the IPA has a large membership, with 17,000 members, divisions in several branches of psychology, and active academic journals. The majority of the organizations reviewed did not indicate student and early career member services and involvement; they had an exclusively mental health focus, and those that identified as “pan-Middle East” seemed to focus exclusively on Arab countries. Not all of the organizations were headed by members of an Arab or Middle Eastern ethnic group and most of the websites and social media profiles were in English. Reema observed that some of the organizations she tried to find no longer had an online presence and she was not certain as to whether they are still active.
This indicates a need for APA’s directory of national psychology associations around the world and the Arab Psychological Sciences Network (ArabPsyNet) database of Arab psychological associations to be updated. She proposed that if she had entered her search terms in Arabic or in another Middle Eastern language, she might have found different results.

The discussion was concluded with Dr. Takooshian proposing having a more formal discussion in next year’s APA Convention which will be held in Toronto, Ontario, Canada. Presenters will therefore present updates about their EPAs next year and collect information about other EPAs. As one of the attendees of this event mentioned, psychology is often mistakenly presented as an exclusively Western endeavor. Some of the EPAs presented are based in America or represent American ethnic groups none of which were listed in APA’s National, International, and Regional Psychology Organizations. The Asian American Psychological Association is listed as one of four EMPAs in APA’s directory of Ethnic Minority Psychological Associations. It is worth noting, however, that the U.S. EPAs do not exclude an international perspective and therefore have important roles to play in the development of psychology both in the U.S. and abroad, not just one versus the other. In contrast, of the 9 Middle Eastern psychological organizations Reema reviewed, MEPA and International Arab Psychological Association were listed in the APA Directory of International & Regional Psychology Organizations while the IPA, Lebanese Psychological Association (LPA), and Emirates Psychological Association were listed in the APA Directory of National Psychology Organizations. The Emirates Psychological Association and International Arab Psychological Association no longer have an online presence while the IPA’s English version of its website could not be found. This may reflect a need for APA to learn about the updated statuses of EPAs abroad as it, along with knowledge about U.S. EPAs, have implications in fostering international and cross-cultural collaborations.

In Memoriam

Rivka Bertisch Meir, PhD, MPH, LMHC
(December 12, 1941 - August 14, 2014)

The remarkable life of Rivka B. Meir ended suddenly, when she was struck by a speeding car near her Miami-area home. All who knew Rivka saw her many deep passions in life--for her field of psychology, the well-being of students, her faith, and her beloved family.

Rivka was born in Argentina in 1941, into a prominent Jewish family - the Bertisch--who fled from Poland, where most of her family was killed by Nazis. Rivka’s multi-national career spanned many regions - from Argentina to Honolulu, Jerusalem, Durham NC, San Francisco, New York, and most recently Miami.
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Rivka completed her bachelor in psychology and communications in 1974, as a Phi Beta Kappa graduate of the University of Hawaii. There, she also completed a Masters in Public Health in 1975, and graduate work in psychology with her beloved mentor Raymond Corsini. Much later, in 2005, Rivka earned a PhD in psychology with Stanley Krippner at Saybrook University in San Francisco, with dissertation research on "Life patterns and beliefs counseling: Theory and practice."

Across three decades, Rivka was an immensely popular counselor to individual and organizations, who often appeared in the media. Since she established her Foundation much of her work was done with her beloved husband Michael Meir, MD, PhD, who is a counselor, originally trained in cardiology and aerospace medicine. She hosted workshops for up to 400 participants, and was a prolific author of books, and producer of multilingual videotapes—as described on her website, [http://www.doctorrivka.com/](http://www.doctorrivka.com/)

In 2007, Rivka was elected a Fellow of the American Psychological Association (APA), based on her "outstanding contributions to international psychology" research, teaching, and service. Within APA Division One, Rivka had many leadership roles—including program chair, and co-founder of the national speaker network. The two-day mid-winter board meetings of November 2006 and 2007 were hosted in the Meirs’ home. After a time of many health and family challenges in 2012, Rivka and Michael relocated to Miami in 2013, at the invitation of the vibrant Spanish-speaking community in that region.

Each individual has his or her special area. Rivka excelled in many, as evidenced by the great influence she had throughout the world through her internet postings. Whereas the internet teaches us how a single individual can have infinite positive influence on the world, it is only a few who merit actually putting that into practice. Her positive influence on the world is both obvious and everlasting as her commitment and determination for everything especially helping people.

APA’s council approves several governance changes and continues to debate Council’s structure

In addition to approving proposals for improving the association’s governance system, the APA Council of Representatives endorsed initiatives to bring emerging science to practice and psychology’s expertise to human welfare.

At its August meeting, APA’s Council of Representatives approved several proposals recommended by the Good Governance Project (GGP) Implementation Work Group (IWG) that seek to streamline the association’s governance system and make it more inclusive. IWG was tasked with developing the implementation plans for the governance changes that Council adopted at its August 2013 meeting. IWG brought forward several items for Council’s consideration at its February and August 2014 meetings.

“This was a challenging but important council meeting,” APA President Nadine J. Kaslow, PhD says. “Challenging because updating the APA governance system, as the Good Governance Project is designed to do, is not a simple task.”

The GGP model, proposed after a thorough assessment with input from governance groups, seeks primarily to increase member engagement and give members a more direct voice in the decision-making process. It also seeks to enable APA governance to respond more nimbly to issues of the day and to ensure strategic alignment across the organization. The GGP was an outgrowth of the APA Strategic Plan focused on optimizing organizational effectiveness.

Over the last year, the council has approved several proposals from the IWG,

At its February meeting, the council approved a three-year trial delegation of duties to the Board of Directors in four areas: financial and budgetary matters; the oversight of APA’s chief executive officer; the alignment of the budget with APA’s Strategic Plan; and internally focused policy development. These changes free up council to focus on strategic and emerging issues affecting psychology and to engage in higher level dialogues that inform the development of policy and strategic directions.

The council also approved a change in the composition of APA’s Board of Directors. Under the change, the board would have six member-at-large seats open to election from and by the general membership. In addition, the board would have a public member, as well as student and early career psychologist representation. Two seats would also be reserved for members of a newly created Council Leadership Team (CLT), in order to ensure a bridge between the APA board and council. The CLT will manage the work of council, determine the process for council to select topics for discussions and provide recommendations on agenda items that council would consider. The CLT will have 12 members, all of whom would be current or past council members.

The changes to the board’s composition require a Bylaw change and therefore need approval by the APA membership; the Bylaw amendment ballot is expected to be sent to members next year.

Continued on page 37...
Fifty years later: What have we learnt from the 1964 Kitty Genovese tragedy?

Continued from page 2

Yet the Genovese tragedy remains unique in many ways--a non-celebrity homicide victim who is better known than her killer. Like Anne Frank, Kitty was an unknown person who became a national public figure only in her death. Kitty is known only for the last 28 minutes of her life, not the first 28 years.

3. Behavioral sciences. In the Sixties, the Genovese tragedy moved three separate teams of psychological scientists in New York to create what became new, data-based psychology specialties. (a) Stanley Milgram at CUNY used field experiments to introduce what is now known as "urban psychology," studying the impact of city life on the individual. (b) Harry Kaufmann at Hunter College used surveys to study what is now cognitive forensic psychology, the impact of law on moral reasoning. (c) Bibb Latane at Columbia and John Darley at NYU used lab experiments to study what we now term "prosocial behavior." (d) We might belatedly add Philip Zimbardo’s recent research on heroism and "the heroic imagination," developing data-based methods to promote heroic responses in Genovese-type situations.

4. Truth? There is a trend for some to point to exaggerations in the original reports of the Genovese tragedy, which they now term a "myth," or even a "fraud" or a "hoax." When Charles Skoller, the prosecutor of Kitty’s killer in 1964, began hearing such reports in 2003, he was moved to travel from Florida to New York at his own expense to address an audience about this; in his seventies, Skoller pledged to write the precise facts as he knew them in the first, first-person account of the trial of Kitty's killer. Skoller’s book indeed appeared in 2008 before his death, Twisted Confessions.

Surely a prime reason why people around the world 50 years later remain so touched by Kitty’s tragedy, is the haunting image of this terrified young woman, as she watched her neighbors ignore her desperate screams. Because of Kitty, we behavioral scientists now understand more about the dynamics of bystander inaction, and the moral choices that accompany this; in his seventies, Skoller pledged to write the precise facts as he knew them in the first, first-person account of the trial of Kitty’s killer. Skoller’s book indeed appeared in 2008 before his death, Twisted Confessions. As Mr. Skoller would agree, there are actually two spellings of the five-letter word, "truth." First, truth with a small "t" refers to the surface facts in a report. Second, Truth with a capital T refers to the enduring and underlying veracity of a report. It is the difference between myth and parable. Whether or not it was 38 or 8 witnesses, Ms. Genovese felt horribly alone, and would have survived if inactive neighbors responded to her cries.

In 1983, Wilfred Perera and other psychology student researchers examined the three New York dailies for 3 months to study media accounts of bystander behavior during crises. What they found, in part: (1) Initial bystander reports typically contained inaccuracies that were tweaked in later editions. (2) Such reports were used as filler that rarely appeared in more than one paper. (3) When they did, reports in the two papers varied greatly. The Genovese case was no exception.

So we ask, "What is the legacy of the Kitty Genovese murder, 50 years later?" On March 8-9 of 2014, Fordham University in New York City hosted "The Kitty Genovese Memorial Conference"--where 150 people heard an interdisciplinary group of 24 experts discuss this question, including four psychologists: Bibb Latane (NC), Scott Plous (CT), Harold Takooshian (NY), and Philip G. Zimbardo (CA).

** Address any inquiries to Harold Takooshian, Professor of Psychology & Urban Studies, Fordham University, New York NY 10023; Email: takoosh@aol.com
On March 8-9, 2014, 150 people gathered in the rooftop conference center of Fordham University in New York City, to hear 24 experts address the "The Kitty Genovese Memorial Conference: 50 years later." These 24 speakers included journalists, scholars, activists, and Genovese family members--most of them meeting for the first time. Participants heard each expert speak with passion for 15 minutes, presenting their new information or insights, on one of three themes: (1) a celebration of young Kitty’s life, (2) a re-examination of the facts in her senseless death, or (3) the many ways society has changed for the better after Kitty’s tragedy.

When Kitty was fatally stabbed outside her New York City home at 3 am on March 13, 1964, her little-known death soon exploded into headlines world-wide, when journalist A.M. Rosenthal's bold book, Thirty-eight witnesses, asked this simple question: "If many of Kitty's neighbors saw or heard her screaming for her life, why did none of them help her, or even phone the police in time?" Even a half-century later, we continue to learn new facts about Kitty and her iconic tragedy. Inexplicably, not one biography of Ms. Genovese has appeared these past 50 years--yet this conference included the voices of authors of at least five powerful new or forthcoming books this year about Kitty and her tragedy. A list of these books appears in the conference program, at

http://file-id.org/140310/13688

One question probed in this conference was whether knowledge of Kitty’s tragedy has changed bystander behavior since 1964? A blog seeks people’s views on this question, http://psyccritiquesblog.apa.org/2009/04/what-is-the-value-of-the-genovese-parable.html

Some scenes from this public forum appear at picasaweb.com/takoosh For any details, contact the forum’s co-chairs: Attorney Joseph F. DeMay of New York City, or Professor Harold Takooshian of Fordham University, kgconf@gmail.com
Kitty Genovese Forum

Links to recent books, and related information:

Kevin Cook, http://books.wwnorton.com/books/Kitty-Genovese/

Peter Hellman, http://peterhellman.com/

Andrew Karmen, www.crimevictimsupdates.com/

Catherine Pelonero, www.kittygenovesebook.com

Myrna Skoller, http://twistedconfessionsbook.com/

James Solomon, www.thewitnessfilm.com

LuLu LoLo, www.lululolo.com/calendar.html

Jim Rasenberger, www.jimrasenberger.com

Carrie Rentschler, www.mcgill.ca/igsf/about/staff

Curtis Sliwa, www.guardianangels.org/

Harold Takooshian, http://takooshian.socialpsychology.org/files

Zehra Imam, www.facebook.com/illuminatedcitiesproject

Philip Zimbardo, www.heroicimagination.org

In 2014, new and forthcoming volumes related to Ms. Genovese:
APA August 2014 Council Report

Continued from page 33

At its August meeting, the council continued to grapple with council’s optimal size and structure. The questions still remaining -- and that will be considered at the February 2015 council meeting -- include:

1. The overall size of the council.
2. Whether the allocation of council seats should be made on an apportionment basis, as they are currently allocated, based on size of a division or state/provincial/territorial association or based on one seat per constituency,
3. Whether to adopt a IWG proposal recommending that nine at-large council seats be added and determined by the Needs Assessment Slating and Campaigns Committee based on an annual needs assessment.

“I am deeply grateful to my fellow council members for their diligence and thoughtfulness in making sure that the changes we make are the ones that appear to be optimal for the organization at this time and will serve future members well,” Kaslow says.

In other GGP action, the council received reports from the IWG on making better use of technology, on the delineation of financial oversight responsibilities within the new governance structure, a plan for developing a leadership pipeline and development program after gathering additional input from Council, and a plan for how professional and disciplinary issues would be introduced to and triaged by the new governance system.

In addition, the council approved a change in the oversight functions of the Committee for the Advancement of Professional Practice (CAPP). The committee will now be wholly a committee of the APAPO Board of Directors. This change will also add a voting member from the American Psychological Association of Graduate Students to CAPP, which already has a designated early career psychologist member. The Board of Professional Affairs will continue to oversee the work of the Practice Directorate, including policy formulation; the development of both professional practice and clinical practice guidelines; public education and disaster response; and advocacy for access to quality mental health services.

Additional council action

In other action the council:

1. Approved a change to the Association Rules to now require that all boards and committees have at least one member who is an early career psychologist. Exceptions were allowed when membership criteria for a particular board or committee made a slate solely comprised of early career members impossible.
2. Adopted a resolution aimed at stemming false confessions and wrongful convictions, including a recommendation that all interrogations of domestic criminal felony suspects be videotaped in their entirety and from a “neutral” angle. The measure, which relies heavily on psychological research, states that law enforcement officers often close their investigations after a criminal suspect confesses, even in cases where the confession is inconsistent, contrary to evidence or coerced. Many adults with mental disabilities and younger suspects don’t fully understand their right to remain silent and to have a lawyer present, and are more likely to waive their rights, the resolution says. In addition, jurors often have difficulty distinguishing true confessions from false, in part because even false confessions sometimes contain vivid and accurate details and facts that had not been previously reported.
American Psychological Association
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3. Adopted as APA policy a resolution on gender and sexual orientation diversity in children and adolescents in schools that encourages education, training and ongoing professional development about the needs of gender and sexual orientation diverse students for educators and other school personnel.

4. Adopted as APA policy a resolution in support of the UN Convention on the Rights and Dignity of Person with Disabilities.

5. Adopted as APA policy Guidelines for Clinical Supervision in Health Service Psychology. These guidelines delineate optimal performance expectations for psychologists who supervise trainees in health-service delivery settings (see www.apa.org/about/policies/guidelines-supervision.pdf).

6. Approved the creation of a Div. 42 (Psychologists in Independent Practice) journal titled Practice Innovation.

7. Approved the creation of a APA Committee on Associate and Baccalaureate Education. This committee will subsume the work of the current Psychology Teachers at Community College Committee.

8. Adopted new policy that supports the inclusion on all governance boards and committee members who have not previously served in governance. Such members running for governance will be given the option to have the fact that they are new to governance service noted by an asterisk on the election ballot.