University of South Carolina

[Scholar Commons](#)

2010

School, Community and Clinical Psychology Training and Working together in the Interdisciplinary School Mental Health Field

Mark D. Weist
University of South Carolina - Columbia, weist@mailbox.sc.edu

C. Mills

S. Huebner

B. Smith

A. Wandersman

From the President

Patricia O'Connor
Sage Colleges,
Troy, New York

Setting Direction and Staying the Course

SCRA – we are in such an exciting place! Thanks to the work of previous presidents, particularly Anne Bogat, we are more financially viable than ever; we have numerous active committees and interest groups (the Practice Council is particularly notable as a relatively new, amazingly active, initiative); we have solidified our position, strengthening the Executive Council (EC) with an additional representative from the Practice Council and enhancing our supports with an excellent management firm; and, most importantly, we have compelling contributions to make, to the field of psychology and to our many local, national, and international communities. We sponsored some of that significant work at the recent APA meeting in San Diego, including Pennie Foster-Fishman's invited address on the role of "place"

in constructing and assessing our interventions, Ed Seidman's Sarason Award Lecture on the elaborations of his social regularities work, and Mark Aber's presidential address on inserting trust into our understanding of and involvement in interventions.

Stepping into this presidential role, I see three critical factors for SCRA as we move forward, which are, of course, not new! First is the critical issue of membership; we are a graying organization and though we can rely on hair color products, it is not enough! We need to recruit and retain our younger colleagues, in and outside of academia, and in and outside of community psychology. This means that we have to ensure that we are meeting the needs and interests of those we wish to engage. We can begin by identifying strategies which will add value to their ongoing community-based practice, research and teaching endeavors. To address this I plan to try/implement several strategies in conjunction with our EC members-at-large who focus on membership. First, we will work with directors of SCRA-related academic master's and doctoral programs through our Council of Educational Programs (CEP) to identify recent graduates. We will then solicit their perceptions about the actual and potential value of SCRA. Second, through our two EC student representatives, we will use the SCRA student listserv, which comprises some 500 students, to

seek their feedback on the actual and potential value of SCRA. We can then use those perceptions as the basis for re-examining how we see and how we project ourselves. A third strategy will be to pair with like-minded divisions of APA to conduct mutual recruiting efforts (you can recruit ours if we can recruit yours). This might be combined with a reduction in first year dues, or in dues of early career members, or with a "pay a nominal fee for the first year and get the second year and third years at half price." These options will be explored with the EC to assess their viability. As a fourth strategy, I would personally like to hear from those of you who have been less involved in SCRA (oconnp@sage.edu) -- What can we do to make you feel more integrated into the organization? Are you satisfied with your current relationship with SCRA? Are there ways that we can enhance your sense of connection with your professional organization? Finally, we can track members who have not renewed in the past couple of years, both to assess the reasons for non-renewal and, hopefully, to re-recruit them into SCRA.

The second critical factor is visibility, or the lack thereof, of SCRA as an organization and as individuals within that organization. Part of that lack of visibility is simply the nature of our field: basically we work to give away our talents and our skills to increase the talents and skills of others. In doing so, we draw attention away from rather

Contents:
Fall 2010

than toward ourselves. Most of us take the position that we are most successful when we put ourselves out of work. That fundamental perspective rather contradicts aiming for visibility! Yet the viability of any organization requires attention to making the organization visible. During my tenure as president I want to initiate a focus on visibility through an exploration of our relationship with our umbrella organization: APA. There will certainly be an appropriate sensitivity to this topic among our members and even within the EC. Recent positions taken by APA and the very strong clinical practitioner emphasis within APA are not very compatible with some of our basic SCRA principles. That lack of compatibility led, many years ago, to the emergence of SCRA as an organization with a strong membership base outside of APA. Yet we as an organization rely on APA for some of our basic structural supports, including APA's legal department, the Public Interest Directorate, their training opportunities for our SCRA leadership, and so on. By encouraging us to examine and clarify our SCRA relationship with APA I anticipate that we can foster better visibility within APA in ways that will strengthen our positions without compromising our principles. To accomplish this, I will call upon past-presidents, our current and past representative to the APA Council, and SCRA members who are or have been active within APA to act as an ad hoc working group. This group can address such questions as: What are the ways in which SCRA interacts effectively and ineffectively with APA? Are there available connections with APA that would be useful to SCRA? Are there ways in which SCRA should separate more clearly or join more closely with APA?

The third critical factor is the simple continuation and strengthening of the organizational structures within SCRA itself. We have, as I already noted, committees and interest groups that function well. Some might want more EC attention and/or support (not necessarily financial). I am fortunate to have a strong EC with committed members, each of whom works diligently to fulfill their particular EC tasks. One interesting direction for the EC, set out by recent past-present Mo Elias, is an emphasis on policy at the EC level. We have a three-year project (we are starting year two) to identify strategies to enhance or even establish SCRA's role (as an organization through the contributions of our members) as a contributor to policy decisions. Under Mark Aber's leadership, our immediate past-president, we identified two areas in which our members might make contributions: the Violence Against Women Act (VAWA) and the Secondary and Elementary Schools Act (SESA), both of which will be coming up for re-authorization by Congress. We have already begun identifying appropriate experts within SCRA and working to connect them with national groups involved with these issues. There is also an effort initiated by Division 17 (Counseling Psychology) to establish guidelines for prevention to be adopted by APA; as I write this Mark Aber is seeking involvement from our SCRA prevention experts to provide feedback on the proposed guidelines.

This will be an exciting year for me – I thank SCRA members who voted for me for this opportunity! And I hope my work during this year will result in an even stronger and more viable SCRA organization. 🌐

From the Editor

Maria B. J. Chun,
University of Hawai'i at Manoa

Happy Anniversary, as David (Associate Editor), Baker's Printing (Production Editor), and I celebrate the start of our second year as the TCP editorial team. Thanks to all of you for your support, submissions, and suggestions. We truly appreciate and value your input and feedback. Mirroring what our new President, Pat O'Connor, notes in her column with regard to SCRA as a whole, we would like to know what we can do to continuously improve The Community Psychologist to make it as accessible and valuable as possible to all of our readers (mariachu@hawaii.edu or dj5775@yahoo.com). In fact, we hope to be able to contribute to an increase in readership via Pat's efforts to welcome new members and invite back former ones.

As one of the running themes throughout the past year, I too have continued to ponder what it means to be a community psychologist. At the Biennial last year, I participated in a meeting that discussed how we could encourage students to "choose" community psychology as a career as opposed to the other way around. For example, someone had jokingly said that the typical path to community psychology is, "I was walking down the sidewalk one day, stepped on a crack, and then . . ." To be honest, that pretty much sums up how I was introduced to the field over two decades ago. My mentor at the time was a cross-cultural psychologist who was hired by our department's community psychology program. I had entered graduate school in social psychology, but was told that I needed to switch to community if I wanted to continue to work on all the cool cross-cultural research projects. So, that is what I did. I have never regretted the decision and was pleasantly surprised with how community psychology was the perfect fit for my interests and career aspirations.

I relay this to all of you as a way to share how completely impressed I am with how times have changed and how we now increasingly have more students who "choose" community psychology from the start of their graduate careers. The work of the Student Interest and Practice Groups is truly amazing. They are helping to craft our message and are clearly getting the word out. This hit home for me just a month ago when the Fall semester began. When I asked the students in my junior-level Honors class to introduce themselves, one of them proudly announced that she planned to become a community psychologist. At that point it hit me that we really have grown as a field and the word is getting out about what we do.

EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE 2010–2011

PRESIDENT
Patricia O'Connor,
Sage Colleges, Troy, New York
PAST PRESIDENT
Mark S. Aber,
University of Illinois,Urbana-Champaign
PRESIDENT–ELECT
James Cook,
University of North Carolina, Charlotte
TREASURER
Fabricio E. Balcazar,
University of Illinois, Chicago
SECRETARY
Sandra Lewis,
Montclair State University
STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES
Lindsey Zimmerman,
Georgia State University
Todd Bottom, *DePaul University*
APA COUNCIL REPRESENTATIVE
Meg Bond,
University of Massachusetts Lowell
COUNCIL OF EDUCATION PROGRAMS
Steve Davis, *Aurora University*
REGIONAL NETWORK COORDINATOR
Susan McMahon,
DePaul University
MEMBERS-AT-LARGE
Rhonda K. Lewis–Moss,
Wichita State University
Tiffany Townsend,
Georgetown University
Chiara Sabina,
Pennsylvania State University
AJCP EDITOR
Jacob Kraemer Tebes,
Yale University
TCP EDITOR
Maria B.J. Chun,
University of Hawai´i at Manoa

COMMITTEE CHAIRS

APA 2010 PROGRAM COMMITTEE
Bradley Olson,
National Louis University
CULTURAL & RACIAL AFFAIRS
Rhonda K. Lewis–Moss,
Wichita State University
FELLOWS
Maurice J. Elias, *Rutgers University*
INTERNATIONAL
Serdar M. Değirmencioğlu,
Istanbul Arel University
INTERDISCIPLINARY LINKAGES
Eric Mankowski,
Portland State University
MEMBERSHIP
Rhonda K. Lewis-Moss,
Wichita State University
Tiffany Townsend,
Georgetown University

NOMINATIONS
Mark S. Aber, *University of Illinois
at Urbana-Champaign*
Patricia O'Connor, *Sage Colleges*
PUBLICATIONS
Roger Mitchell,
North Carolina State University
PUBLIC POLICY
Nicole Porter, *DePaul Center
for Community Research*
Steven Howe, *University of Cincinnati*
WOMEN
Pamela Mulder,
Marshall University

REGIONAL COORDINATORS

U.S.–MIDWEST
Nicole Porter, *DePaul University*
Lisa Walt, *DePaul University*
Sharon Song, *Midwestern University*
U.S.–NORTHEAST
Anne E. Brodsky, *University of Maryland
at Baltimore County*
Lauren Bennett Cattaneo,
George Mason University
Michele Schlehofer, *Salisbury University*
**U.S.–ROCKY MOUNTAINS/
SOUTHWEST**
Maria Felix-Ortiz,
University of the Incarnate Word
Jessica Goodkind,
University of New Mexico
U.S.–SOUTHEAST
Vacant
U.S.–WEST
Regina Langhout,
University of California-Santa Cruz
Maria B.J. Chun,
University of Hawai´i at Manoa
Joan Twohey-Jacobs,
University of LaVerne
Dyana Valentine,
info@dyanavalentine.com

INTERNATIONAL REGIONAL LIASONS

ASIA
Toshi Sasao, *University of Tokyo &
University of Illinois at Chicago*
**AUSTRALIA/NEW ZEALAND/
SOUTH PACIFIC**
Katie Thomas,
Curtin University of Technology
Dr. Diane Costello,
Curtin University of Technology
Dr. Kamal Kishore,
Fiji School of Medicine
CANADA
Liesette Brunson,
University of Quebec at Montreal
EUROPE/MIDDLE EAST/AFRICA
Vacant
LATIN AMERICA
Vacant

INTEREST GROUPS

AGING
The Aging Interest Group focuses on the productive role of aging in the community and the prevention of mental health problems in the elderly.
Chair: Margaret M. Hastings
(847) 256-4844
margaretmhastings@earthlink.net

CHILDREN, YOUTH & FAMILIES
The Children, Youth & Families Interest Group facilitates the interests of child and adolescent development in high risk contexts, especially the effect of urban poverty and community structures on child and family development.
Chair: Richard N. Roberts (435) 797-3346

COMMUNITY ACTION
The Community Action Interest Group explores the roles and contributions of people working in applied community psychology settings.
Chair: Bradley Olson (773) 325-4771

COMMUNITY HEALTH
The Community Health Interest Group focuses on health promotion, disease prevention, and health care service delivery issues as they relate to the community.
*Co-chairs: David Lounsbury (415) 338-1440
dlounsbu@aecom.yu.edu;
Shannon Gwin Mitchell (202) 719-7812
sgwinmitchell@gmail.com*

DISABILITIES
The Disabilities Interest Group promotes understanding of the depth and diversity of disabilities issues in the community that are ready for research and action, and influences community psychologists' involvement in policy and practices that enhance self determination, personal choice, and full inclusion in the community for people with disabilities.
*Chair: Tina Taylor-Ritzler (312) 413-4149,
tritzler@uic.edu*

ENVIRONMENT & JUSTICE
The Environment & Justice Interest Group is focused on research and action related to global climate change and environmental degradation. With a focus on environmental justice, particularly how environmental change affects and often perpetuates social inequality, this group explores the role community psychology can and should play in understanding in these urgent changes to our ecology.
Chair: Courte Voorhees, (505) 306-7323

INDIGENOUS
The Indigenous Interest Group is hosted by the Australian, New Zealand and Pacific branch of the Society for Community Research and Action. The aims of this group are interrelated. Firstly, it wants to support SCRA members who are conducting indigenous research by providing a forum for the exchange of ideas, literature and experience. This will assist the Group's more specific focus which is to utilize our combined resources more effectively to conduct strengths-based praxis towards raising public awareness of the plight of indigenous people and addressing the social justice issues they face in oppressive dominant societies.
*Co-chairs: Brian Bishop,
B.Bishop@curtin.edu.au;
Lizzie Finn, l.finn@curtin.edu.au*

**LESBIAN, GAY, BISEXUAL,
& TRANSGENDER (LGBT)**
The LGBT Interest Group increases awareness of the need for community research and action related to issues that impact LGBT people, and serves as a mechanism for communication, collaboration, and support among community psychologists who are either interested in research/service/policy related to LGBT people and communities, and/or who identify as LGBT.
*Co-chairs: Richard Jenkins,
jenkinsri@nida.nih.gov;
Maria Valente, valent60@msu.edu*

ORGANIZATION STUDIES
The Organization Studies Interest Group is a community of scholars who are interested in community psychology themes (e.g., empowerment, ecological analysis, prevention, sense of community) in organizational contexts, and in importing organization studies concepts, methods, models, and theories into community psychology.
*Chair: Neil Boyd (717) 512-3870
Boyd@Lycoming.edu*

PREVENTION & PROMOTION
The Prevention & Promotion Interest Group seeks to enhance development of prevention and promotion research, foster active dialogue about critical conceptual and methodological action and implementation issues, and promote rapid dissemination and discussion of new developments and findings in the field.
*Co-chairs: Monica Adams,
madams8@depaul.edu;
Derek Griffith, derekmg@umich.edu*

RURAL
The Rural Interest Group is devoted to highlighting issues of the rural environment that are important in psychological research, service, and teaching.
*Chair: Cécile Lardon, (909) 474-5781
c.lardon@uaf.edu*

SCHOOL INTERVENTION
The School Intervention Interest Group addresses theories, methods, knowledge base, and setting factors pertaining to prevention and health promotion in school.
*Co-chairs: Paul Flaspohler,
flaspopd@muohio.edu;
Melissa Maras, marasme@missouri.edu*

SELF-HELP/ MUTUAL SUPPORT
The Self-Help/Mutual Support Interest Group is an international organization of researchers, self-help leaders, and policy makers that promotes research and action related to self-help groups and organizations.
Chair: Louis Brown, ldb12@psu.edu

I feel so fortunate to be a part of one of the main tools that help to get that word out – The Community Psychologist. Please keep sending in all of your suggestions and submissions and help to keep community psychology in demand. We have so much to offer. 🌐

Special Section

Edited by Bret Kloos, Guest Editor

Strike at the University of Puerto Rico: Lessons for Community Psychology

Written by
Carlos Rivera and
Juan Carlos Cusman

For 62 days, the students of the University of Puerto Rico (UPR) sustained and "won" a strike against the administration of the UPR, aiming for social change in the long run. The administration wanted to eliminate tuition exceptions for honor students, athletes, and many other categories. This also was part of a political agenda to make the only public university in Puerto Rico less accessible to people. Day after day, students, professors, workers, and citizen-community members participated and watched very closely at what consumed the headlines in the national news for virtually the entire duration of the strike. Dozens were hurt because of police brutality, others were arrested with civil disobedience-related charges, and the end of the semester was extended so far into summer that summer courses were not held. During this time, supporters of the strike experimented with social change strategies inside and outside of the university, such as participation and intervention, action and research strategies, and in communication and power relations. As graduate students of social-community psychology and participants in the strike, we were very interested in community-group and psycho-political processes as analytical aspects of social change. We came

> As graduate students of social-community psychology and participants in the strike, we were very interested in community-group and psycho-political processes as analytical aspects of social change.

to view the strike as a broader social movement, since we actively participated in demonstrations, meetings, assemblies and even stayed on campus during this strike. We believe that social movements, such as strikes, can be fascinating as social phenomena to be analyzed from the community psychology perspective.

Puerto Rico (P.R.) has been a United States Territory since 1898 when P.R. was offered as a war prize in the Hispanic-American War. P.R. as a U.S. territory has been governed, at first, by military personnel, later by U.S. appointees and finally in the 1950s by our own elected governor. However P.R. is still considered a U.S. territory and, therefore, governed in many aspects by the U.S. Congress. P.R.'s colonial situation is the core debate in Puerto Rican politics, mainly divided into three positions: separatist, permanent union with U.S., and association movements. The separatist movement aims for independence as a nation, the association movement aims to keep the colonial "Commonwealth" status, and the permanent union with U.S. movement aims to become a U.S. state. Since 1919, the University of Puerto Rico (UPR) has been a place for political action and reflection of the nation's colonial situation. Student and worker strikes and other civil manifestations have taken place in the UPR for decades. What makes this 2010 student strike so unique is the democratic decision making of the student leadership and its outcome.

The location of the strike was the university campus. Therefore, most students who participated in the strike stayed and slept at the university. This is important to consider because in addition to the challenges of our meetings and implementation of strategies in order to win our goal, we also had to coexist in the same space. At first the students could leave campus at will; however, the administration ordered a "University Administrative Closure" after the first week of the strike. This meant that everyone had to vacate the university, but the students resisted. Special units of police were brought to create a perimeter that prevented entry into and exit from the university, creating a violent atmosphere and a state of generalized anxiety. The government of Luis Fortuño even did not permit food to be brought in to the university for the students. These conditions continued for 60 days.

The strike had support from many constituencies in P.R. and even from international sources. People made official protests to the government that civil and human rights were being violated. When the university prohibited food, even more citizens brought food, despite the governor's order. When students called for demonstrations in support of the strike, protests occurred at the university, at the Capitolio, at important malls and other places, thousands of citizens participated. Public opinion was in favor of the students.

The use of the media, through press conferences, press releases and even alternative media, such as Radio Huelga (Strike Radio, a web-based radio station) was a key strategy. While the administration of the UPR kept committing institutional violence, the students kept denouncing this and making the administration look bad

in terms of public opinion. This strike revitalized opposition movements, sympathy of worker's unions and the conditions for further actions from all citizens. The administration of the UPR was forced for the first time in history to negotiate with students. In the end, the negotiation was brought into the courts through a mediation process that ended the strike because the student tuition exceptions were not eliminated. We also had to agree to a new semester-based student "contribution" of $400 per semester, which many students remain unhappy about. The average cost of tuition alone per semester, without the "contribution," is $800 for undergraduate students and $1,200 for graduate students. In the case of undergraduates, it represents a 50% increase. However, most people considered this outcome as a victory for students achieved by the strike.

The actions outcome of this strike was guided by specific values that were generally accepted by the people in Puerto Rico. The ethical-axiological values that guided the student strike were: 1) university autonomy; 2) participatory democratic processes; and 3) promotion of cultural relativity. University autonomy means that, ideally, no political or institutional influence can govern the UPR. The college education of the nation cannot depend on any political fluctuation so that freedom of thought can be facilitated. Participatory democratic processes mean that students, professors, workers and the community participate in the decision-making processes of the University, as well as the administration. This implies that the traditional approach of the administration being the only one responsible for the governance of the university does not work. Another value that we saw guiding the student strike was

the recognition and promotion of different cultural and social voices, and their claims. That is, the student claims were always

Special units of police were brought to create a perimeter that prevented entry into and exit from the university, creating a violent atmosphere and a state of generalized anxiety.

represented by many sectors within the student community, such as political movements, feminist activist, LGBT communities, among others. These values were actively presented in written, visual and audible statements that helped create a very clear discourse and explicit goals that guided the political-strategic processes.

Psycho-political processes and power relations, between the organized students and the administration, characterized the student strike phenomena. In terms of representation the students organized their strength by first consolidating all the Universities of Puerto Rico (UPR) in all their locations, which totaled 11. Ten of 11 of these UPR's branches joined the actual strike. Also, we managed to gain the support of professors, workers, and even national and international organizations. With all this support, a student negotiation committee was formed and the administration was forced to talk with the students. For almost a month the negotiation process went on, and they found that different kinds of manifestations (e.g., civil disobediences,

This strike can easily produce a lot of intellectual work and even provide specific examples for achieving social change, guided by specific values.

marches of thousands of supporters) forced the administration to give in little by little.

The students delivered a clear message that many citizens could identify with. This was even more evident for the students that participated actively

in the strike, because after every day of negotiation with the administration, the students would hold open meetings to discuss what was being negotiated and what the students thought the negotiating committee should do. This created a sense of "generalized inclusion" in the process. The students knew exactly what their claims were and what was happening at all times. This "democratization of information" stimulated an active and extended participation of students.

On the other hand, the students were very aware that the university administration was very influenced by the governor's group and political party ideals. Luis Fortuño (Puerto Rico's present governor) has a neoliberal perspective and clearly wanted the university to adjust to this ideal by raising the income of the university and decreasing government funds for it. In the Puerto Rican context, the public universities are the only options for persons living in poverty and the oppressed. Raising the cost of tuition would translate into excluding these groups from a college education. In addition to this, many citizens believe in the value of a free college education, a very influential movement in South America and some countries of Europe. Unveiling this political agenda made very clear how to act against the administration. This also made clear that public opinion was very important in order to engage who really governed the administration and therefore controlled the University. It was very evident that more than a negotiation process was required; it was almost a political process. Negotiation and political skills were key factors for a promotion of transforming the power relations that ended in an agreement, forced by civil activism.

Student movements have been the spirit of social change in many countries. Puerto Rico is no exception. Even further,

it seems to this day that a long-term goal for the Puerto Rican student movement is to transform social conditions in order to bring a more democratic, inclusive, and just government. The case of the University of Puerto Rico student strike is already being analyzed, not only by social-community psychologists, but by a great deal of social scientists. This strike can easily produce a lot of intellectual work and even provide specific examples for achieving social change, guided by specific values. As social-community graduate students we witnessed and participated in a process of action and intervention for a systemic change. This process of collective intervention and constant critical reflection gave us a vantage point view of what could be the praxis (theory and practice in the same spectrum) of the community psychology of social movements.

Author Notes

Book Reviews

Edited by David S. Jackson, Associate Editor

Hard Knocks: Domestic Violence and the Psychology of Story-Telling
Janice Haaken.

Written by Catherine Campbell, Institute of Social Psychology, London School of Economics, UK

In an era of depressed and gloomy soul-searching about the achievements of the feminist movement and its relevance to women in the 21st century, Janice Haaken's penetrating historical critique of the domestic violence movement comes as a welcome breath of fresh air – opening up new avenues for reinvigorated feminist analysis and activism.

An academic psychologist, social theorist, feminist activist and film-maker, Haaken's rich and scholarly monograph draws on her engagement with a rich range of sources. These include critical feminist theories of power and inter-sectionality, Klein's theory of projective identification, the domestic violence literature and Paulo Freire's insights into the intertwined dynamic of the personal and the political in the reproduction or transformation of oppressive social relationships. She also draws on interviews conducted with domestic violence advocates in New York City, Berlin, Manchester and the Pine Ridge reservation of South Dakota – as well as various popular films and novels.

Her personal starting point is the same as many of the more traditional feminists she seeks to challenge: that men batter to establish power and control over women. Thereafter, however, she quickly parts company with many of them in her desire to transcend limiting feminist orthodoxy, and to construct new stories that open up possibilities for more transformative modes of feminist discourse and practice.

Drawing on feminist literary criticism, Haaken introduces the conceptual frame of "subversive storytelling" to deconstruct the stories that feminist domestic violence scholars, authors, film-makers and activists have sought to tell about gendered violence. Her analysis uncovers the way these have served to converge and congeal around a series of problematic symbolic splits and binaries – good women and bad men, powerful male oppressors and powerless women victims, aggressive men and pacifist women, damaged victims and their healthy (feminist) "rescuers."

Empirically, these splits are simply not accurate conceptual tools. They often fail to reflect the realities of battered women's experiences, and the deeply complex emotional attachments that women have with the men that batter them. Their preoccupation with male power ignores the sense of total powerlessness that leads many men to batter. They refuse to acknowledge that many male batterers themselves come from traumatic and brutalised childhood relationships (a point that many feminists angrily refuse to consider, worrying that acknowledgement of male vulnerability may be 'selling women out' in a zero sum game). These binaries also mask the fact that women may sometimes be as aggressive as men, and that battering exists in lesbian relationships. Controversially, the dichotomy of 'victim-rescuer' masks the fact that feminist advocates and activists are also human beings dealing with their own unconscious fears and pain. They, too, are subject to the very human tendency to "split" the infinitely complex world into "good" and "bad" objects in driving forward their feminist political agendas.

Haaken's goal is not simply to take feminists to task for their dependence on intellectually questionable binaries, however. The brilliance of her argument is her uncovering of the subtle ways in which these splits have unwittingly depoliticised the movement. They have led to its collusion with many of the deeply conservative social institutions that perpetuate the very forms of oppression that lead to male intimate partner violence in many situations. She provides, for example, a detailed critique of the close and positive relationship between many domestic violence movements with the police and the state.

Yet, these are often the social institutions that perpetuate the very social and economic policies that foster the socially "combustible" situations in which so much violence against women flourishes. These include policies relating to food security, lack of work, immigration difficulties, housing, militarism, the economic exploitation of poorer men by richer men, the historically rooted and on-going oppression of black people by white, the deeply negative impacts of the incarceration of growing numbers of poor minority men in the U.S., and so on.

Some highlights of Haaken's analysis include her interrogation of those sections of the shelter or refuge movement who have sought to "hide away" abused women in secret locations – contributing to the popular perception of domestic violence as a "private" rather than a "public" problem, and often playing into exaggerations of male power that are not always helpful either for survivors or their frontline workers. She delivers a devastating critique of the influential Duluth model of domestic violence (which depicts male violence as an individual choice for which individual men must take complete responsibility). She highlights the way in which the associated radical feminist depiction of men as individual violent predators resonates with the agendas of a range of individualising and conservative organisations (the National Rifle Association, for example), which survive through diagnosing the psycho-social impacts of social inequalities and injustices in terms of individual deviance or pathology.

Haaken highlights how this collusion with the state has eroded

of the past may have been historically necessary as political strategies for achieving the now widely accepted social recognition of the extent of domestic violence as well as the now widely held moral consensus that the battering of women is intolerable. These have been hard-won struggles, and Haaken by no means seeks to undermine the immensity of these achievements.

However, the movement is now ready for a new phase, one which "finds new uses for old stories," and ways of breaking out of tired old feminist scripts to embrace more complex modes of understanding, opening up the possibilities of alternative resolutions to stories of domestic violence. Haaken does not seek to prescribe the content of new scripts or their potential resolutions. However, her own analytical ability to hold complexity within one analytical frame provides feminist psychologists with an exemplary case study of the types of dialectical thought and action that need to be promoted. This book serves as a much-needed roadmap of the contours of new and more transformative approaches

...her own analytical ability to hold complexity within one analytical frame provides feminist psychologists with an exemplary case study of the types of dialectical thought and action that need to be promoted.

the movement's early roots in feminist solidarity. Advocates and agencies are increasingly mired in the neo-liberalisation of welfare. This is manifest in the growing "professionalisation" of domestic violence advocacy and a system which increasingly requires different domestic violence groups to compete with one another – or to compete with groups pursuing what should be closely inter-locking agenda's, such as housing or immigration rights – for a short supply of funding.

In unfolding her complex counter-narrative, Haaken acknowledges that many of the simplistic binary analyses

to domestic violence - approaches that are able to embrace the role of complexity, power and difference in shaping the ways in which human beings manage the aggression and conflict that is inherent to all human functioning. Haaken's book convincingly shows why greater recognition of the complexity of power and pain are vital for urgently needed new modes of understanding and managing the violence that shatters so many male-female relationships in a deeply unequal social world. 🌐

Cultural and Racial Affairs Committee

Edited by Rhonda K. Lewis-Moss

Postdoctoral Experiences: "Things to Consider" Postdoctoral Experiences from Two African American Female PhDs

Written by
Michelle L. Redmond, University of Kansas School of Medicine-Wichita and Chakema C. Carmack, Independent Consultant

Postdoctoral fellowships are designed to provide additional training to recent PhDs. This concept has existed since the 1960's (National Academy of Sciences, 2000) and continues to be a popular choice. The postdoctoral experience allows the "postdoc" to gain additional methods and hone their skills in a research environment. However, there is tremendous variability in postdoctoral experiences. The experience can be productive and lead to additional networks and opportunities or it can be a holding pattern that leads to frustration and isolation. There are a number of factors that can lead to a productive postdoc or one that needs additional fine tuning. What follows is a discussion from two recent postdoctoral fellows – one from the University of Michigan and the other from Pennsylvania State University. Both schools provide outstanding opportunities for postdoctoral training for recent graduates to learn and continue to grow as professionals (National Academy of Sciences, 2000).

Michelle L. Redmond, Ph.D.

As a recent postdoctoral fellow, I gained valuable experience and expertise during my fellowship. I completed a National Institute on Drug Abuse

postdoctoral fellowship at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. My postdoctoral experience was challenging, rewarding and an overall wonderful learning experience. Deciding to apply for a postdoctoral position before joining the tenure-track job market was something I weighed heavily. I made the decision to apply for a postdoctoral fellowship because I wanted to enhance my skills, knowledge, and expertise in a specific area: mental health and substance abuse services research. By completing a postdoctoral fellowship at the University of Michigan I was able to achieve this objective.

Postdoctoral fellowships are diverse and they vary in terms of length, funding, field of study as well as other aspects. There are some key things you should consider in order to accomplish your goals in the short amount of time that you are a fellow. Looking back at my own postdoctoral experience there is some specific advice I would have appreciated before embarking on this adventure.

The most important advice I would give anyone starting a new postdoctoral fellowship is to make the most of this opportunity to develop new skills and enhance others. This can be done by taking advantage of learning opportunities, actively collaborating with other postdoctoral fellows, senior researchers and faculty on campus and utilizing the expertise and knowledge of your research mentor. I also recommend that you use your time wisely, publish as much as you can and remember to enjoy your new surroundings. If you find yourself at a new institution or city, don't isolate yourself – get involved in the community. The first key to landing a successful postdoctoral fellowship is to know where to find them.

Finding a Postdoctoral Opportunity.

Postdoctoral opportunities are abundant; however, given the current economy one may have to search a little longer. Nevertheless, there are several good resources available for researching postdoctoral opportunities. Conducting an online search by accessing such sites

as indeed.com, APA's psychcareers, the Chronicle of Higher Education and your division's listserv can prove to be beneficial. Basic networking is also a wonderful way to find out about postdoctoral fellowships. I personally was successful in finding a postdoc opportunity through the SCRA Division 27 listserv. Belonging to the division's listserv, presenting at and attending conferences are wonderful ways to get to know what opportunities are available. Once you have written a successful application and you are on your way to start your fellowship, make sure you have a good research plan.

Have a Plan.

Many postdoctoral opportunities will ask you to write a research plan which outlines what you intend to accomplish while you are in residence during the fellowship. Having a research plan really helps you stay on task. When you are feeling a little lost during those first few weeks into the fellowship, a good research plan helps you refocus your attention on your research goals. I would also say that you really need to put some thought into your research plan to make sure that you can execute your research goals within the length of your fellowship. As you are writing your plan consider including opportunities for grant writing and enhancing technical skills. While it is tempting to delve into every topic you are interested in, being focused for me was the best way to make sure that I was successful and productive. While a research plan is essential to be successful, your research mentors are also important in helping you execute your research plan.

Postdoctoral Research Mentors.

All postdocs are different, and in some instances you will enter a training program where you select your research mentors or you may enter a program where they make the selection. Regardless of how you find your mentor, it is important to base the connection on similar research interests. The research mentor should be someone you can go to for advice about your academic pursuits while in the postdoc and someone whom you can collaborate and work with while you are in residence. My experience in finding research mentors involved being paired with faculty who were on the training grant as well as having the opportunity to find research mentors who had similar research interests as my own. In my experience, it is also beneficial as a postdoc to seek out unofficial mentors, particularly senior researchers or faculty who work in other disciplines and who are working in various research areas that you are interested in pursuing. When you first arrive at your new postdoctoral site take time to seek out those on campus who you are interested in meeting. Use

The most important advice I would give anyone starting a new postdoctoral fellowship is to make the most of this opportunity to develop new skills and enhance others.

this as an opportunity to learn more about their research. Be willing to introduce yourself, set-up a meeting and go prepared with questions. Set these meetings up as opportunities to network and learn more about your new academic environment. From these meetings you might find opportunities to collaborate in the future.

Collaboration.

Collaborating with other postdocs, your research mentor and other senior level researchers on campus will give you an opportunity to form professional relationships that have the opportunity to

continue once your postdoc is over. One of the goals of many postdoctoral fellows is to write and publish as much as you can. By collaborating with your postdoctoral peers, senior level researchers, and faculty you are increasing your opportunity to publish. Being a reliable and consistent collaborator will benefit you in future research projects.

Enjoy Your Experience.

In general, your postdoctoral fellowship will be an intense time where you are focused on accomplishing as much as you can in a short period of time. However, remember to enjoy your new surroundings. Take in cultural, social and intellectual opportunities at your new institution and the surrounding community. It is also advantageous to get to know other postdocs on campus where you can form a social network and be around a group of like-minded individuals who are having similar experiences. I personally recommend pursuing a postdoctoral fellowship if this is your interest. Remember, your postdoctoral fellowship is a chance to enhance technical skills, increase publications and take advantage of new learning opportunities. In pursuing your fellowship you are investing at least two years of time, energy and work, so it is important to make sure the overall postdoctoral fellowship will be a good fit you. ⊕

Chakema C. Carmack, Ph.D.

As an upcoming graduate in community psychology, I chose to seek a postdoctoral opportunity that would strengthen my methodological expertise. I accepted a postdoctoral training opportunity granted by The National Institute on Drug Abuse at The Pennsylvania State University. This training was a dual appointment at The Prevention Research Center and The Methodology Center, intended to provide current methodological expertise to prevention scientists and/ or provide various prevention research

skills to methodologists wishing to expand their applicability. Overall, this was a beneficial experience. Because of the postdoc experience, I am now a community psychologist equipped with advanced methodological skills that allow me to better synthesize and analyze complex research questions in public health, psychology, and community-based participatory research. I encourage upcoming graduate students in community psychology, as well as many other disciplines, to seek postdoctoral opportunities, especially if your goal is to increase expertise in a specific area of scholarly development.

In this increasingly competitive job market, PhDs are wisely turning to postdoctoral training programs to provide them with a deeper understanding of their chosen field, a more fine tuned skill set, and a more intense launching pad to carve out their niche of expertise. Postdocs usually are 24-month appointments. A postdoc can also be an excellent opportunity to apply your expertise to an

Once you've chosen, applied for, and received your postdoctoral appointment letter, it is crucial to have a clearly articulated plan of focus.

emerging issue in community psychology or to a completely new field. My former fellow postdoc colleagues and I agree that some of the best pieces of advice a new postdoc could have would be to: 1) seek out a postdoctoral experience where there are researchers or practitioners carrying out the kind of work you are interested in pursuing; 2) enter your postdoc experience with a clearly articulated plan of focus; and 3) network and take advantage of all the other opportunities your postdoctoral experience can offer.

As an undergraduate in psychology interested in health disparities, the best advice I received was to find a graduate program where they are carrying out research and practice similar to what I aspired to do. The same holds true for seeking out a relevant and worthwhile

post doctoral opportunity. All academic postdocs usually advertise on various message boards and professional society websites. Most will also list the academic department associated with the postdoc opportunity. It is a good idea to visit the department/institution website and take a look at the scientific and practical contributions of which some of the faculty and staff are involved. Communication is key when deciding on which postdoc opportunities to apply for. It may be a good idea to contact the postdoctoral advisor and briefly discuss the directions that former postdoctoral fellows have taken to get an idea of what type of career paths they chose after their postdoc experience. Some postdoctoral programs even keep recorded databases of what their former fellows venture on to do.

Once you've chosen, applied for, and received your postdoctoral appointment letter, it is crucial to have a clearly articulated plan of focus. Some postdocs may require this; others won't. Regardless, it is wise to know which

direction this postdoc will steer you regarding your professional goals. After all, as a community psychologist, you are already equipped with the knowledge and training to carry out quality prevention and social action research. A postdoc may be intended to increase, expand, and fine-tune your already obtained graduate training. What you aspire to become professionally should be reflected in a clearly articulated plan. The greatest barrier to most well-intending postdoctoral fellows is that it takes a few months to acclimate to new professional surroundings and perhaps deciding exactly what they will venture to accomplish in the appointed time. This is a barrier to progress because the typical two year postdoc is not a lot of time. It will pass quickly. You will want as much time as

possible being in the swing of things to gather the expertise you seek. Therefore, it is advantageous to have some clearly definable goals that will kick start your experience. For instance, if your goal is to submit a grant within a year or so, you may want to outline your plan for one, list and communicate to faculty who has the expertise and availability to assist, and detail tentative months to complete each section. If your goal is to submit four manuscripts in two years, whether through independent research, collaborative research, or previously completely research, then you should have a clear plan for accomplishing each step of that process. Keep in mind that because most postdoc terms are a short two years and much expertise and exposure should be gained, you will likely be required to multitask, participating on multiple projects and/or performing various tasks related to your overall expertise for the benefit of both yourself and the ongoing academic endeavors of the department. Discussing your plan of focus with the postdoctoral advisor or another superior is paramount to ensure that your goals and expectations are realistic and obtainable.

Some postdocs are structured, meaning there are specific guidelines each postdoc fellow will adhere to in order to have a successful training experience. However, most postdoc fellowships (when I was in the market to obtain one, at least) are unstructured. This usually means that the postdoc fellow has more autonomy to guide his or her training. The level of structure is a continuum, so identifying how much structure you need and matching that with the level of structure an opportunity will provide is a worthwhile endeavor. The greatest benefit of having a clearly articulated plan of focus is that even the most structured postdoc opportunity may afford you more autonomy should you already have a plan of focus, and likewise, you will have the self-made structure to navigate a very unstructured postdoc, provided that you have access to guidance, real-world opportunities, and training mentorship.

Most postdoctoral opportunities

afford the postdoc fellow with various professional development budgets. It is a good idea to inquire about such perks and utilize them. Staying current in the field is crucial to any community psychologist who practices or conducts research. I was able to stay current in my chosen field of health disparity research and methodology with ease by networking and utilizing funds allotted to me for conference participations, workshops, invited presentations, and the financial resources to carry out independent research. I believe it is a good idea to weigh these factors when deciding if the postdoc is an optimal fit to accomplish your intended goal of developing focused expertise, thereby continuing to become an expert in your field.

Lastly, as you embark on your postdoctoral fellowship, please keep in mind that your postdoc will be as successful as you make it. Constantly being clear about your needs and expectations, as well as clearly understanding the postdocs' needs and expectations, will allow smooth sailing throughout your training. Be sure to stay in constant communication with your supervisor in order to create a win-win situation for yourself and setting you are in. I was fortunate enough to obtain excellent postdoctoral training in prevention and methodology where leading prevention scientists and cutting-edge methodologists facilitate fascinating and important work. With clear professional goals, determination, and a positive attitude, a postdoctoral fellowship can be an excellent way to obtain your community psychology career of choice.

Overall, the postdoctoral experiences that were reported were positive and productive. As stated, having a research plan and a mentor and not isolating yourself are key factors in being successful during your postdoc.

References

National Academy of Sciences. (2000). *Enhancing the Postdoctoral Experience for Scientists and Engineers: A Guide*

for Postdoctoral Scholars, Advisers, Institutions, Funding Organizations and Disciplinary Societies. Washington D.C.: National Academy Press. 🌐

Disabilities Action and Public Policy

Edited by Tina Taylor-Ritzler

Editors' Note

Dear TCP Community,
In this issue I am pleased to include a short article by Donna Mertens, Raychelle Harris and Heidi MacGlaughlin calling for the use of a cultural lens in disability research. I look forward to including other integrative articles in this column, highlighting the multiple ways in which disability research and action inform and are informed by our understanding of culture, gender, public policy, evaluation, education, empowerment and other areas of interest to community psychologists.
Best,
~Tina

Bringing a Cultural Lens to Research with Disability and Deaf Communities

Written by
Donna M. Mertens, Raychelle Harris, and Heidi MacGlaughlin, Gallaudet University

Scholars writing from the perspective of feminists, indigenous peoples, and human rights advocates have commonly expressed dissatisfaction with government-regulated and discipline-based ethical guidelines because of the lack of "voice," that is, the lack of representation or agency, in the conversation on ethical issues in research that effects them (Brabeck and Brabeck, 2009; Cram, 2009; Chilisa, 2009; LaFrance and Crazy Bull, 2009). This body of literature provides a dialogical space to consider the meaning of ethics

through a cultural lens and to extend that lens to encompass the concerns of people with disabilities and those who are Deaf, some of whom believe they are members of a community and/or a cultural group. Emerging "culturally sensitive" research approaches "both recognize ethnicity and position culture as central to the research process" (Tillman 2002, p. 1123).

The transformative paradigm provides a philosophical framework that addresses the need to directly engage members of culturally diverse groups in research studies that affect them with a focus on increased social justice (Mertens, 2009; 2010). The primary ethical principles of the transformative paradigm reflect the responsibility of researchers to:

- conduct research in culturally respectful ways;

- acknowledge power differences between researchers and communities;

- address issues of discrimination and oppression that can be reflected in these power differences;

- facilitate the development of trusting relationships; and

- give back to the communities in the pursuit of increased social justice and furtherance of human rights.

The arguments for culturally sensitive research ethics made by members of specific communities, such as Māori (Cram, 2009), the African Botswana community (Chilisa, 2009), Canadian natives (Mi'kmaq College Institute, 2006), and indigenous communities (Osborne and McPhee, 2000) are in line with the transformative ethical principles. They also provide both a parallel justification and a model for researchers in the Disability and Sign Language communities to join in a reexamination of ethical principles and practices in research.

Culturally specific guidelines for the entire Disability community are beyond the scope of this article. Rather, we provide one illustration of culturally responsive ethical guidelines for research with members of the Sign Language Community (SLC). Sign Language communities refer to people whose primary experience and allegiance is to the Sign Language community and culture of Deaf people (Harris, Holmes, and Mertens, 2009). *The American Heritage Dictionary of the English Language*, Third Edition, 1992 defines "Deaf" as "of relating to the Deaf or their culture" and "deaf" as the "lack of hearing sense." Ladd (2003) elaborates on the lowercase deaf terminology, which refers to people who wish to retain their membership and primary experience with the cultural majority. However, researchers interested in researching Sign Language communities should be conscious about the complexity of D/deaf people and the Sign Language community.

SLC members (Harris, Holmes, and Mertens, 2009) adapted the ethical frameworks created by indigenous groups and developed Terms of Reference for research with SLCs. The core values include the following:

- the worth and validity of contemporary Deaf cultures;

- the right of expression of Sign Language community realities;

- self-determination and self-management;

- the right of sign language groups to work and make decisions within their own cultural terms;

- Sign Language community control;

- the recognition and acceptance of Sign Language community diversity; and

- reconciliation of competing interests among people who use sign language.

For instance, when hearing researchers who are unfamiliar with Deaf culture have the power to define reality for D/deaf people, some common versions of "reality" that are accepted include the following:

- tests developed for the general population can be used with D/deaf people;

- research results based on a sample of D/deaf people apply to the Deaf community as a whole;

- interpreters who are used in research team meetings or data collection are equally skilled in meditating culture and language; and

- hearing researchers' advanced degrees and years of research experience are sufficient to conduct valid research in Sign Language communities.

When D/deaf people are in a position to express reality as they perceive it, these false assumptions and beliefs are challenged. For example, at the beginning of the research process, a dialogue needs to occur in order to identify the community's experiences, past and present, with the issue being investigated. The historical process of how the community has experienced the issue is critical to understanding how it has been shaped.

In a research context, researchers identify certain variables and measure aspects of them in an attempt to look for truth or what is perceived to be real within some level of defined probability. A transformative lens shifts the focus from one knowable reality, rejects cultural relativism, and acknowledges that perceptions of what are real are influenced by the societal power structure that privileges certain versions of reality over others

> *...researchers interested in researching Sign Language communities should be conscious about the complexity of D/deaf people and the Sign Language community.*

(Mertens, 2010; 2009). Transformative epistemology is characterized by a close collaboration between researchers and community members, whether the latter are participants or co-researchers. The research purpose, design, implementation, and utilization are developed and implemented with appropriate cultural sensitivity and awareness. Researchers require collaboration with the relevant members of the host community, ranging from the leaders, program participants, and those who are excluded from program participation for whatever reasons. This relationship is interactive and empowering.

Research in the transformative paradigm is a site of multiple interpretive

> ## *Transformative epistemology is characterized by a close collaboration between researchers and community members, whether the latter are participants or co-researchers.*

practices. It has no specific set of methods or practices of its own. This type of research draws on several theories, approaches, methods, and techniques. Quantitative, qualitative, or mixed methods can be used; however, the inclusion of a qualitative dimension in methodology is critical in order to establish a dialogue between the researchers and the community members. Mixed-methods designs can be considered in order to address the community's information needs. However, the methodological decisions are made with a conscious awareness of contextual and historical factors, especially as they relate to discrimination and oppression. Thus, the formation

of partnerships with researchers and members of the Sign Language communities is an important step in addressing methodological questions in research. The cultural lens described herein has implications for ethical practice in the wider Disability community.

References

Brabeck, M. M., and Brabeck, K.M. (2009). Feminist perspectives on research ethics. In D.M. Mertens and P. Ginsberg (Eds.), *Handbook of social research ethics* (pp. 39-53). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Chilisa, B. (2009). Indigenous African-centered ethics: Contesting and complementing dominant models. In D.M. Mertens and P. Ginsberg (Eds.), *Handbook of social research ethics* (pp. 407-425). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cram, F. (2009). Maintaining indigenous voices. In D.M. Mertens and P. Ginsberg (Eds.), *Handbook of social research ethics* (pp. 308-322). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Harris, R., Holmes, H., and Mertens, D.M. (2009). Research ethics in Sign Language communities. *Sign Language Studies, 4*, 486-489

Ladd, P. (2003). *Understanding deaf culture: In search of deafhood.* Tonawanda, NY: Multilingual Matters, Ltd.

LaFrance, J., and Crazy Bull, C. (2009). Researching ourselves back to life: Taking control of the research agenda in Indian Country. In D.M. Mertens and P. Ginsberg (Eds.), *Handbook of social research ethics* (pp. 135-149). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Mertens, D. M. (2010). *Research and evaluation in education and psychology: Integrating diversity with quantitative, qualitative and mixed methods* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Mertens, D. M. (2009). *Transformative research and evaluation.* New York: Guilford Press.

Mi'kmaq College Institute. (2006). Mi'kmaw research principles and protocols. Retrieved May 11, 2006, from http://mrc. uccb.ns.ca/prinpro.html

Osborne, R., and McPhee, R. (2000, December). Indigenous Terms of Reference (ITR). Presented at 6th UNESCO-ACEID International Conference on Education, Bangkok.

Tillman, L. C. (2002). Culturally sensitive research approaches: An African-American perspective. *Educational Researcher, 31,* 3-12. 🌐

The Community Practitioner and Education Connection

Edited by Susan Wolfe and Jim Dalton

Learning Key Competencies For Community Psychology Practice: Collaboration with Citizens and Communities, Group Processes, Part II

How can students learn key competencies for community psychology practice? The Practice Group and Council of Educational Programs of SCRA are working together to address this crucial question for our field. In this column we continue the conversation, focusing on two related competencies, *Collaboration with citizens and communities and Group processes.* The Practice Group defined these as: "Developing and maintaining a network of constructive work partnerships with clients, organizations, and communities, including diverse populations. Ensuring that diverse persons and communities are involved in making decisions. Negotiating/mediating between stakeholders. Assisting in resolving conflicts. Using effective interpersonal communication skills."

We asked nine community psychologists, including full-time practitioners, graduate program faculty, and students, to write

brief commentaries on these skills. Commentators described how they learned these skills and use them in practice, and how graduate students might be trained in these skills. In the Spring 2010 issue, we presented commentaries by Tom Wolff, Susan Wolfe, Bret Kloos, and Judah Viola. In this issue, we continue with commentaries by David Julian, Lucy Marrero and Gregor Sarkisian, and Rachel Smolowitz and Tiffeny Jimenez. It is significant that three of these five commentators are students writing from their experiences in learning these skills during graduate education – a perspective that complements those of faculty and full-time community practitioners in this issue and the Spring issue.

Add your own views! You can comment on these commentaries in the SCRA CP Education Blog at: www. scra27.org/blogs/educationb . 🌐

Group Process and Policy Recommendations Regarding the Prevention Workforce in Ohio

Written by
David A. Julian, Center for Learning Excellence, The Ohio State University

The Holden Leadership Center at the University of Oregon (http://leadership.uoregon.edu) refers to group process in terms of people working together to get things done. Facilitation might be thought of as an important adjunct to group process. The BNET Business Dictionary (http://dictionary.bnet.com) states that facilitators help groups or individuals "to learn, find a solution, or reach a consensus, without imposing or dictating an outcome" (p. 1). Bacal (2003) defines a range of competencies related to facilitation that include distinguishing process from content; managing relationships; using time and space intentionally; and evoking participation.

Julian (2006, p. 68) defines community psychology practice as strengthening the capacity of communities "to meet the needs of constituents and help them to realize their dreams…" It might be argued that the ability to use process to assist a group in defining concerns and articulating a response in an effective and efficient manner are valuable contributions to the realization of dreams. This argument positions the facilitator as a process expert who knows how to build consensus related to problem definition and development of viable responses that when implemented lead to desired outcomes.

An Example of a Facilitated Process

The description below illustrates key aspects of the process of facilitation and the relationship of facilitation to policy development. Throughout 2006, 22 stakeholders representing a variety of constituencies including providers, educators and policy makers met to create a plan to enhance the capacity of the AOD prevention workforce in Ohio (The Ohio Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention Workforce Development Taskforce, 2007). Data (www.ebaseprevention.org) suggested that service providers experienced difficulty in filling prevention positions and that

As is apparent in this conception, facilitation and group process are critical skills related to community psychology practice.

many prevention workers were near retirement age. Barriers to recruitment included low salaries, instability of the prevention field; demands of prevention programming; and limited resources (The Ohio Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention Workforce Development Taskforce, 2007).

.Developing AOD Workforce Policy Recommendations

The facilitation process focused on six key elements: 1) summarizing context and background information; 2) defining key terms; 3) developing guiding principles; 4) identifying general goals; 5) developing strategic objectives; and 6) developing implementation procedures. Stakeholders met five times between January and October 2006. Each meeting lasted approximately four hours and was staffed by a trained facilitator from the Center for Learning Excellence at Ohio State University. The first meeting focused on reviewing the group's desired outcome (the development of policy recommendations). The facilitator also established ground rules and noted that the group "owned" the process and final product.

During the second meeting, long-term goals were established and broken down into component parts. Meeting three focused on developing strategies to address sub-goals and meeting four on implementation procedures related to each strategy. The last meeting was devoted to review of the final product and development of dissemination strategies. At the conclusion of this process, the group issued five policy recommendations ranging from defining the scope of prevention practice in Ohio to developing procedures for evaluating prevention programs to modifying the prevention credentialing process.

In summary, facilitation involves working with groups to help members define and achieve specific objectives. This might be considered a necessary but not sufficient step in the social change process. Actual change is dependent on mobilizing appropriate constituencies and implementing plans. One might also argue that evaluation of the impacts resulting from implementation of plans is a critical component of the change process. These activities starting with plan development and culminating with implementation and evaluation define at least one conception of community psychology practice. As is apparent

in this conception, facilitation and group process are critical skills related to community psychology practice.

[For further information, contact David Julian by email at: DJulian@ehe.ohio-state.edu .] ⊕

Learning and Teaching Collaboration in the Applied Community Psychology (ACP) Specialization

Written by
Lucy E. Marrero and
Gregor V. Sarkisian,
Antioch University at Los Angeles

The Applied Community Psychology (ACP) Specialization is a course of study in the M.A. in Psychology program at Antioch University Los Angeles. One of the four core ACP courses is Community Consultation and Collaboration, wherein students 1) work in collaborative teams; 2) act as consultants to address issues identified by a director-level consultee from a local community based organization; and 3) advance their knowledge of related course curriculum, and (4) collaboratively write a technical report that is presented to the consultee in the host organization.

The group consultation project serves as the major learning activity in the course which focuses on a generalist model of community consultation with roots in mental health and an explicit focus on organizational empowerment theory. After teaching the course in the Fall 2009 quarter, Gregor (instructor) asked Lucy (ACP student) to collaborate in writing about their experiences with learning and teaching collaboration skills.

Student Experiences in Developing Collaboration Skills

In completing the ACP specialization, I (Lucy) worked collaboratively in four different groups with four different community agencies. Each group project provided an opportunity for a lived experience of empowerment and respect for diversity.

Trust in Self, Others, and the Process

When I entered the ACP specialization, I had already experienced a taste of working collaboratively. Still, I entered my first ACP group project with trepidation about my new colleagues. Would they be smart enough to do good work? Would they do the work they agreed to do? Would they do it on time? I worried about their potential to damage my relationship with our chosen community agency. Would they respect the elderly director, our consultee, who liked to talk in stories rather than statistics? I also worried that

> *I found that although conflict is inevitable, it can be reduced, and better outcomes attained, through aligning my approach to collaboration with the values of community psychology, particularly diversity and empowerment.*

the climate of the group would be more competitive than collegial. Would I have to fight to have my ideas considered?

I couldn't help but feel these worries again when conflicts emerged during the project. Yet, the program evaluation project was a success. We turned in a technical report that Gregor, our instructor, declared was one of the finest he had seen. And when we presented

the report to our community agency, we were humbled by their positive emotional response to seeing their program validated on paper. In subsequent group projects, I found myself more relaxed and less captured by worry—a direct result of increased trust in myself, in others, and in the process of collaboration.

In my case, that trust was earned through both experience and knowledge of community psychology. Community psychology assumes that people are inherently resourceful and capable. My experience with ACP faculty only reinforced this idea. Being treated as a junior colleague, and not as an ignorant, passive student supported my growing trust in myself and in my inherent capacity for meaningful contribution. This, reflexively, supported my growing trust in others. Superficial "knowledge" about collaboration shifted into lived experience of humanity as essentially relational. Successful collaboration became a reasonable, reachable, and expected outcome.

Conflict: Opportunities for Growth

My most significant learning came through experiencing conflict. I found that although conflict is inevitable, it can be reduced, and better outcomes attained, through aligning my approach to collaboration with the values of community psychology, particularly diversity and empowerment. Multiple, supervised opportunities to work collaboratively toward clear, focused goals facilitated this values alignment. I now have a lived experience of how collaboration is built on the foundation of empowerment in the sense of "enhancing wellness instead of fixing problems, identifying strengths instead of cataloging risk factors, and searching for environmental influences instead of blaming victims" (Zimmerman, 2000, p. 44). This "listening for context" was the anchor that kept my first group project from drowning in conflict, and was instrumental in the enjoyable, nearly conflict-free collaboration in my final ACP project.

Instructional Method: Group Goals Exercise

As instructor, I (Gregor) encourage students to constructively work through conflict –much more easily said than done. Lucy and others in the Consultation class identified the Group Goals Exercise as instrumental in addressing conflict and developing collaboration skills. Following is a brief description of how I facilitate this exercise.

The first day of class I read Curtis and Stollar's (2002, p. 226) definition of collaboration: "two or more people working together, using systematic planning and problem solving procedures to achieve desired outcomes." The second class, after students divide into groups to form their consultation teams, we discuss the desired outcomes of collaborative group work. With the class, I review the section of the syllabus which describes the consultation project. The technical report serves as the ultimate outcome for which they are accountable. I then ask them to take 15-20 minutes to develop three goals that will guide their process of working together to assist them in reaching that outcome. As groups share their goals, I provide feedback to help groups better articulate their goals (e.g., clarifying expectations). Periodically, through the remainder of the course, I ask the groups to rate their individual and overall group accountability to each goal on a five-point Likert scale. This quick rating supports students in reflecting on their individual and group contributions to the collaborative process, as well as constructively working through conflicts and (re)building trust among members.

[For further information, contact Gregor V. Sarkisian, Ph.D., M.A. in Psychology Program, Antioch University Los Angeles, 400 Corporate Pointe, Culver City, CA 90230. 310/578-1080x330. Email: gsarkisian@antioch.edu] 🌐

Improving Educational Contexts for Training Collaboration and Group Processes

Written by
Tiffeny R. Jimenez,
Michigan State University
Rachel Smolowitz,
University of South Carolina

Collaboration and group process skills are essential competencies for effective community psychologists (Dalton, Elias and Wandersman, 2007). From the perspective of students currently practicing in two different Community Psychology (CP) programs, we take this opportunity to discuss ideas for how to create more supportive educational contexts. Towards this aim, we have identified opportunities in graduate training from our own experiences that can facilitate such development, and provide suggestions for addressing the challenges associated with training collaboration and group process practice skills within academia. To preserve the integrity of our graduate institutions and mentors, we sought to avoid highlighting specifics particular to any one program.

Identifying Opportunities for Learning that Support Skill Development

While each graduate program may vary in the extent to which they emphasize the various subareas of our field (e.g., research, clinical practice), all are involved in some type of community practice where we think skill development plays a role within the varied contexts of our work. In our experiences as CP students, we think that the development of practice competencies for collaboration and group processes happen at the individual, interpersonal, and community levels.

Individual-level development associated with learning collaboration and group processes involves gaining a sense of personal agency, emotional intelligence, and several skills associated with professional identity development. We view individual-level development as the foundation to all other interpersonal activities. Graduate programs can serve as safe spaces to learn about oneself through reflective writing or presentations, and discussions with peers and mentors. Through reflection and dialogue students learn how to position oneself in pursuit of social change though carefully supervised projects that can lead to more independent projects within community settings later on.

Interpersonal-level development involves learning relationship building,

> *Interpersonal-level development involves learning relationship building, conflict management, negotiation, listening, and perspective-taking.*

conflict management, negotiation, listening, and perspective-taking. CP is a field that brings forth a diverse student body where students have varying backgrounds (e.g., different academic disciplines, ethnically and culturally diverse backgrounds, varying professional histories). Developing and maintaining relationships with faculty and peers based on clear expectations is one way programs can assist students in understanding how professional relationships work. By faculty mentors teaching, modeling, and coaching students through learning skills associated with relationship building, faculty can gradually support students in taking on more independent relationship-building endeavors as students display these skills with more confidence.

Community-level development includes gaining skills in group facilitation, coalition building, developing rapport, working with diverse stakeholders, and impression management. These more dynamic skill sets can be built through coursework and or work with community

groups. Working with faculty and peers in identifying opportunities for skill development can occur through internships, consultations, and practica. Finding outlets for publishing written reflections, or presenting about community practice, could promote further reflection and dialogue with mentors and peers in professional settings.

Being competent in collaboration and group processes requires a mixture of complex skill sets, and we think it is particularly important that the training process of students involve intentional learning about how personal beliefs, perspectives, and behaviors can play out interpersonally and in larger contexts. Utilizing graduate program settings for personal development and exploration, as well as how to engage interpersonally and with communities, can be a supportive space to learn this intersection.

Addressing Contextual Challenges

Graduate training programs have optimal opportunities for gaining expertise in collaboration and group process skills. However, there are also several challenges present in academic settings that can get in the way of an ideal process. A few of the challenges associated with training in academic settings involve time constraints, outside advising, and lack of expertise among faculty.

A primary concern is that of academic timelines and how it may differ from the timelines of collaborators. Student timelines and academic calendars can pose time constraints on the learning of complex skill development. Several steps in these processes are time consuming, such as developing rapport with stakeholders, assessing organizations, developing and implementing interventions, and evaluating them. One remedy to this situation is to develop relationships between the organization and the program, rather than the individual student. This allows for different students to be a part of these lengthy processes yet have adequate time for learning each step.

Working on collaborations as students has the potential to create complications, such as having a faculty supervisor who is not otherwise involved in the collaboration. In collaboration, it is frequently necessary to have all stakeholders at the table to ensure a common understanding of any steps in the project. Having another personality who is consulting with the student away from the formal collaboration but is not directly involved with the organization can complicate this process substantially. For example, if the student does not feel adequate support from the faculty, she may bring frustration to the project unrelated to the collaborators. Faculty and students may also have priorities beyond the collaborative process, such as publications, obtaining funding, and course credit. A primary way of addressing this issue is for students and supervisors to meet regularly, with community collaborators where possible, and maintain open and honest communication throughout the supervisory process.

Finally, the development of practice skills within academia can be a struggle because training is done by research focused faculty. Students develop such skills over time, so allowing experiences to be more structured and supervised for newer students and more independent for more experienced students is important. Without this, students may have insufficient support to develop expertise in practice skills. Addressing this challenge may involve having community practitioners supervise or mentor students. Programs may consider intentionally developing relationships with community practitioners who may have expertise of interest to students.

Conclusions

We believe that supportive learning contexts, where self exploration and professional development can take place, can be catalysts for the development of effective future agents of change. We aimed here to briefly address some of the issues that we have encountered as students ourselves and in discussions with other students in CP programs.

We hope that these opportunities and suggestions for addressing challenges shed light on the process of skill development from the student perspective.

[Please feel free to contact Tiffeny Jimenez at jimene17@msu.edu or Rachel Smolowitz at smolowitz@sc.edu with any questions or comments.]

References for All Commentaries

Bacal, R. (2003). *The role of the facilitator.* Retrieved June 28, 2010, from www.iaf-world.org

Curtis, M.J., and Stollar, S.A. (2002). Best practices in system-level-change. In A. Thomas and J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology* (4th ed., pp. 223-243). Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.

Dalton, J.H., Elias, M.J. and Wandersman, A. (2007). *Community psychology: Linking individuals and communities* (2nd Ed.). Wadsworth Cengage.

Julian, D.A. (2006). Defining community psychology practice: Meeting the needs and realizing the dreams of the community. *The Community Psychologist,* 39(4), 66-69.

Ohio Alcohol and Other Drug Prevention Workforce Taskforce. (2007). *Enhancing the Prevention Workforce in Ohio.* (Available from The Ohio Department of Alcohol and Drug Addition Services, 280 Plaza, 280 North High Street, Columbus, OH, 43215-2550).

Zimmerman, M.A. (2000). Empowerment theory: Psychological, organizational, and community levels of analysis. In J. Rappaport and E. Seidman (Eds.), *Handbook of community psychology.* New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum. 🌐

Edited by Manuel Riemer

A Green Biennial? Let's Make it Happen!

Written by Manuel Riemer and Courte Voorhees

There is a growing number of publications within community psychology that highlight the interconnections of individual and community well-being, social justice, and environmental degradation such as global climate change (e.g., Culley and Hughey, 2008; Dean and Bush, 2007; Edelstein and Wandersman, 1987; Riemer, 2010; Riemer and Voorhees, 2009), including an upcoming special section on the topic in the American Journal of Community Psychology (Riemer and Reich, in press). If we, as community psychologists, take these connections seriously, it is critical that we evaluate our own activities with respect to their environmental impact. The SCRA Biennial in Chicago next year will be a good opportunity to practice our green values. Members of the conference planning committee have already integrated some ideas to green the Biennial, but there is still room for more change. Also, as conference participants, understanding these changes may help all of us to accept the changes we hope to see at our Biennials. There are many things we can do to make our next conference a green one – the least of which is to go with the green flow. Here are some suggestions[1]:

- Use paperless technology. Paper has multiple negative environmental impacts, beginning with the harvesting of trees for fiber, continuing with the processing of wood fiber into pulp for making paper, and finishing with the disposal of paper products at the end of their useful life. The U.S. government estimates that pulp and paper manufacturers are the fourth largest industrial emitters of greenhouse gases (EIA, 2002). In addition, the pulp and paper industry releases about 212 million tons of hazardous substances into the air and water (amounts comparable to the U.S. primary metal industry) and is ranked as the third largest user of industrial water (EPA, 2002, 2004). With modern technology, there are many ways one can reduce the use of paper. Promotional material can be emailed. Conference programs can be made available for download on hand-held devices and also be accessible at computer work stations at the conference site. Handouts can be distributed via the conference website. If the use of paper is necessary, 100% recycled paper that is certified by the Forest Stewardship Council should be used;

- Serve only vegetarian meals with seasonal locally grown organic ingredients. According to a report released in 2009 by the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations, livestock accounts

Following these recommendations could significantly reduce the carbon footprint of this conference.

for 18 percent of worldwide greenhouse gases, more than those emitted by all forms of transportation combined, and is a leading cause of deforestation and water pollution (FAO, 2009). The shortage of meatless meals at SCRA Biennials is a common annoyance for the vegetarian participants. In the United States, food typically travels between 1,500 and 2,500 miles from farm to plate, as much as 25 percent farther than in 1980 (World Watch Institute, 2002). By using locally grown food that is seasonal we could significantly reduce the carbon footprint of the conference;

- Practice the 3Rs. In 2008, U.S. residents generated an average of 4.50 pounds of solid waste per day, up from 3.66 in 1980 (EPA, 2009). According to one source, the U.S. produces 30% of the world's waste (Green Answers, 2009). While, in general, there has also been a positive development in regard to the amount of waste that is recycled (33.2% in 2008 according to EPA), finding a recycling bin at SCRA Biennials has often been difficult. The real key is to avoid producing waste in the first place. For example, avoid box lunches with individually wrapped food items and conference bags stuffed with things one will likely throw away. Also, do not use plates and silverware that cannot be reused. Using products made out of biodegradable corn does not solve the problem, it simply changes its nature;

- Don't serve bottled water. According to the Beverage Marketing Corporation, Americans bought approximately 31.2 billion liters of bottled water in 2006 (Pacific Institute, 2008). The Pacific Institute finds that it took approximately 17 million barrels of oil equivalent to produce plastic for bottled water consumed by Americans in 2006 (not including transportation) - enough energy to fuel more than 1 million American cars and light trucks for a year (Pacific Institute, 2008). Using bottled water is easily avoidable by asking participants to bring their own reusable bottles and provide refill stations with tap water throughout the conference site. In addition, some reusable bottles with a conference logo could be made available for purchase on site;

- Save energy. In the U.S., 20 percent of greenhouse gas emissions come from home energy use

(Encyclopedia of Earth, 2010). In warmer areas, summertime air conditioning contributes the most to this emission. Why do we need to wear sweaters in the middle of summer? Coordinate with the meeting venue to ensure that energy lights and air conditioning will be turned to lower settings during sessions and completely off when rooms are not in use;

- Have virtual sessions. By introducing virtual sessions and broadcasting certain sessions on the internet people from countries far away such as Australia and New Zealand can still participate in the conference without having to add significantly to their carbon footprint by flying great distances;

- Select environmentally conscious hotels. Preferably select hotels that reuse their linens, recycle, and use bulk dispensers for shampoos and soaps in guest rooms;

- Be conscious about transportation. Make sure the conference site is relatively close to an airport, accommodations, and areas where people can go out at night. Use fuel efficient vehicles to transport people around; and

- Offset carbon. Clearly, it is not possible to completely avoid a carbon footprint for this conference. Thus, conference participants should be offered the opportunity to offset their carbon footprint caused by their conference attendance right when they register. The money raised by carbon offsets are typically used to reduce carbon production elsewhere (e.g., investing in solar panels for remote villages in several African countries) and support reforestation.

Following these recommendations could significantly reduce the carbon footprint of this conference. Of course, the environmental impact is not the only aspect that we need to consider in planning the conference. Issues of community, diversity, worker rights, equity, affordability, and discrimination are equally important factors that need to be considered to ensure that the Biennial is consistent with the values that we are trying to promote. If we can't follow our values at the Biennial, how can we expect to follow them in our work and daily lives?

Footnotes

1 These suggestions are based on information gathered by the authors from www.bluegreenmeetings.org, www.epa.gov/opptintr/greenmeetings, a document with community tips for SCRA conferences initiated by the SCRA International Committee at the Biennial in Pasadena and drafted by Niki Harre, Serdar M. Değirmencioğlu and Manuel Riemer, and contributions by members of the Environment and Justice Interest Group.

References

Culley, M. and Hughey, J. (2008). Power and public participation in a hazardous waste dispute: A community case study. *American Journal of Community Psychology,* 41, 99-114.

Dean, J. H., and Bush, R. A. (2007). A community psychology view of environmental organization processes. *American Journal of Community Psychology,* 40(1-2), 146-166.

Edelstein, M. R., and Wandersman, A. (1987). Community dynamics in coping with toxic contaminants. In I. Altman and A. Wandersman (Eds.), *Neighborhood and community environments (*pp. 69-112). New York: Plenum.

Encyclopedia of Earth. (2010). *Carbon footprint.* Retrieved August 12, 2010, from http://www.eoearth.org/article/Carbon_footprint.

Energy Information Agency, US. (2002). *Delivered Energy Consumption Projections by Industry in the Annual Energy Outlook 2002.* Retrieved August 10, 2010, from http://www.eia.doe.gov/oiaf/analysispaper/industry/consumption.html

Environmental Protection Agency, US. (2002). *Pulp and Paper Industry. Chemical Releases and Transfers.* Retrieved August 10, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/compliance/resources/publications/assistance/sectors/notebooks/pulppasnp2.pdf.

Environmental Protection Agency, US. (2004). *TRIExplorer.* Retrieved August 10, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/triexplorer.

Environmental Protection Agency, US. (2009). Municipal Solid Waste Generation, Recycling and Disposal in the United States: Facts and Figures for 2008. Retrieved August 12, 2010, from http://www.epa.gov/osw/nonhaz/municipal/msw99.htm.

Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations. (2009). *The state of food and agriculture 2009.* Retrieved August 12, 2010, from http://www.fao.org/docrep/012/i0680e/i0680e00.htm

Green Answers. (2009). *What countries produce the most trash?* Retrieved August 12, 2010, from http://greenanswers.com/q/63410/recycling-waste/garbage/what-countries-produce-most-trash.

Pacific Institute (2008). *Bottled water and energy: A fact sheet.* Retrieved August 12, 2010, from http://www.pacinst.org/topics/water_and_sustainability/bottled_water/bottled_water_and_energy.html

Riemer, M. (2010). Community psychology, the natural environment, and global climate change. In G. Nelson and I. Prilleltensky (Eds.), *Community psychology: In pursuit of liberation and well-being* (2nd Ed.). New York: Palgrave.

Riemer, M., and Reich, S.M. (in press). Community psychology and global climate change [Special Section]. *American Journal of Community Psychology,* 47 (1-2).

Riemer, M. and Voorhees, C. (2009). Environment, justice, and community. *The Community Psychologist,* 42(2), 36-39.

World Watch Institute (2002). Home Grown: The case for local food in a global market. Retrieved August 12, 2010, from http://www.worldwatch.org/node/827. ⊕

Indigenous

Edited by
Brian Bishop, Lizzie Finn,
and Diane Costello

Launch Of SCRA Indigenous Interest Group

This SCRA Indigenous Interest Group has been launched via a listserv on the American Psychological Association (APA) website. This group is currently chaired by Brian Bishop, Lizzie Finn and Diane Costello at Curtin University of Western Australia who are members of the Australian, New Zealand and Pacific Branch of SCRA. A draft version of the SCRA Indigenous Interest Group aims is being circulated to members of this listserv to gain feedback and revision towards a more comprehensive vision for this group.

Current Aims of SCRA Indigenous Interest Group

The aim of this group is to stimulate a collaborative global research community that reflects on research and practice with Indigenous communities to promote socially just outcomes. An important goal of this group is to provide support to SCRA members who are conducting Indigenous research by providing a forum for the exchange of ideas, literature and experience. This will assist the Group's more specific focus which is to utilize our combined resources more effectively to conduct strengths-based praxis towards raising public awareness of the plight of Indigenous people and

addressing the social justice issues they face in oppressive dominant societies.

Joining the Interest Group

To join the interest group, send an email to b.bishop@curtin.edu.au and we will put you on the list.

Corresponding With Members of the Interest Group

Send emails to SCRA-IIG@lists.APA.org

Paradox of Non-Indigenous People Researching Indigenous Issues

Written by
Brian Bishop, Diane Costello
and Lizzie Finn, Curtin University

Respect for diversity is a major plank in community psychology values. At a number of levels the concept of acknowledging, tolerating and embracing cultural differences is a basic underpinning of the philosophy and methodology of the discipline. Developing culturally safe practice and research has been of great significance and is reflected not only in community psychology but in other aspects of psychology such as counselling (Palmer, 2002; Sue and Sue, 1999; Westerman and Vicary, 2000; Whaley, 2008) and cross-cultural psychology (Dudgeon, Garvey, and Pickett, 2000; Sue, 2009).

The need for culturally safe research and practice has become increasingly emphasised in psychological literature. Not only has the notion of cultural awareness, cultural sensitivity and cultural safety found their way into teaching practice but the actual concepts of culturally relevant practice and research have become conceptually better understood (Palmer, 2002). For example, Eckerman et al. (2010) placed practice with Indigenous people firmly in the context of colonial history and its ramifications as did Dudgeon et al. (2000).

The increasing awareness of the importance of describing not only the

current situations ethnic minorities face, but also the historical, political and economic situation in which they live, recognises the importance of the broader social structure in determining the well-being of Indigenous people. Peoples of regions like the Americas and the Pacific, form a specific category of need. They have worse living conditions than their non-Indigenous counterparts (e.g., King, 2009; Kuang-Yao Pan, Erlien and Bilsborrow, 2010; Tobias, Blakely, Matheson, Rasanathan, and Atkinson, 2009). They have been dispossessed of their lands, and had to suffer cultural attacks in the name of "civilising." There are strong social justice issues around past and present conditions and policies related to Indigenous peoples.

There is an obvious need for psychologists to increase the amount of research undertaken with Indigenous people. Through the launch of a SCRA Indigenous Interest Group forum we hope to help foster that. We have recognised the importance of actually engaging with Indigenous people in research practice rather than the past practice of researching "on" Indigenous people (Milech and Oxenham, 1999). This is an important step towards developing a much more constructive approach. Garvey (2000) has pointed out that Australian Indigenous people are possibly the most researched for the least gain of any indigenous community in the world.

Engagement with Indigenous communities in setting research agendas has been a significant and welcome step towards providing research that is appropriate and applicable. Implicit in the increased research undertaken by mainly non-Indigenous people with Indigenous people is the knowledge that over time the number of Indigenous researchers will increase. In Australia, we have seen an increase in Indigenous PhDs, reflecting government and university attempts to engage Indigenous people in higher education (Dudgeon and Fielder, 2006). While these attempts are admirable, the reality is that, in fact, higher education in Australia is a middle-class activity

and requires economic resources to enable people to study at a university. Indigenous people are living in what has been described as Third World conditions, but this is probably an underestimation. Biddle (2010) argued that while Australia's economic situation put it fourth among the developed countries in 2006, if the same index was used with Indigenous people, Aboriginal Australia would be placed above Syria and Occupied Palestine Territories and below Fiji and Sri Lanka, and significantly worse off than Indigenous communities in Canada, the USA and New Zealand.

What makes indigenous research important in Australia and elsewhere is that while the various waves of ethnic migration have experienced discrimination, over time and generations they have integrated into broader society and changed its basic character. Indigenous people, on the other hand, were dispossessed of their land and have continued to be oppressed and excluded from the advantages that mainstream society takes for granted. There are many psychological processes that have been identified in the subjugation of Indigenous people. These include paternalistic government policies and extensive blaming the victim (Duckett and Schinkel, 2008; Ryan, 1971). For example, housing for Indigenous people is very limited and overcrowding is a major issue in terms of psychological and physical well-being. This issue is often represented in the media as being an issue of poor tenancy; with an implicit assumption that Indigenous people do not understand how to live in "White" houses.

Identifying the myths about Indigenous communities and the sources of stress and conflict in their lives, as well as the lack of employment and occupation they face are issues that researchers need to be addressing. In Australia, there have been significant advances in psychological research with indigenous people. The Australian Psychological Society (APS) has created initiatives to advance research and practice. There is an active Indigenous interest group in APS and a number of conferences and papers have been supported. A major event was the publication of a handbook for psychologists working with indigenous people (Dudgeon et al., 2000). This handbook not only provided advice for practitioners working with indigenous people, it was also a rallying call to recognise the need for psychologists to work with indigenous people. Nolan and McConnochie (2005) have reported a steep increase in papers reporting on Australian Indigenous issues in academic psychological journals recently. While little has flowed through to Indigenous communities, the increase in interest of researchers in indigenous issues does signify change.

Until we recognise that we, as part of the dominant society, are part of the problem, we will not begin to address questions about the extent to which our research serves the dominant society.

Troubles at Farm

Nolan and McConnochie (2005) reviewed a century and a half of Australian psychological research and other material reporting on Indigenous issues. They showed the content of this recent rash of publications addressed issues such as critical reviews of the role and history of psychology in Indigenous contexts, White attitudes, racism and race relations, guidelines for culturally appropriate psychological practices and forensic psychology.

While recent psychological researchers are engaging with Indigenous communities much more significantly in their research (e.g., Vicary and Andrews, 2000; Westerman and Vicary, 2000), the research topics do reflect a compromise between Indigenous issues and the academic context. Academics need to undertake and publish rigorous research that conforms to editors and reviewers' view of what constitutes "good science" and this can create a stumbling block for producing community-relevant research (Blanche and Szabo, 2005; Brennan and Ankers, 2004).

Another significant issue relates more to the underlying or implicit worldviews of the researchers and the dominant culture. Like Africa, the Americas and New Zealand, Australia has a colonial history. It was established by the British as a penal colony in 1788 when the War of Independence stopped the British sending prisoners to the United States, and has been changed into a modern economy through the exploitation of natural resources, principally mining and agriculture. This required the dispossession of Indigenous people of their lands. The values and worldviews that allowed the early colonies to justify their oppression of Indigenous people is part of the mindset that still exists in Australia today. There is little recognition that the lifestyle the dominant culture enjoys today has been gained at the expense of another society. Yet the impact of this substantial power imbalance is evident for everyone to see. Indigenous people die approximately 17 years younger than their non-Indigenous counterparts. Their health status, economic status and social power are substantially less than non-Indigenous people. The impact of this disadvantage is reflected not just in mainstream society but is also played out in the research arena. Earlier research in Australia is based on the assumptions that Indigenous people are less intelligent and less civilized than the culture from which the researchers came. Much of the early research was based on the assumptions of eugenics and "demonstrated" the inferior status of Indigenous people. One question we have to ask researchers working with Indigenous people is whether history will judge us as poorly as research with Aboriginal people in the 19th century judged them.

How can we avoid making the same

mistakes as our researcher ancestors? Firstly, we are more sophisticated and more aware, so we are more immune to such biases. Or are we? We know that the nature of racism has changed from traditional, overt racism to modern racism where expression of oppression is more subtle. We need to examine our motives for doing this sort of research. Is the motivation prompted by a desire to help these "noble savages"? Are we motivated by a strong sense of social justice? One of the problems with identifying our motivations is that there are a number of levels at which our research and interventions operate. One of the issues is that of objectivising and problematising and this approach is disempowering to the subjects of research. If we focus on the "problems" facing indigenous people, this assumes they are in "need of help" and also implies that we, as members of the dominant society, are in a position to provide help, albeit through research. This issue of paternalism reflects a longstanding power imbalance. The power imbalance plays out in numerous ways. Until we recognise that we, as part of the dominant society, are part of the problem, we will not begin to address questions about the extent to which our research serves the dominant society.

This paradox is also reflected in empowerment approaches. As researcher, we can and do foster skill transfers and development of capacity. Through engagement processes it is possible to foster enhanced community competence in grant application writing, research design and conduct. This can have positive benefits as it enables communities to apply for funding through acquisition of knowledge about the ways in which bureaucracy requires money to be applied for, spent and acquitted. The problem with this approach is that the Indigenous communities have to learn the dominant funding worldviews and strategies, which often do not allow framing of research questions in appropriate ways for local culture and contexts. A question arises then that in empowerment and capacity development, are we operating in

culturally unsafe ways, to the detriment of local communities. There have been some moves in Australia to change the bureaucracy to suit the needs of the communities (e.g., Bishop, Vicary, Brown and Guard, 2009), but this change is slow. This is an issue that we need to be mindful of, and reflect on, in research and practice. We need also to be mindful that oppression can be maintained by omission as well as commission. Doing nothing may be worse than doing something.

A question arises then that in empowerment and capacity development, are we operating in culturally unsafe ways, to the detriment of local communities.

The website we are launching here is designed to provide contact and mutual help in supporting research with Indigenous communities. It can also be a forum for self-examination and reflection to help in examining both the intended and unintended consequences of our research.

References

Biddle, N. (2010). *A human capital approach to the educational marginalisation of Indigenous Australians,* CAEPR Working Paper No. 67/2010. Canberra: Centre for Aboriginal Economic Policy Research, ANU.

Bishop, B.J., Vicary, D.A., Browne, A.L., and Guard, N. (2009). Public policy, participation and the third position: The implication of engaging communities on their own terms. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 42*, 21-33.

Blanche, M.J.T., and Szabo, C.P. (2005). Research strategy: One goal, two discourses. *South African Psychiatry Review, Vol.8*, 81.

Brennan, R., and Ankers, P. (2004). In search of relevance: Is there an academic-practitioner divide in business-to-business marketing? *Marketing Intelligence and Planning, 22,* 511-519.

Duckett, P., and Schinkel, M. (2008). Community psychology and injustice in the criminal justice system. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 18,* 518-526.

Dudgeon, P., and Fielder, J. (2006). Third space within tertiary places: Indigenous Australian studies. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 16,* 396–409.

Dudgeon, P., Garvey, D., and Pickett, H. (Eds.). (2000). *Working with Indigenous Australians: a handbook for psychologists*. Perth: Gunada Press.

Eckerman, A.K., Dowd, T., Chong, E., Nixon, L., Gray, R., and Johnson, S. (2010). *Binan Goonj: Bridging cultures in Aboriginal health.* Sydney: Elsevier.

Garvey, D. (2000). A response to the Australian Psychological Society discussion paper on suicide. *Australian Psychologist, 35,* 32-35.

King, M. (2009). An overall approach to health care for indigenous peoples. *Pediatric Clinics of North America, 56,* 1239-1242.

Kuang-Yao Pan, W., Erlien, C., and Bilsborrow, R.E. (2010). Morbidity and mortality disparities among colonist and indigenous populations in the Ecuadorian Amazon. *Social Science and Medicine, 70,* 401-411.

Milech, B., and Oxenham, D. (1999). Mixing It. *Hecate's Australian Women's Book Review, 11,* 10.

Nolan, W., and McConnochie, K. (2005). Policies and paradox in Indigenous psychology: de-colonising practice. Paper presented at the XII biennial conference of Australian and New Zealand Community Psychology, Sydney, June.

Palmer, S. (Ed). (2002). *Multicultural counseling: A reader.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ryan, W. (1971). Blaming the victim. London: Orbach and Chambers.

Sue, S. (2009). Ethnic minority psychology: struggles and triumphs. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 15,* 409-415.

Sue, D.W., and Sue, S. (1999). *Counseling the culturally different: Theory and practice.* New York: Wiley.

Tobias, M., Blakely, T., Matheson, D., Rasanathan, K., and Atkinson, J. (2009). Changing trends in indigenous inequalities in mortality: lessons from New Zealand. *International Journal of Epidemiology, 38,* 1711-1722.

Vicary, D.A., and Andrews, H. (2000). Developing a culturally appropriate psychotherapeutic approach with Indigenous Australians. *Australian Psychologist, 35,* 1–5.

Westerman, T., and Vicary, D. (2000). Aboriginal youth suicide. In P. Dudgeon, H. Pickett, and D. Garvey, (Eds.), *Working with Indigenous Australians: A Handbook for Psychologists* (pp. 471–480). Perth: Gunada.

Whaley, A.L. (2008). Cultural sensitivity and cultural competence: Toward clarity of definitions in cross-cultural counseling and psychotherapy. *Counselling Psychology Quarterly, 21*, 215-222. 🌐

Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender Concerns

Edited by Richard Jenkins and Maria Valente

Engaging LGBTQ Youth Through Photovoice: Teens Resisting Urban Trans/Homophobia (TRUTH)

**Written by
Katie Cook, Alix Holtby, and Robb Travers, Wilfrid Laurier University.**

Author Note

Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer (LGBTQ) youth frequently experience societal discrimination in the form of homophobic harassment and violence (Lock, 2002) that increases their risk for rejection from family and peers, violence, homelessness, substance use, depression, and feelings of social isolation (Savin-Williams, 1994). This increased stress and victimization of LGBTQ youth has been linked to health risk behaviours and negative psychosocial outcomes, including higher risk sex, drug and alcohol problems, depression, and suicidal ideation, and increased vulnerability to HIV (Silenzio, Pena, Duberstein, Cerel, and Knox, 2007; Whitbeck, Chen, Hoyt, Tyler, and Johnson, 2004).

To more fully understand the connection between homophobia/transphobia and these negative health outcomes, and to develop a broader understanding of the lives of LGBTQ youth in Waterloo Region, Ontario, a mid-sized urban centre comprised of three smaller cities an hour west of Toronto, Canada's largest city, the Teens Resisting Urban Trans/Homophobia (TRUTH) project examined LGBTQ youth's experiences using a photovoice approach.

Photovoice is a method whereby participants are given cameras and asked to take photos of their daily experiences. Its objective extends beyond merely producing research findings to meaningfully engaging participants and working toward social change (Wang and Pies, 2004). TRUTH emphasized LGBTQ youth's challenges as well as personal agency, community strengths, and resilience in the face of social exclusion. We meaningfully engaged youth, building upon their existing strengths through skills-development, and actively involved them in dissemination planning.

Photovoice was chosen as our method due to its focus on engaging participants beyond simply data collection. One of the project coordinators, Katie Cook, had previous experience in using photovoice with marginalized youth as well as with single mothers living in a low income neighbourhood. Based on the success of these previous endeavours, as well as the photovoice literature, it was our belief that photovoice could provide opportunities for youth to tell stories about their lives that often remain invisible, including stories of social exclusion. Additionally, photovoice would provide opportunities for community building with youth who may otherwise be disconnected from each other.

Recruitment

Fifteen youth participated in the TRUTH project. Project researchers recruited first for the project's youth advisory committee (YAC), seven of whom became photovoice participants, who then helped recruit a second wave of eight other photovoice participants. Recruitment was carried out through

online advertisement by community-based organizations in the Waterloo Region, as well as snowball sampling through YAC members, photovoice participants, and researchers. KW Counseling Centre - our principal community partner in the study - advertised through their LGBTQ support group for youth aged 13-18, which helped significantly with recruitment. While we were conscious of diversity when recruiting, particularly with regards to gender, gender identity, sexual orientation, geographic location, and socioeconomic status, our sample was primarily White. We relied on the diversity of the clientele within the organizations we contacted in order to build as diverse and inclusive sample as possible.

Our criteria for inclusion for the YAC and for photovoice participants were youth between the ages of 16 and 25, identifying as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, queer, or as part of the queer community, and living in Waterloo Region. YAC members modified the inclusion process for photovoice participants to include anyone who identified "as part of the queer community." This decision was made in order to include individuals who do not identify as LGBTQ necessarily, but do identify as part of the queer community, for example individuals whose parents are LGBTQ.

Youth Advisory Committee (YAC)

The role of the YAC was to establish ground rules for the project, help set parameters for participant recruitment, partake in preliminary data analysis, and help direct the dissemination of results. The YAC participated in the photovoice process, as well as training and planning sessions both prior to and following the photovoice sessions.

Youth advisory committee members were involved in five sessions before the photovoice process, including one initial information session, one business meeting, and three training sessions that addressed the values of participatory research and the method of photovoice, anti-oppression values, and advocacy and

public speaking skills. We attempted to frame these sessions as knowledge-sharing with YAC members rather than as teaching. Each member was compensated $20 per session for their time.

At the initial YAC session, YAC members created a list of ground rules which were prominently displayed in future meetings, and then revised once additional photovoice participants

> **Based on the success of these previous endeavours, as well as the photovoice literature, it was our belief that photovoice could provide opportunities for youth to tell stories about their lives that often remain invisible, including stories of social exclusion.**

joined the project. We used icebreakers at each session to establish rapport between participants, and we began each session with a three-word check in, which was useful in helping to build trust by knowing how participants were doing and what they were bringing into each session. At the end of each session, we had participants briefly check out, to create a space where participants could give feedback (positive and negative) on our process.

Following the photovoice process, the YAC came together to analyze photographs (approximately 180 photos), and they produced a list of initial themes that were used as a preliminary step to

guide further analysis. They also directed how photos from the study were going to be shared with the community and were involved in the planning of a one-time community exhibit of the photos.

Collecting Data: The Photovoice Process

The photovoice process itself spanned four weeks, and consisted of an information session, two photo discussion sessions, and a reflection session. In the information session, we gave an overview of the project, obtained consent and completed photo release forms, distributed cameras, and conducted workshops on basic and narrative photography skills. We then simply asked participants to take photos of their experiences as LGBTQ youth. They were given four days to take five to ten photographs before returning their memory cards to the researchers for photo printing.

A week later, we held an initial photo discussion session, beginning with an icebreaker to increase participant comfort level. Next, we had participants fill "SHOWeD" worksheets for their photo, which included the following questions: What is seen here? What is really happening? How does this relate to our lives? Why are things this way? How could this image be used to educate people? What else can we do about it? After completing worksheets, participants met in small groups to discuss the photos. Each was asked to share at least one photo with the group and discussion ensued. The group facilitator provided minimal guidance in order to keep discussions directed by and focused on participants' experiences. Upon completion of this first discussion, participants were asked to take more pictures. Two of these discussion sessions took place one week apart, with time for taking new photos between sessions.

The final week of data collection served as a reflection session for participants. We met in the same small groups to reflect on the photovoice and overall project processes, and to discuss

feedback on the project. The session concluded with a final check out with all participants, where they each spoke about their photovoice experience. After the final week of data collection, the YAC came together to analyze the content of the photographs and begin planning a community photo exhibit.

Participant Feedback

We asked participants for feedback on the photovoice process, focusing on positive aspects, negative aspects, and what participants would have changed. The most common topics discussed were the use of the SHOWeD worksheets, the nature of the small groups, and the time given for taking photographs.

Many participants found that the questions on the SHOWeD worksheets, particularly the final two questions regarding creating change, were not appropriate for the photos they had taken, as some participants did not believe that the onus for making changes fell on them. Participants felt that the project photos were better used to educate our community on both negative and positive issues, and serve as an impetus for action on the part of community members. Some participants did not answer all the questions, and many used the back of the worksheets to discuss areas they considered most important. Considering the relevance of questions asked and consulting with the YAC regarding worksheets is recommended.

The size and consistency of the small discussion groups was given positive feedback by many participants. Many participants had shared a great deal of personal information with their group members which they felt they would not have done had group dynamics been different. This comfort that developed with group members provided an environment of trust and respect for boundaries. Some participants also felt that remaining in the same groups allowed for greater comfort and trust within the group, and for conversation to build from one week to the next.

Finally, many participants felt that four days each week was insufficient time for taking photos. We felt that the balance between time allotted for photo-taking and the overall length of project was difficult, as increasing the project length would likely result in higher attrition. Different coordination of photo printing might alleviate this problem.

Conclusion

While photovoice is a unique methodology for conducting research with marginalized communities, it has not often been used with LGBTQ youth. The members of our research team set out

Preliminary data analysis revealed that youth discussed experiences related to harassment, safety, family support/lack of support, coming out, and lack of relevant sexual health resources, among other themes.

to not only understand the social context of living in Waterloo Region as LGBTQ youth, but also to engage youth with the photovoice method. We were able to provide space for youth to tell and reflect upon stories about their lives that often remain invisible. Preliminary data analysis revealed that youth discussed experiences related to harassment, safety, family support/lack of support, coming out, and lack of relevant sexual health resources, among other themes. Photovoice was a critical tool used to understand the depth of these negative and positive aspects in the lives of LGBTQ youth. We also aimed

to provide opportunities for community building with youth who may have otherwise been disconnected from each other. Many of our participants were engaged in their communities before the TRUTH project; however, we also saw a great deal of community-building between participants throughout the project. This community-building was seen mainly in the informal conversations that developed throughout the course of the project. The TRUTH photos were displayed at a community event at the end of 2009, with more than 150 community members attending. This event, along with a smaller photo exhibit that travelled to various agencies and venues throughout the city over the six months following the photo exhibit, fostered discussion and a potential for social change within the Kitchener-Waterloo community.

The TRUTH project highlighted the value of using photovoice with marginalized populations, particularly LGBTQ youth. This article detailed the stages of the photovoice process, summarizing feedback from participants, and reflecting on our experiences with participants.

References

Lock, J. (2002). Violence and sexual minority youth. *Journal of School Violence, 1*, 77-89.

Savin-Williams, R.C. (1994). Verbal and physical abuse as stressors in the lives of lesbian, gay male, and bisexual youths: Associations with school problems, running away, substance abuse, prostitution, and suicide. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 62,* 261-269.

Silenzio, V.M.B., Pena, J.B., Duberstein, P.R,. Cerel, J., and Knox, K.L. (2007). Sexual orientation and risk factors for suicidal ideation and suicide attempts among adolescents and young adults. *American Journal of Public Health, 97,* 2017-2019.

Wang, C.C., and Pies, C.A. (2004). Family, maternal, and child health

through photovoice. *Maternal and Child Health Journal, 8*, 95 – 102.

Whitbeck, L.B., Chen, X., Hoyt, D.R., Tyler, K.A., and Johnson, K.D. (2004). Mental disorder, subsistence strategies, and victimization among gay, lesbian, and bisexual homeless and runaway adolescents. *Journal of Sex Research, 41*, 329 – 342. ⊕

Living Community Psychology

**Edited and Written by
Gloria Levin, Glorialevin@verizon.net**

"Living Community Psychology" highlights a community psychologist through an in-depth interview that is intended to depict both personal and professional aspects of the featured individual. The intent is to personalize Community Psychology (CP) as it is lived by its diverse practitioners. For this and the next installment, we feature two leaders of the international movement of CP, both interviewed at the June 2010 Third International CP Conference in Puebla, Mexico. We start with Dr. Wolfgang Stark of Germany – a leader in German and European CP. In the next issue, we will visit with Dr. Maritza Montero, a political/community psychologist from Venezuela who is a leader in the Latin American CP movement.

Featuring:
Dr. Wolfgang Stark

*Professor of Organizational Psychology
University of Duisburg-Essen, Germany
Email: Wolfgang.stark@uni-due.de*

Born in 1954, Wolfgang Stark was a little young to be a part of Germany's student movement of 1968. However, he got a taste of that by his involvement in the Youth Center Movement when he was 17 years old. This was an autonomous group of youth who sought to develop their own culture and share meeting space. Although the movement became a breeding ground for some radical elements, Wolfgang was definitely mainstream, but he was impacted strongly by the movement's leftist political thinking.

Before graduating from the German gymnasium at age 18, he began considering psychology as a career, because he observed that people sought him out to recount their life stories. However, his grades were not good enough to gain admittance to a (competitive) psychology program, so he entered an economics program instead. He soon found it to be less challenging in terms of social and psychological issues. In a stroke of great luck, a student in the psychology program withdrew shortly after the term began, and the university announced it would fill the unexpected vacancy. Three hundred people applied and, from among the eligible applicants, Wolfgang's name was drawn. To this day, he considers his 1:300 win to be fate – signifying that he was meant to be a psychologist. He thereupon entered the University of Wurzburg, studying for a diploma in (clinical) psychology.

To this day, he considers his 1:300 win to be fate – signifying that he was meant to be a psychologist.

At that time, the new Italian concept of democratic psychiatry was attracting politicized students. He joined a small group of psychology students who created an alternative educational program. Guest speakers were invited to their parallel curriculum, and the students ran their own workshops and events. Although Wolfgang had not heard of community psychology at that time (1973), looking back on their alternative curriculum, he now recalls that the content was close to community psychology principles. Being one of the group's leaders and because of his love of learning, he took 7 years to earn his diploma, which normally takes 4-5 years. In the end, the university gave the group members academic credit for their alternative courses.

Earlier, at the age of 19, Wolfgang had refused service in the Army (which was obligatory for young German men at that time) and obtained status as a conscientious objector (CO). The government allowed him to finish his diploma in psychology from the University of Wurzburg, before starting his 18-month term as a CO.

Upon earning his diploma, he sought to perform his alternative service with the most prestigious organization that would accept him, hoping to receive high quality training while fulfilling his CO commitment. Because the government paid a stipend, although small, to CO's, he would be "free labor" to the receiving organization. He was, accordingly, "hired" by the world famous Max Planck Institute in Munich. "With my modest grades and no connections, I would never have been able to get a job there otherwise." He affiliated with the psychiatry institute's clinic, with which several prominent behavioral therapists were associated. He obtained superb training there, mostly being a clinical researcher in a behavior therapy project on depressives. He stayed at Max Planck a few months beyond his 18-month CO commitment, working on projects with drug addicts. Although he

found the work intellectually challenging, he realized that he was not inclined to be a clinical therapist. In part because of his earlier politicization from his student movement involvements, he still was attracted to political psychology and to prevention science, specifically.

In 1977, an edited book was published in German which included a few chapters from Americans, introducing community psychology principles. Slowly over time, Wolfgang met other Germans, mostly based in Munich and Berlin, who also were attracted to community psychology-like values and principles. Some, especially from Berlin, used Marxist theory as their base, similar to today's critical psychology.

Wolfgang entered a doctoral program at the Technical University in Berlin. In Germany, one enters a Ph.D. program having chosen a Ph.D. dissertation topic already; he chose to focus on primary prevention. Seeking mentoring, he approached the brilliant and influential Heiner Keupp at the University of Munich, one of the founders of community psychology in Germany. Through Keupp, Wolfgang met others who shared his interests and experiences, and Keupp encouraged him to begin writing and publishing right away.

Wolfgang was repeatedly advised that the U.S. was the place to learn about prevention. Although "prevention ideas were floating in the air in Germany at the time," Germany had yet to offer public health as a discipline of study. He read the prevention literature, checking citations so as to identify prominent prevention scholars in the U.S. He applied for and won a six-month grant (DAAD) to enhance his academic's development. Realizing that 6 months would be insufficient for learning about primary prevention in a typical academic exchange in one setting (and having not been granted more time), he obtained (rare) permission to use the grant money to travel around, meeting U.S experts.

Wolfgang wrote to U.S. community psychologists, asking to be hosted for a

few weeks or months. He was invited by Arnie Binder to start his sabbatical at the University of California, Irvine, for a one-month stay. At the time, he had "school English only, but I didn't care as long as I could express myself to obtain my basic needs." At every subsequent stop, he was asked to deliver a talk, so he was "thrown into" speaking English from the start. He got a hard dose of reality when his second host, Bernie Bloom (Boulder, CO) told him that his written English was "incomprehensible." He readily admits that was true at the time.

Wolfgang directly benefited from American-style networking; "Americans are very generous, readily setting up

"My trip to the U.S. was a combination of holiday, cultural adventure and work."

contacts for you with others." Through introductions made by Bernie Bloom, he was invited to meet most of the American leaders of the field at that time, including trips to visit Jim Kelly, Ed Trickett, Lenny Jason, Julian Rappaport, and Seymour Sarason. He met others at a community psychology conference in Tennessee. Rick Price hosted a part at his home to introduce Wolfgang to his University of Michigan graduate students – an unheard of event for German professors.

"My trip to the U.S. was a combination of holiday, cultural adventure and work. It was exciting; I was busy but free to do what I wanted." He easily met DAAD's (only) requirement for the grant, submitting a 20-page report about what he had learned, but he had also collected considerable material from his encounters (including recorded interviews) for his dissertation. Soon after his arrival back home, in 1982, Rappaport's seminal paper on empowerment was published. "It took me a few months to realize the paper's value, that empowerment was the next step beyond prevention, and so we immediately set out to translate and disseminate the paper in German."

Once back home, he needed a job to support himself through graduate school,

so he took a half-time job in artificial intelligence research. He, thereafter, bounced between several research jobs in various disciplines close to community psychology for 3 years, until he was offered a job at a new institution -- the (Munich) Self Help Resource Center. The Center was founded as the fulfillment of a campaign promise by a political coalition of the Greens and Social Democrats who had won municipal elections. To accept this job, Wolfgang had to relinquish a grant that would have allowed him to finish his dissertation. (He finished his PhD degree 8 years after he started this job.) "Working at the Center represented a way for me to apply to the community all the empowerment work that I'd only written about." At the beginning, the Center merely provided a facility for the many self-help groups in Munich to meet, such as Alcoholics Anonymous, and it modestly expanded to assist in the creation of new self-organized groups and to apply empowerment principles in practice. However, eventually the Center became the launching pad for many innovative programs in Munich.

Fate interceded, again. The Chernobyl nuclear accident of 1986 released radiation across Europe, causing a mass exodus of German families who were fleeing the path of the radioactive clouds. This impelled the Center to broaden its mission for serving the community, promoting the distribution of non-radioactive food, especially for school children, obtained from local organic farms. In this way, the Center promoted self reliance (rather than dependence on the government). The project was very successful and has grown significantly, beyond its start as short-term disaster reaction. After the disaster subsided and the Center had received positive media coverage, Munich's officials – who had originally only intended to pay lip service to their campaign promise of establishing a Center -- were more supportive of the Center's programming that went beyond self help. The Center's budget grew to 1.2 million marks annually (approximately $600,000), "relatively

huge by German standards," he explains.

Another re-invention of the Center stemmed from Wolfgang's attendance at a Tavistock-like workshop in group relations when he learned tools of team coaching. He had the revelatory insight that these tools would be of use to elites, thus expanding the Center's clientele so it was not only intervening with the lower rungs of society. Thus, influential people were assisted in dealing with their management problems and, in so doing, the Center ingratiated itself even more with the government. "They used our Center to create and implement innovative ideas of all kinds through the Center."

One innovative idea generated by the Center staff was to allow (academic-like) sabbaticals for themselves. The city officials approved their proposal, as long as employees covered for their colleagues who were on sabbatical. Wolfgang used his 3-month sabbatical to finish writing his dissertation.

Upon obtaining his Ph.D., Wolfgang decided to undertake an academic career. His employment choice was between teaching at a technical (professional) school and an (arts and sciences) university. A significant consideration was location. By that time, Wolfgang had married Sabine, a manager of adult education programs. She (a dedicated alpinist) wanted to continue residing in Munich because of its proximity to mountains. Wolfgang got 3 job offers, including one in (flat) Essen – 700 km from Munich. After much discussion, including consulting a professional counselor who advised against it, they decided to live apart during weekdays, in Essen and Munich, but to commute regularly between the two cities on the weekends. Ten years later, this has evolved into Wolfgang living 4 days a week in his Essen apartment and commuting to Munich. Wolfgang explains that it is not unusual for German academics' families to stay in one location, because the academics often change (university) employment.

He has applied for jobs in Munich, but the competition is fierce, and he has lost out to younger men and women for these jobs. "It's not so bad; it keeps a relationship fresh," he says, and he expects to stay at Essen through the rest of his career.

Twelve years ago and at the age of 44, Wolfgang started his academic career as a Full Professor and, on the basis of an evaluation of his teaching, was awarded tenure within a year. During a 3 ½ year term as Dean, he oversaw the merger of Essen and Duisburg Universities. The (now combined) university has 35,000 students, and classes are large, with a ratio of 1:56 (teachers to students). Half of his day onsite is teaching and related administration; half is research. Since the University does not have a psychology department, he teaches for related departments. He is the director of the Organizational Development Laboratory (www.orglab.de); while his salary is paid by the university, the Lab's 18 staffers are supported by outside grants for applied research, obtained from foundations and the government.

Wolfgang also heads the University's

...eventually the Center became the launching pad for many innovative programs in Munich.

Center for Societal Learning and Social Responsibility (www.uniaktiv.org), a service learning (SL) center for students which is enthusiastically supported by the university's president and with funding from a foundation. While SL has long been a staple at American universities (and in many American communities is a high school graduation requirement), his university is only one of two in Germany with a SL program. This program is unique in that SL has been made a requirement within all academic departments and for both bachelor's and master's degrees (with plans to extend the requirement to PhD students). Also, at least some of the SL work must be

performed outside the student's own discipline. Some innovative programs emerging from the SL program have been recognized by national and international awards, one given by the Jimmy and Rosalynn Carter Foundation. Wolfgang's research focus is on the cultural analysis and empowerment of organizational and social systems (community development, organizational learning) and corporate and societal social responsibility.

Considering academic life in Germany to be fairly isolating, with little collaboration among professors in the same department or university, Wolfgang has sought out collaborations with academics at other universities. He collaborated with Paul Toro, when Paul was Division 27's International Liaison, to produce a directory of community psychologists outside the U.S. and served as one of the International and European Coordinators of SCRA from 1986-1994. An informal network of approximately 30 German community psychologists was established; and he became a founding member and was on the Executive Committee (1994-1998) of the German Association for Community Research and Action. He has organized many national community

He is a strong proponent of transdisciplinary efforts for community psychology that would break free of the traditional, department-based organization of universities.

psychology conferences, including one held the summer of 2010 in Essen.

In 1995, together with two charismatic leaders, Jose Ornelas of Portugal and Donata Francescato of Italy, a meeting, convening about 15 European community psychologists, was held in Munich. Wolfgang was a founding member of the European Network of Community Psychologists (ENCP) which organized bi-annual conferences on community psychology, and ten years later, the European Community Psychology Association was founded. (Wolfgang served as that group's second President). In 2004, Wolfgang and Jarg Bergold hosted the Fifth European Conference

on Community Psychology in Berlin. He considers these professional meetings to be important opportunities, not only to reconnect with old academic friends but also to discover new people and ideas in community psychology. Although the German and European community psychology associations have grown and been formalized, he laments that the same few people do all the work.

One positive initiative of the European group has been the issuance of invitations to collaborate and teach at each other's institutions. For example, Wolfgang has an official visiting position at the Instituto Superior Psicologia Aplicada in Lisbon (a private university specializing in psychology) and sits on the Board of the Institute's community psychology master's program.

Having already contributed much to German and European community psychology, Wolfgang now aspires to create a master's program that would allow students to take courses at different universities within Germany and eventually across Europe. He is a strong proponent of transdisciplinary efforts for community psychology that would break free of the traditional, department-based organization of universities. He is exploring transdisciplinary concepts in his current research on the sound of social systems, in which his collaborations include not only psychologists and social scientists but also architects, musicians, physicists and computer experts. He concludes: "I am convinced that successfully linking different disciplines and ideas will foster the emergence of social innovations and become one of the major future perspectives of community psychology." ⬢

Regional Update

Edited by Bernadette Sánchez

Australia/New Zealand/ South Pacific

International Regional Liaisons
Katie Thomas:
Katie.thomas@curtin.edu.au

Diane Costello:
d.costello@curtin.edu.au

Kamal Kishore:
k.kishore@fsm.ac.fj

International Regional Student Liaison
Karen Johnson:
Karen.Johnson3@det.wa.edu.au

Some Implications: A Hung Discipline and a Hung Parliament

As this is written it would appear that Australians have a hard time being able to discriminate between political approaches. This lack of clarity was also reflected in the recent exclusion of Community Psychology from endorsement under the new national registration system administered by the recently formed Professional Board of Australia. We would like to thank all of our global colleagues who assisted us in petitioning the Australian government to reverse their decision not to endorse Community Psychology as an area of specialised practice in psychology. While there are some Universities in Australia still hoping to offer a Masters in Community Psychology, including Victoria University and Edith Cowan, without specialist endorsement the most likely outcome is that postgraduate training in Community Psychology will cease.

The current requirements for specialist registration with the APS (the Australian equivalent of the APA) are a Masters degree in Community Psychology plus a year of experience that incorporates at least 80 hours of college activities. At this time there is also the possibility of alternate entry through examination or bridging study or work. With the new Professional Registration board the alternative entry option will cease as from 2011 and full membership will then only be possible through the Masters degree and two years of approved experience. Ms. Heather Gridley has been working tirelessly to encourage specialist registration for those who are eligible before the 2011 change. Without an alternative route to college membership many excellent practitioners are likely to be excluded. Without nationally recognized specialist endorsement for Community Psychology this is likely to become a moot point.

The site for the online petition to send a message to the Hon John Hill, MP, who is Chair of the Council which can give endorsement to Community Psychology is http://www.gopetition.com/petitions/endorse-community-psychology.html

There are currently almost 3000 petitioners and, with a hung parliament, it may be some time before these requirements are reviewed or processed. We hope to have enough of a groundswell to reverse the previous decision.

On a positive note progress has been made on the SCRA Indigenous Interest Committee as outlined in this issue. Again, we thank our overseas colleagues for their involvement, support and solidarity. ⬢

Northeast Region, U.S.

Regional Coordinators
Anne Brodsky:
brodsky@umbc.edu

Lauren Bennett Cattaneo:
lcattane@gmu.edu

Michele Schlehofer:
mmschlehofer@salisbury.edu

Student Coordinators
Samantha Hardesty
hardest1@umbc.edu

Amaris Watson
aw55082@students.salisbury.edu

The Northeast Region Coordinators are looking forward to an exciting year ahead. Continuing on as second-year coordinators are Anne Brodsky, Associate Professor and Associate Chair of Psychology at University of Maryland Baltimore County, Lauren Cattaneo, Associate Professor of Psychology at George Mason University, and Michele Schlehofer, Assistant Professor of Psychology at Salisbury University. This year we are pleased to welcome two Student Regional Coordinators, one graduate and one undergraduate. Samantha Hardesty received her Masters in Applied Behavior Analysis from University of Maryland Baltimore County, and is continuing there as a doctoral student in Community/Clinical Psychology. Amaris Watson is a senior majoring in psychology at Salisbury University. She intends to pursue graduate work in either a clinical or community/clinical program. We are lucky to have these students on our team and look forward to working together!

Speaking of working together, please mark your calendars for the next SCRA Northeast Regional conference, which will be held as part of the Annual Meeting of the Eastern Psychological Association (EPA) **March 10-13, 2011** at the **Hyatt Regency in Cambridge, MA**. The chief task of the Northeast Region Coordinators will be developing the NE SCRA program, which will provide an opportunity for community psychologists, practitioners, researchers, and students in the Northeast Region to connect and discuss their current and future work in research, prevention/intervention, and community advocacy.

Now is the time to start planning your proposal submission, as we'd love to continue to increase the turnout for community psychologists at EPA. To be part of the NE SCRA Program at EPA, please be on the lookout for a call for proposals on the SCRA website www.scra27.org and SCRA listservs. More to come! 🌐

West Region, U.S.

Regional Coordinators

Maria Chun:
mariachu@hawaii.edu

Regina Langhout:
langhout@ucsc.edu

Joan Twohey-Jacobs:
jtwohey-jacobs@laverne.edu

Dyana Valentine:
info@dyanavalentine.com

Student Coordinator

Marieka Schotland:
mss286@nyu.edu

From the Bay Region...

The network of Bay Area community psychologists and colleagues from other fields with interests in community-based research and intervention continue to meet once a semester for an informal colloquium. The upcoming Fall symposium will take place on October 29th at UC Berkeley. For those interested in attending and/or presenting please contact Marieka Schotland or Gina Langhout (see emails below). The goal of our network is to provide a forum to informally discuss work in progress, network with other community practitioners, and provide an exchange of ideas related to community intervention work. The larger group meets twice a year while encouraging smaller groups to form around particular interests. If you would like to be on our mailing list, please email Marieka Schotland (mss286@nyu.edu) or Gina Langhout (langhout@ucsc.edu). 🌐

FromHawai'i...

Two incoming and one exchange student at UH. Below are brief bios written by the new students in the Community and Cultural Concentration Program at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa.

Jeff Berlin. Jeff Berlin is pursuing a PhD in the community and culture concentration at the University of Hawai'i

at Mānoa. His specific research interests include cross-cultural training, diversity, organizational psychology, and environmental psychology. He received his B.A. in psychology from the University of North Carolina at Wilmington and M.S. in Industrial/Organizational psychology from San Jose State University. Before beginning his Ph.D. work at UH, he worked as a Human Resource Development specialist at NASA for over three years.

Ashley Anglin. Ashley Anglin is a graduate of Berry College in Rome, Georgia with a BS in Psychology and a BA in Spanish. She is a member of Psi Chi, Sigma Delta Pi, Omicron Delta Kappa, and Phi Kappa Phi. Currently she is a graduate student at the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, working with Dr. Ashley Maynard in the Community and Culture Concentration. Her research interests include Hispanic youth civic engagement, ethnic identity, positive youth development, and service-learning.

Seini O'Connor. I was born in Nuku'alofa, Tonga, but was mostly raised further south in the Pacific: in Aotearoa/New Zealand. I grew up with my three siblings on a diet of much outdoor activity and a busy school and community life, then went to university to study philosophy and psychology. After a year of post-study travel, I fell into a short career of development consulting, during which time I completed a graduate diploma in commerce and travelled the world looking at how best to organize water and electricity service delivery in rural and peri-urban areas. It was eye-opening, often fascinating, and I learned a lot; but ultimately I realized that I was less interested in the culturally-varied economic and political institutions I was dealing with than in the people within them. I decided to return to study to pursue a new direction. The MSc Cross-Cultural program offered by the University of Victoria in Wellington seemed to provide a good opportunity for building relevant skills in understanding and exploring cultural differences. I am now 18 months into my program, and

am working on a thesis on how New Zealand youth from different ethnic backgrounds engage in community-based activities, and how this relates to their well-being over time—a topic that brings together several of my interests (positive youth development, extra-curricular activities [particularly sports!], and cultural similarities and differences). While enjoying the wonderful opportunity to come on exchange to the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa, I am also taking courses in community psychology and Pacific studies, and am a student affiliate at the East-West Center. I have appreciated

The University of Hawaii's Community and Cultural Concentration Program Welcoming Incoming Graduate Students Jeff Berlin and Ashley Anglin, and Exchange Student Seini O'Connor, during Labor Day Weekend at Kailua Beach Park, Oahu, Hawai'i.

the warm welcome I have received so far, and look forward to learning and experiencing a lot during the rest of my 5 month stay. I am also happy to share my passion for Aotearoa/New Zealand with anyone who is interested! 🌐

Exciting News from Program Director Clifford O'Donnell

The Cooperative Agreement between the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa's Community and Cultural Concentration and the University of Victoria in Wellington, NZ's Cross-Cultural Psychology Program has been officially approved and signed by officials

at both universities. This Agreement will facilitate student exchanges with opportunities for courses, research, and practica. Students who complete graduate work at the exchange university will receive a Certificate recognizing their work at graduation. 🌐

An Update from Hawai'i by Melodi Wynne, University of Hawai'i at Mānoa

This spring I, Melodi Wynne, completed the requirements for a Master of Arts degree in Community and Cultural Concentration (CCC) in Psychology from the University of Hawai'i at Mānoa (UHM). My thesis, "Video Feedforward (Ffwd) and Self-efficacy in Adult Tribal Language Users" looked at changes in self-efficacy to speak one's tribal language throughout a video self-modeling intervention designed to project future success into present behavior (Dowrick, 1999). My study targeted the adult population of an American Indian tribe because adult tribal members have varying levels of lifetime exposure to their tribal languages and a level of comprehension, but may hesitate to speak the language aloud in different settings for various reasons. It is important that they speak aloud the words and phrases that they know in order to normalize the recovering language in the tribal community while the children and youth learn it in classes and immersion programs.

Analysis of the results revealed an interesting pattern dividing participants

into three groups according to age. Changes in self-efficacy to speak the language most consistently increased throughout the video Ffwd intervention with the younger adults who reported less lifetime exposure to the language and more proficiency at speaking as opposed to comprehending. Self-efficacy also increased, although to a lesser degree and less consistently upward, for the group of middle age adults who reported more exposure to the language across their lives and greater comprehension than speaking ability. The older age group in this small sample (n = 6) did not complete the study. The small sample size limits the generalizability of the findings but video Ffwd shows promise in this indigenous language recovery effort.

A qualitative analysis of interviews with participants revealed themes such as appreciation for the language, desire to speak and understand the language, motivation to learn, contextual reasons for hesitating to speak, and perceived role in language recovery. I was honored to tell the story of language recovery for these few participants, and to share their comments and suggestions with the tribal language and culture programs.

On the way to present a poster of my thesis research to the Society for the Psychological Study of Ethnic Minority Issues (Division 45 of APA) first annual conference at the University of Michigan at Ann Arbor, I attended the International Network of Indigenous Health Knowledge and Development (INIHKD) biennial conference in Poulsbo, Washington. Representatives of indigenous groups from Canada, United States, Hawai'i, New Zealand, Australia, and Norway attended the INIHKD conference. One of the key ideas gleaned from this conference is that indigenous knowledge is not held by any one person, but rather by the collective, which will inform my present and future research with these populations.

Between the INIHKD and APA Div. 45 conference I reported the results of my thesis research to the tribal council

(TC) of the particular tribe targeted in my study. The TC provided several comments and future collaborations are forthcoming including possible training regarding research issues within this tribe. Presently, I am part of a developing organization called Antithesis Research that aims to support research within Tribal communities. A report of my thesis research project has been submitted to the tribal newspaper to disseminate the findings from it to the community.

Along with learning and networking opportunities at the Div. 45 conference, the poster presentation provided questions and comments from observers regarding my thesis research that will inform my dissertation and future research of cultural and psychological issues facing indigenous communities. I also accepted an invitation to serve on a task force looking at issues of trauma in diverse populations and advocate for the integration of culture in trauma theory, research, practice, training and policy.

Back at UHM, I joined in support of other Native American students to organize a Native American Student Association (NASA), which hosted its inaugural event in the spring semester. "NASA Exposed" was a movie and discussion forum and was preceded by a cultural demonstration. Approximately 50 university and community members viewed the movie "Smoke Signals." I introduced the movie and served on the panel to field questions regarding issues raised by the audience.

In the meantime, I have been accepted by UHM's CCC program to continue studying toward a Ph.D., which I will use to continue researching and working within North American Indian tribal groups.

References

Dowrick, P. W. (1999). A review of self modeling and related interventions. *Applied and Preventive Psychology, 8,* 23 🌐

School Intervention

Edited by Paul Flaspohler and Melissa Maras

Greetings from the School Intervention Interest Group!

We are pleased to present an article that expands on this column's ongoing discussion of interdisciplinary training, research and practice in the emerging field of School Mental Health. For this issue, Mark Weist, Scott Huebner, Brad Smith, and Abe Wandersman from the University of South Carolina and Carrie Mills from the Center for School Mental Health at the University of Maryland School of Medicine discuss challenges and opportunities related to pre-service training in the field with a particular focus on preparing graduate students for the realities of interdisciplinary practice in and with schools. They begin by describing the unique roots and contributions of three of the vital disciplines engaged in school mental health (school, clinical, and community psychology), then continue to discuss the practical challenges that arise as the disciplinary distinctions between roles of school mental health professionals blur. Finally, they offer some examples of innovative training practices that aim to support high-quality training in school mental health, as well as several recommendations related to general issues of pre-service preparation in the field. To develop these recommendations, the authors drew from content surfaced during an ongoing brown bag series that brings together graduate students and faculty from some of the various disciplines engaged in school mental health to discuss barriers to and facilitators of better collaboration among these disciplines with the field. Thus, this article presents a unique approach to stimulating local conversations about current training, practice and research issues in the field, as well as contributing to a broader dialogue that continues to be a major focus of this column. 🌐

School, Community and Clinical Psychology Training and Working Together in the Interdisciplinary School Mental Health Field

Written by
Mark D. Weist,[1]* Carrie Mills,[2]** Scott Huebner,[1]** Bradley Smith,[1]* and Abe Wandersman,[1]*

[1] *Department of Psychology, University of South Carolina*
[2] *Center for School Mental Health, University of Maryland School of Medicine*
* *Clinical/Community Psychologist.*
** *School Psychologist.*

School mental health (SMH) services are gaining momentum in the United States (U.S) (Foster, Rollefson, Doksum, Noonan, and Robinson, 2005) and in other countries (Rowling and Weist, 2004) related to recognition that youth and families generally do not connect or stay connected to traditional "specialty" mental health centers, and that services in schools are not nearly at the level they should be. In addition, there is emerging evidence of benefits of more comprehensive mental health services in schools, including improved access to care (Burns, 1995; Catron, Harris, and Weiss, 1998; Rones and Hoagwood, 2000), enhanced preventive services (Elias, Gager, and Leon, 1997), increased early problem identification (Weist, Myers, Hastings, Ghuman, and Han, 1999), less stigmatizing and more natural services (Atkins, Adil, Jackson, McKay, and Bell, 2001; Nabors and Reynolds, 2000), and increased likelihood of generalization of intervention impacts across settings (Evans, Langberg, and Williams, 2003).

A significant amount of school mental health services are provided by school-employed staff such as school psychologists, counselors, and social workers, as well as other staff including school nurses and educators focused on behavioral issues (Flaherty et al., 1998). In this work, these school-employed professionals are increasingly being joined in the schools by child and adolescent mental health staff from collaborating community agencies.

The term expanded school mental health (Weist, 1997) has been used to emphasize that these programs should reflect school, family, community-system collaboration and a shared agenda (Andis et al., 2002) to provide a full continuum of mental health promotion and intervention programs and services to youth in general and special education. The word "expanded" in this term is used purposefully to convey that mental health professionals from other community systems augment the foundation of this work established by school-employed educators and mental health and health professionals.

Interdisciplinary collaboration in providing mental health services in schools is called for in federal reports emphasizing high quality mental health care (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services [DHHS], 1999), improving children's mental health (U.S. Public Health Service, 2000), preventing and addressing the impacts of violence (U.S. DHHS, 2001), and transforming approaches to become more collaborative, preventive, flexible and evidence-based (President's New Freedom Commission, 2003; Mills et al., 2006). In addition, there is a comprehensive array of federal grants available to support SMH, including Safe Schools/Healthy Students (Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration [SAMHSA], U.S. Department of Education [DOE]), Integrating Mental Health into the Schools (U.S. DOE), Building Capacity for School Mental Health Services (Centers for Disease Control and Prevention), and Developing Systems of Care for Youth with Serious Emotional/Behavioral Disorders (SAMHSA). Further, research on SMH is increasingly supported within the National Institutes of Health and the U.S. DOE-sponsored Institute of Education Sciences, and there is an emerging major emphasis on SMH within the military, particularly the Army (Faran et al., 2003). The growth and development of the SMH field is also reflected in two newer interdisciplinary journals, Advances in School Mental Health Promotion (Clifford Beers Foundation and the University of Maryland, www.schoolmentalhealth.co.uk) and School Mental Health (Springer, www.springer.org).

Within this context of growth of school mental health services, there is a need for greater collaboration by psychologists of different disciplines along with other mental health disciplines and education staff. The school setting offers considerable opportunity to build interconnected programs of training, practice, research and policy influence in SMH. However, fragmentation of services is the norm in children's mental health (U.S. Public Health Service, 2000), and training programs in psychology generally do not develop the potential for interdisciplinary collaboration in schools (see Paternite et al., 2006).

In this article, school, community, and clinical psychologists working together at two universities present a background on this issue and ideas for moving past the status quo of separateness in training, practice and research among these disciplines in psychology (see Sarason, 1981, 2001). First, we present the relevant background on school and then community and clinical psychology. Then we present barriers to enhanced collaboration and make preliminary recommendations to overcome barriers and increase collaboration.

School Psychology

School psychology is a rapidly evolving field, moving from an emphasis on special education gatekeeper and diagnostician to much broader roles of prevention and mental health promotion as well as individual assessments and interventions for learning problems (e.g., Doll and Cummings, 2008; Fagan and Wise, 2007). The National Association of School Psychologists (NASP) has called for and is providing guidance and leadership toward an expanded role. For example, NASP's Blueprint for Training and Practice III includes multiple roles for school psychologists reflecting a major trend toward providing more comprehensive services. These roles increasingly reflect a three-tiered approach to school-wide prevention, prevention/early intervention, and intervention aimed at "improving academic competence, social-emotional functioning, family-school partnerships, classroom instruction, and school-based child and family health and mental health services for all learners" (Ysseldyke, et al. 2008, p. 40; also see NASP's Model for Comprehensive and Integrated School Psychological Services, 2010). In addition to these multi-tiered approaches, school psychology is increasingly emphasizing promotion of students' strengths and assets (Huebner, Gilman, Reschly, and Hall, 2009).

Community and Clinical Psychology

Community psychologists have long emphasized work in schools; for example, as reflected in Sarason's early work (1971) on school transformation. Also of note is the Collaborative for Academic Social and Emotional Learning (CASEL; www.casel.org) and its prominent work to build the construct of social and emotional learning (SEL) while supporting the development of a growing evidence base of programs that improve SEL in children (Greenberg et al., 2003; Zins, Weissburg, Wang, and Walberg, 2004), associated with significant positive impacts on behavior and learning in schools (Durlak and Weissburg, in press). Clinical and counseling psychologists are also increasingly working in schools (Foster et al., 2005) related to recognition of needs and advantages as reviewed earlier, along with data documenting very poor attendance at traditional 'specialty' mental health centers (Catron, Harris, and Weiss, 1998). This shift is consistent with an increasing ecological emphasis among a wide range of disciplines in psychology and other mental health professions (Atkins et al., 2001; see Bronfenbrenner, 1979). While associated with many advantages for services, as these clinicians move into the schools, augmenting the work of school-employed staff, there is a steep learning curve along many dimensions, including understanding school culture, relevant

regulations, team processes, educational decision making, and so on. A major challenge is working in an environment characterized by low administrative support, a need for a high level of independent functioning, and strong interpersonal demands (Weist, Ambrose, and Lewis, 2006). In addition, clinicians need to navigate different constructs related to student emotional/behavioral functioning; for example special education labeling versus DSM-IV diagnoses, more emphasis on behavior and less acceptance for a perspective focusing on "psychopathology," a term increasingly falling into disfavor related to its pejorative implications (Weist, 2010).

Barriers to Collaboration

While the above reflects the move of child and adolescent mental health staff from a range of disciplines and different systems to come together to work in schools (see Merrell and Buchanan, 2006; Nastasi and Vargas, 2008; Shapiro, 2006) a number of challenges are being confronted. For example, relationships to date among school psychologists and other mental health providers in schools and the community have lacked clarity, consistency, and integration. As early as 1963, Gray decried that "the essentially ad hoc arrangement of pupil personnel services in many systems is certainly one cause of the highly confused articulation of the duties among the several specialties working under one administrative unit" (p. 256).

Roles of mental health professionals who work in schools are also blurring together. For example, the roles of school social workers have extended beyond the traditional roles – caseworker, group worker, counselor, parent liaison, and occasional truant officer – into newer and more specialized roles – behavior management, mental health promotion and intervention, and systems evaluation and change (Hepworth, Rooney, Rooney, Strom-Gottfried, and Larsen, 2010; Zastrow, 2010). While this evolution in

roles for school- and other community-system mental health staff is encouraging along many dimensions, it also creates confusion; for example, if people have comparable roles, why have separate disciplines? How should decisions about allocations of professional staff for schools be made? For the most part, there are not clear answers here.

In addition to challenges to collaboration among mental health

professionals who work in schools, there are also challenges for these professionals to work with health staff and educators. Interdisciplinary barriers are confronted such as difference in language, very limited training in mental health for educators, and common frustration voiced by educators in trying to get assistance for students' emotional/behavioral problems (Burke and Paternite, 2007). A related issue is that interdisciplinary training and teamwork in schools should be a purposeful process requiring planning, monitoring, and adjustment of processes; however, time and support for these processes are rarely allocated or sanctioned (Bronstein, 2003), and teams in schools generally do not evaluate their functioning or the quality of their working relationships (Mellin et al., in press).

Within psychology, graduate training programs present barriers to interdisciplinary collaboration. For example, school and counseling psychology are often housed in Colleges of Education, while clinical psychology and community psychology are often housed in Colleges of Arts and Sciences, a geographical boundary that likely reflects and reinforces a cultural one (see Sarason, 1981). In school psychology, there are some differences of opinion regarding doctoral versus non-doctoral practice (Curtis, Lopez, Castillo, Batsche, Minch, and Smith, 2008; Huber, 2007),

and areas of disagreement between the National Association of Schools Psychologists (2010) and the American Psychological Association (APA, 2009). In clinical and community psychology there has been some struggle to balance academic versus applied roles (Jenkins, 2010), and doctoral accreditation by the APA is driven primarily by clinical requirements, creating some ambiguity for community psychology.

Examples of Enhanced Collaboration and Preliminary Recommendations

The Department of Psychology at the University of South Carolina (USC) benefits from both the School and Clinical/Community Programs being housed together in one department in the College of Arts and Sciences. There is growing collaboration occurring across these programs. This includes cross-mentoring of students on theses and dissertations, offering common courses, and collaboration on service and research projects. A noteworthy nexus for school, clinical, and community collaboration is the Challenging Horizons After-School Program (Smith, McQuillin, and Shapiro, 2008). Each year, this school-based program engages hundreds of undergraduates and many graduate students in service-learning activities that exemplify best practices in evidence-based, interdisciplinary collaboration to help public school students with learning or behavior problems. The Department also benefits from scholarly and research programs calling for strong interdisciplinary and stakeholder collaboration such as the Community Science framework (Chinman et al., 2005; Flaspohler et al., 2006; Wandersman, 2003) and the related Getting to Outcomes approach (Chinman, Imm, and Wandersman, 2004), as well as the interdisciplinary movement to infuse positive psychology in the school setting (Huebner and Hills, in press).

To stimulate ideas for this article, a

Within this context of growth of school mental health services, there is a need for greater collaboration by psychologists of different disciplines along with other mental health disciplines and education staff.

forum was held with faculty members and graduate students from School and Clinical/Community Programs at USC, asking for ideas relevant to promoting better collaboration between these programs and other disciplines involved in child and adolescent mental health, with particular emphasis on working in schools. A number of ideas emerged from an initial group discussion as part of a Brown Bag lunch seminar, with an emphasis on strategies for integration among clinical, community, and school psychology. Other faculty and graduate students from USC and staff from the University of Maryland, Center for School Mental Health (CSMH; faculty home of the lead author until his move to USC recently) provided ideas by email. What follows is a preliminary set of ideas that we will explore this academic year as part of the Brown Bag seminar and in other forums (e.g., conferences of the CSMH; see http://csmh.umaryland.edu). We hope these ideas promote increased dialogue on overcoming barriers to collaboration within disciplines in psychology focused on children and adolescents and schools and with other disciplines doing this work.

Need for Enhanced Planning for Integrated Training. Within clinical and community psychology, "getting along collegially cannot be taken for granted," with a goal for collaboration but in reality "a lot of parallel play." In training, this can be analogous to "sampling different courses in a buffet style, sampling them and liking them" but not achieving "haute cuisine" or a more purposeful integrated approach.

Arbitrary Narrowing of Training. For instance, school psychology students may become proficient in psychoeducational assessment and consulting, but may lack experience in counseling and family therapy. The reverse is true for the clinical/community students, who may never set foot in a school as part of their applied training. There are opportunities for collaboration and economies of scale here that remain underexplored.

Seeking Complementarity. Differences in emphases can actually be strengths in collaborative training. For example, school psychology can provide additional training to clinical/community students in assessment of intelligence and learning disabilities, with clinical/community psychology similarly providing such training to school psychology in intervention to address more severe psychiatric disorders.

Building Common Training within Psychology. Classes fulfilling common training requirements for school and clinical/community psychology are often separated. Efforts should be taken to purposefully integrate them, and beginning strategies for doing the same were discussed (e.g., the development of an advanced "school mental health" practicum that would fulfill training requirements for third year school psychology students, while also offering enhanced practicum opportunities for clinical/community students).

Building Common Training with Other Departments. Similarly, there are common training requirements across psychology and social work departments, but these almost always operate in separate colleges. How can constraints such as colleges "protecting dollars" for student credit hours be overcome? (a small group agreed to meet to enhance planning for more social work – psychology collaboration at USC).

We hope these ideas promote increased dialogue on overcoming barriers to collaboration within disciplines in psychology focused on children and adolescents and schools and with other disciplines doing this work.

Discipline-Related Arrogance and Rigidity. A reality, not often openly discussed is that some disciplines in psychology may feel and act "superior" to others from different disciplines, a common problem within and across other professions (see Berger, 2002). Such "discipline ethnocentrism" is associated with overt and covert communication patterns that impede collaboration both for the person feeling superior and the

person from the other discipline, who may feel disrespected and thus avoid contact. The difficulties and realities (e.g., high pace, fluidity, minimal administrative support) of the work in schools can exacerbate these tensions (Flaherty et al., 1998; Weist, 1997). There are also related problems of "discipline rigidity" or over-relying on the knowledge base and skill set of one discipline, and "discipline ambiguity" or not showing interest in those of other disciplines. Clearly there is a need for open dialogue about these issues for faculty and trainees across psychology disciplines and with related professions such as social work, counselling and education. This would involve creation of space that promotes shared leadership, training, responsibility, and communication among different disciplines who work in the schools (see recommendation below).

Addressing Interdisciplinary Skill Deficits. Difficulties in interdisciplinary work may reflect deficiencies in effective leadership, communication, and collaborative skills among team members. Some authors (e.g., Huebner and Hahn, 1988) have suggested the need for specific training in leadership and teambuilding skills for the many disciplines who work in schools, including skills such as developing shared agendas, goal setting, communicating and working together effectively, and ensuring follow through. This training agenda is being pursued by the Mental Health-Education Integration Collaborative (MHEDIC), whose mission is "to promote interdisciplinary collaboration and professional workforce preparation for the many disciplines involved in supporting student learning and mental health, including educators, mental health and health staff, families and youth, advocates and others. Goals of MHEDIC are to:

1. through pre-service, graduate, and in-service training and ongoing support, equip and empower educators in their roles as promoters of student mental

health and mental health staff to work effectively in schools;

2. promote interdisciplinary collaboration and mutual support among families and youth, and education and mental health/health professionals who work in schools; and

3. build research and advance policy related to mental health and education systems working closely together to improve programs and services and achieve valued outcomes for students and schools." (see www.mhedic. org, retrieved August 31, 2010).

Developing Resources and New Models for Supervision. An increased interdisciplinary focus in psychology training will require rethinking supervision and other resources. For example, in an integrated training experience in the schools involving multiple disciplines (such as school, community and clinical psychology, and social work and counseling), who are the supervisors? If this is truly a team approach, including leaders from each discipline, then planning and logistical hurdles will need to be overcome. Clearly, there is a need for new models of supervision, away from passive approaches involving "discussion" of cases (see Stephan, Davis, Burke, and Weist, 2006) toward active approaches including engaging teaching, behavioral rehearsal, peer to peer support, emotional support and administrative assistance, as in the emerging field focused on *implementation support* (see Fixsen, Naoom, Blasé, Friedman, and Wallace, 2005).

Building Research Agendas. The hypothesis that enhancing interdisciplinary collaboration in schools will improve the availability of effective services that schools will use is plausible and testable. But this is a very early research agenda, with the construct of interdisciplinary collaboration in school mental health poorly articulated, with a lack of measurement strategies and intervention approaches. This is an emerging agenda in MHEDIC, with some preliminary research of very high promise emerging (see Mellin et al., in press). Collaboration among the range of disciplines in psychology along with other disciplines who work in schools, would help to build this research agenda and likely promote other integrations in training and practice.

Conclusion

The article presented here emphasizes increasing collaboration among school, clinical, and community psychologists, reflecting two programs at the University of South Carolina (school and clinical/community psychology), a national center for school mental health at the University of Maryland and the authors' experiences. As presented, this is only one segment of the network of collaboration that should be in place for effective SMH programs and services. Within psychology, three notable omissions in this paper are counseling, educational and developmental psychology, with all three disciplines playing a very important role in the advancement of school mental health. As mentioned, there is also a critical need for collaboration with disciplines including school social work, counseling, general and special education, nursing and other allied health disciplines such as occupational therapy and speech pathology.

A theme that emerged in discussions held for this paper was on increasing critical mass for interdisciplinary collaboration that should occur once a group of collaborating programs begin on this path. For example, if school, clinical, community, counseling (and other) psychology programs prioritize collaboration in graduate training, including within school and community placements, and prioritize outreach to other disciplines, then these students will become university and school and community leaders with the same priorities, creating fertile ground for the further advancement of such collaboration. This is consistent with an experience at the University of Maryland: Twelve years ago, the psychology internship program, accredited by the American Psychological Association, expanded eligible applicants to include school and counseling psychologists (from exclusively clinical/community). This has led to a growing critical mass of collaboration among psychologists from these disciplines, which has facilitated outreach to and collaboration with other disciplines on the University of Maryland Baltimore campus, including child and adolescent psychiatry, pediatrics, nursing, social work, and family medicine.

As part of the process of writing this paper, analyses of training in relation to interdisciplinary collaboration at USC has intensified. One preliminary conclusion is that the Department of Psychology plants the seeds for collaboration among School and Clinical/Community psychology at the undergraduate level (e.g., through the Challenging Horizons program). However, at the graduate level this collaboration has been more hit or miss. Through the brown bag seminar happening this year, and the discussion that has begun from writing this article, we hope to be much further along in this area in coming academic years, and would look forward to reporting on our progress. We would also invite your ideas for building interdisciplinary collaboration in schools among psychology and other disciplines. These can be sent to advances@mailbox.sc.edu, associated with the new interdisciplinary journal, Advances in School Mental Health Promotion (see www.schoolmentalhealth.co.uk).

References

American Psychological Association (2009). *Guidelines and principles for accreditation of programs in professional psychology.* Washington, DC: Author.

Andis, P., Cashman, J., Praschil, R., Oglesby, D., Adelman, H., Taylor, L., and Weist, M.D. (2002). A strategic and shared agenda to advance mental health in schools through family and system partnerships. *International Journal of Mental Health Promotion, 4,* 28-35.

Atkins, M., Adil, J., Jackson, M., McKay, M., and Bell, C. (2001). *An ecological model for school-based mental health services.* 13th Annual Conference Proceedings: A System of Care for Children's Mental Health: Expanding the Research Base. Tampa: University of South Florida.

Berger, A. (2002). Arrogance among physicians. *Academic Medicine, 77*(2), 145-147.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bronstein L. (2003). A model for interdisciplinary collaboration. *Social Work, 48,* 297-306.

Burke, R.W. and Paternite, C.E. (2007). Teacher engagement in expanded school mental health. In S. Evans, Z. Serpell and M.D. Weist (Eds.), *Advances in school-based mental health services, Volume 2* (pp. 21-1 to 21-15). Kingston, NJ: Civic Research Institute, Inc.

Catron, T., Harris, V.S., and Weiss, B. (1998). Posttreatment results after 2 years of services in the Vanderbilt school-based counseling project. In M.H. Epstein, K. Kutash, and A. Ducknowski (Eds.), *Outcomes for children and youth with behavioral and emotional disorders and their families: Programs and evaluation best practices* (pp. 633-656). Austin, TX: Pro-Ed.

Chinman, M., Hannah, G., Wandersman, A., Ebener, P., Hunter, S.B., Imm, P., et al. (2005). Developing a community science research agenda for building community capacity for effective preventive interventions. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 35*(3/4), 143-158.

Chinman, M., Imm, P., and Wandersman, A. (2004). *Getting to Outcomes 2004: Promoting accountability through methods and tools for planning, implementation, and evaluation.* Santa Monica, CA: Rand.

Curtis, M.J., Lopez, A.D., Castillo, J.M., Batsche, G.M., Minch, D., and Smith, J.C. (2008). The status of school psychology: Demographic characteristics, employment conditions, professional practices, and continuing professional development. *Communiqué, 36,* 27-29.

Doll, B., and Cummings, J.A. (2008). *Transforming school-based mental health services: Population-based approaches to promoting the competency of wellness of children.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Durlak, J., and Weissberg, R. (in press). The impact of enhancing students' social and emotional learning: A meta-analysis of school-based universal interventions. *Child Development.*

Elias, M.J., Gager, P., and Leon, S. (1997). Spreading a warm blanket of prevention over all children: Guidelines for selecting substance abuse and related prevention curricula for use in the schools. *Journal of Primary Prevention, 18,* 41-69.

Evans, S.W., Langberg, J., and Williams, J. (2003). Achieving generalization in school-based mental health. In M.D. Weist, S.W. Evans, and N.A. Lever (Eds.), *Handbook of school mental health: Advancing practice and research* (pp, 335-348). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Fagan, T.K. and Wise, P.S. (2007). *School Psychology: Past, present, and future,* (3rd ed.). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Faran, M.E., Weist, M.D., Saito, A.Y., Yoshikami, L., Weiser, J.W., and Kaer,B. (2003). School-based mental health on a United States Army Installation. In M.D. Weist, S.W. Evans, and N.A. Lever (Eds.), *Handbook of school mental health: Advancing practice and research* (pp. 191-202). New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Fixsen, D.L., Naoom, S.F., Blase, K.A., Friedman, R.M., and Wallace, F. (2005). *Implementation Research: A Synthesis of the Literature.* (FMHI Publication #231). Tampa, FL: University of South Florida, Louis de la Parte Florida Mental Health Institute, The National Implementation Research Network.

Flaherty, L.T., Garrison, E., Waxman, R., Uris, P., Keyes, S., Siegel, M.G., and Weist, M.D. (1998). Optimizing the roles of school mental health professionals. *Journal of School Health, 68,* 420-424.

Flaspohler, P.D., Anderson-Butcher, D., Paternite, C.E., Weist, M.D., and Wandersman, A. (2006). Community science and expanded school mental health: Bridging the research to practice gap to promote child well being and academic success. *Educational and Child Psychology, 23*(1), 27-41.

Foster, S., Rollefson, M., Doksum, T., Noonan, D., and Robinson, G. (2005). *School Mental Health Services in the United States, 2002–2003.* DHHS Pub. No. (SMA) 05-4068. Rockville, MD: Center for Mental Health Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.

Gray, S.W. (1963). *The psychologist in the schools.* New York, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston.

Greenberg, M. T., Weissberg, R.P., O'Brien, M.U., Zins, J. E., Fredericks, L., Resnik, H., and Elias, M. J. (2003). School-based prevention: Promoting positive social development through social and emotional learning. *American Psychologist, 58,* 466-474.

Hepworth, D., Rooney, R., Rooney, G., Strom-Gottfried, K., and Larsen, J. (2010). *Direct social work practice: Theory and skills.* (8th Ed.). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole, Cengage Learning.

Huber, D. R. (2007). Is the scientist-practitioner model viable for school psychology practice? *American Behavioral Scientist, 50,* 778-788.

Huebner, E.S., Gilman, R., Reschly, A., and Hall, R. (2009a). Positive schools. In C.R. Snyder and S.J. Lopez (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of positive psychology* (2nd Ed.) (pp. 561-569), Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Huebner, E.S., and Hahn, B. (1988). Best practices in coordinating multidisciplinary teams. In A. Thomas and J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology- II.* Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.

Huebner, E.S., Gilman, R., Reschly, A., and Hall, R. (2009a). Positive schools. In C.R. Snyder and S.J. Lopez (Eds.), *Oxford handbook of positive psychology* (2nd Ed.) (pp. 561-569), Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Huebner, E.S., and Hahn, B. (1988). Best practices in coordinating multidisciplinary teams. In A. Thomas and J. Grimes (Eds.)*, Best practices in school psychology- II.* Washington, DC: National Association of School Psychologists.

Huebner, E.S., and Hills, K.J. (in press). Does the positive psychology movement have legs with children in schools. *The Journal of Positive Psychology.*

Jenkins, R.A., (2010). Applied roles and the future of community psychology. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 45,* 68-72.

Mellin, E.A., Bronstein, L.R., Anderson-Butcher, D., Amorose, A., Ball, A., Green, J. H. (in press). Measuring interprofessional collaboration in expanded school mental health: Model refinement and scale development. *Journal of Interprofessional Care.*

Merrell, K.W., and Buchanan, R. (2006). Intervention selection in school-based practice: Using public health models to enhance systems capacity of schools. *School Psychology Review, 35,* 167-180.

Mills, C., Marshburn, S., and Tillar, M. (2009, November). *Connecting students and families to community services: The Community Resource Initiative.* Poster presented at the 14th Annual Conference on Advancing School Mental Health, Minneapolis, MN.

Mills, C., Stephan, S.H., Moore, E., Weist, M.D., Daly, B.P., and Edwards, M. (2006). The President's New Freedom Commission: Capitalizing on opportunities to advance school-based mental health services. *Child and Family Psychology Review, 9,* 149-161.

Nabors, L.A., and Reynolds, M.W. (2000). Program evaluation activities: Outcomes related to treatment for adolescents receiving school-based mental health services. *Children's Services: Social Policy, Research, and Practice, 3,* 175-189.

Nastasi, B.K., and Varjas, K. (2008). Best practices in developing exemplary mental health programs in schools. In A. Thomas and J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology* (pp. 1349-1360). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

National Association of School Psychologists. (2010). *Model for comprehensive and integrated school psychological services.* Bethesda, MD: Author.

Paternite, C.E., Weist, M.D., Axelrod, J., Anderson-Butcher, D., and Weston, K. (2006). School mental health workforce issues. In M. Hoge, J. Morris, A. Daniels, N. Adams, L. Huey, and G. Stuart (Eds.), *A thousand voices: The national action plan on behavioral health workforce development* (pp. 199 – 210). Rockville, MD: U.S. Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration.

President's New Freedom Commission on Mental Health. (2003). *Achieving the Promise: Transforming Mental Health Care in America. Final Report for the President's New Freedom Commission on Mental Health* (SMA Publication No. 03-3832). Rockville, MD: Author.

Rones, M., and Hoagwood, K. (2000). School-based mental health services: A research review. Clinical *Child and Family Psychology Review, 3,* 223-241.

Rowling, L., and Weist, M.D. (2004). Promoting the growth, improvement and sustainability of school mental health programs worldwide. *International Journal of Mental Health Promotion, 6*(2), 3-11.

Sarason, S.B. (1971). *The culture of the school and the problem of change.* Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Sarason, S.B. (1981). *Psychology misdirected.* New York: The Free Press.

Sarason, S.B. (2001). *American psychology and schools: A critique.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Shapiro, E.S. (2006). Are we solving the big problems? *School Psychology Review, 35,* 260-265.

Smith, B., McQuillin, S., and Shapiro, C. (2008). An installation-adaptation-diffusion model of university-school partnerships. *The Community Psychologist, 41*, 42-45.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. (1999). *Mental health: A report of the Surgeon General- Executive Summary.* Rockville, MD: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration, Center for Mental Health Services, National Institute of Health, National Institute of Mental Health.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2001). *Youth Violence: A Report of the Surgeon General.* Rockville, MD: Author.

U.S. Public Health Service. (2000). *Report on the Surgeon General's Conference on Children's Mental Health: A national action agenda.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Stephan, S.H., Davis, E., Burke, P.C., and Weist, M.D. (2006). Supervision in school mental health. In T.K. Neill (Ed.)*, Helping others help children: Clinical supervision of child psychotherapy* (pp. 209-222). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Wandersman, A. (2003). Community science: Bridging the gap between science and practice with community-centered models. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 31*, 227-242.

Weist, M.D. (1997). Expanded school mental health services: A national movement in progress. In T. Ollendick and R.J. Prinz (Eds.). *Advances in Clinical Child Psychology* (Vol. 19, pp. 319-352). New York: Plenum Press.

Weist, M.D. (2010). Editorial. *Advances in School Mental Health Promotion, 3*(2), 2-4.

Weist, M.D., Ambrose, M., and Lewis, C. (2006). Expanded school mental health: A collaborative community/school example. *Children and Schools, 28,* 45-50.

Weist, M.D., Myers, C.P., Hastings, E., Ghuman, H., and Han, Y. (1999). Psychosocial functioning of youth receiving mental health services in the schools vs. community mental health centers. *Community Mental Health Journal, 35,* 69-81.

Ysseldyke, J., Burns, M., Dawson, P., Kelly, B., Morrison, D., Ortiz, S., et al. (2008). The Blueprint for training and practice as the basis for best practices. In A. Thomas and J. Grimes (Eds.), *Best practices in school psychology V* (Vol. 1; pp. 37-70). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.

Zastrow, C. (2010). *Introduction to social work and social welfare: Empowering people.* (10th Ed.). Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole, Cengage Learning.

Zins, J. E., Weissberg, R. P., Wang, M. C., and Walberg, H. J. (Eds.) (2004). *Building academic success on social and emotional learning: What does the research say?* New York: Teachers College Press. ⊕

Student Issues

Edited by Fernando Estrada and Lindsey Zimmerman

2010-2012 National Student Representative Election

Please congratulate Todd Bottom of DePaul University who was elected by the student members of SCRA to serve a two-year term as national student representative. We look forward to his contributions representing student interests within our society. His statement to students follows this announcement.

We also are grateful for Jesica Fernandez and Danielle Kohlfeldt of University of California, Santa Cruz, and Sandra Sorani-Villanueva of University of Illinois-Chicago, the other candidates for student representative, who are already pursuing other ways to contribute to our society as student members. Please contact your national student representatives Lindsey Zimmerman (lindseyzimmerman@gmail.com) or Todd Bottom (tbottom@depaul.edu) to get involved and help keep SCRA moving forward.

Thanks also go to our outgoing representative Fernando Estrada for his excellent service to SCRA from 2008-2010!

Representative Todd Bottom Statement to Students

I am a second year Ph.D. student in DePaul University's Community Psychology program and have been active in SCRA activities since 2007. In 1997, I received my A.A.S. in marketing from Illinois Valley Community College, and in 2006 I returned to school to finish my B.A. in psychology at Lewis University (Romeoville, IL). Initially, my research interests concerned topics in social and cognitive psychology. However, my introduction to community psychology came in 2007 when I began volunteering as a research assistant for Dr. Leonard Jason at DePaul's Center for Community Research (CCR). My volunteer efforts progressed into a part-time paid staff position and for one year I worked on Dr. Jason's Youth Tobacco Access Project, ultimately publishing a peer-reviewed article regarding the perceptions and measurements used to determine youth smoking status. During my time at CCR, I came to appreciate the participatory approaches and multi-level involvement associated with research in community

psychology. For example, I learned the value and effectiveness of improving the quality of people's lives through action research at the community level as opposed to the individual level.

Most of my current research involves studying missions and values at Catholic universities with my advisor Dr. Joseph Ferrari. Our research team recently submitted grant proposals to fund a two-year project that will assess Catholic university students' perceptions of missions and values at three different universities in Illinois and Pennsylvania. I am also interested in studying the long-term and broad effects of divorce, particularly with regard to fathers' experiences. Because little research has been done on this topic, I hope to explore new perspectives and ecological levels from which to approach it within the framework of community psychology principles.

As National Student Representative, I hope to make two important contributions to fellow SCRA student members. First, I encourage graduate students to actively participate in the overall development of undergraduate students who might have difficulty accessing academic resources due to their social or cultural restrictions. For example I'm a first-generation college graduate from a very small town, and my parents never encouraged me to go to college. As such, I understand how difficult the college experience may be for students who don't have close family members to guide them through their college years. To assist others in similar situations, I have tutored undergraduate students with their psychology classes and have participated in discussion panels to speak with students about applying to and attending graduate school. By acting as mentors, we have an opportunity to share knowledge, experiences, and resources that less fortunate students might not otherwise have access to. As a National Student Representative, I hope to provide recognition to SCRA student members who display outstanding qualities in this area. I invite students to contact me with suggestions or to

share their experiences as mentors.

The second contribution that I hope to make is increasing student participation and inclusion at SCRA-sponsored conference events. I plan to arrange networking and social gatherings at events such as the APA, MPA, and EPA conventions, as well as other events that I attend during my term. These gatherings will provide a forum in which student members can meet other students and discuss issues in the field that are important to them. Ideas, resources, and concerns discussed at these informal meetings will provide important feedback that students can publish in The Community Psychologist or raise as discussion topics within their programs. The meetings will also provide an opportunity for me to report students' views and concerns to the SCRA Executive Committee. I also believe that there are many benefits of SCRA membership that many students are not aware of, such as research grants, travel funding awards, and access to the SCRA student list serve which can be a networking and learning tool. Students are welcome to contact me for information on becoming more involved with SCRA activities and resources.

While I enjoy the challenges and opportunities of being a doctoral student and an active participant in community research, the most important and rewarding role I play is father of three wonderful daughters. The oldest will soon be a teenager and already reads more than I do; the one in the middle is nine years old and will be the first woman U.S. president; the small one is seven years old and makes a tasty ham sandwich. During the summer we can be found playing tag at the American Girl Store, skipping down Chicago's Magnificent Mile, or holding up the checkout line at Game Stop as we look for used PlayStation games to buy. In cooler weather we enjoy cooking, hot chocolate, and watching America's Funniest Home Videos. I also have a desire to play the acoustic guitar when I finally have time for lessons.

In the three years that I have worked in community research, I have come to appreciate the tremendous amount of growth it has experienced as well as the opportunities that it presents. I believe that many current students will continue to grow the field with their own interests and convictions, and hope to use the position of National Student Representative as a way of providing those students with an opportunity to have their voices heard. I encourage fellow students to contact me at tbottom@depaul.edu with questions or to share any comments. 🌐

2010 Student Travel Awards to SCRA Programming at ECO or the Biennial

Your Society of Community Research and Action (SCRA) National Student Representatives, with the approval of the Executive Committee, have created more domestic travel awards for students interested in attending the Biennial or one of the regional Ecological Conferences. Congratulations go to Sandra Sorani-Villanueva and Christopher Beasley who were both winners of 2010 SCRA travel awards to attend the American Psychological Association Convention this August in San Diego. A total of 14 additional domestic student travel awards will be given out this year ($300 each; 5 ECO awards, and 9 SCRA Biennial awards). The regional Ecological Conferences will be held around the U.S. in the Fall of 2010 and the Biennial will be held in Chicago in June 2011. SCRA Regional Eco Conferences and the Biennial Conference dates and calls for proposals are posted the website (www.scra27.org) and distributed through the SCRA listserv.

Eligibility and Application Process.

Eligibility for these awards will be limited to current student members of SCRA (both graduate and undergraduate). Applicants are required to submit a 1-2 page proposal. Applications are available at the SCRA website or by emailing student

representative Lindsey Zimmerman at lindseyzimmerman@gmail.com or Todd Bottom at tbottom@depaul.edu. All application materials must be received by 5 pm (US Eastern time) on the due date. ECO applications are due by September 30th and SCRA Biennial applications are due March 30th. 🌐

Call for Proposals!--2010 SCRA Graduate Student Research Grant

Please consider applying for the Graduate Student Research Grant. This grant is specifically devoted to supporting pre-dissertation or thesis research in under-funded areas of community psychology. This year the award amount is $400 (USD). The application will be available at the SCRA website and via listserv announcements. Applications for the award will be due to Todd Bottom at tbottom@depaul.edu by October 31, 2010. If you have any questions while developing your grant proposal, please contact Todd Bottom at tbottom@depaul.edu or Lindsey Zimmerman at lindseyzimmerman@gmail.com. Decisions will be made and recipients notified in November and December 2010. 🌐

The Community Student

Edited by Fernando Estrada and Lindsey Zimmerman

Cultural Competence and the Road Towards a Transformative Experience

Written by Fernando Estrada, M.A.

In our increasingly diverse world, working alongside community members, leaders, and organizations has become central to our work in psychology, most notably for counseling and community psychology. Graduate training programs by and large understand the importance of cultural competency and fostering cultural sensitivity among their students. But why do students in graduate psychology programs find themselves disappointed in their multicultural training? What are our expectations surrounding cultural competence and are faculty falling short of those expectations? More importantly, what can students do to enhance their own cultural competence when institutional support is lacking? This non-exhaustive but no less critical look at these issues aims to provide some clarity, offer some direction, and spark dialogue around the current and future state of cultural competency in our training as psychologists, practitioners, and consultants.

Cultural Competence: An Overview

Cultural competence refers to the awareness we have about our attitudes and biases, the knowledge we posses about culturally different groups, and the skills we hold to effectively work with diverse constituents (Sue, Ivey, and Pederson, 1996). In the most general sense, cultural competence encourages us to develop a professional orientation that maintains a heightened sensitivity towards the socio-cultural, political, and economic realities of other, more disenfranchised groups. They include sexual and ethnic minorities, differently-abled persons as well as linguistically diverse groups. More concretely, cultural competence urges us to adopt a group-level understanding of our practice and utilize culturally relevant, empirically supported interventions.

The tripartite model of cultural competence (Sue, Ivey, and Pederson, 1996) remains in development. Consequently, it is not uncommon

> ***More importantly, what can students do to enhance their own cultural competence when institutional support is lacking?***

to hear a cadre of opinions and see a litany of efforts among faculty and other professionals as to the most effective method to increase cultural competence in graduate students. Nowhere else is this most evident than in the attempts to raise student awareness about cultural and diversity issues. Awareness as it relates to in-group and out-group biases for example, has been posited as central to the effective and equitable delivery of human services (Toporek, Gerstein, Fouad, Roysircar, and Israel, 2006). Yet research shows that educational attempts to establish higher-order awareness of racial, gender, and sexual bias among college students are inconclusive at best (e.g., Henderson-King and Kaleta, 2000).

As one of the central pillars of higher institution, knowledge is arguably the most well understood branch of the tripartite model and in the best position to receive adequate coverage via traditional classroom settings. Ethically speaking, however, we have a professional duty to move beyond simply learning facts and figures of culturally diverse groups (Philogéne, 2004). And what about the skills component of the tripartite model? Easy. Internship placement has that covered. The only problem is that now more than ever students are faced with the growing problem of not finding an internship site—a stark reality recently referred to by the American Psychological Association of Graduate Students (APAGS) as an "internship crisis".

In a recent online survey (July 2010) of SCRA students (N = 31), two-thirds (74%) of the respondents indicated that they either agreed or strongly agreed that cultural competence, as defined by awareness, was being adequately emphasized in their graduate training. In terms of knowledge, a smaller portion (58%)

agreed or strongly agreed with the statement. The lowest rated aspect of cultural competence was the skills component, with 39% of respondents indicating that they only agreed somewhat that it was being adequately emphasized in their training. Still another 32% of respondents disagreed (ranging from somewhat to strongly) with that statement. These (nonscientific) results would suggest that out of the three components of cultural competence, community psychology students would benefit from graduate programs increasing their emphasis on skills training.

Community psychology students strongly value the notion of cultural competency and believe their graduate programs hold a similar view. But according to the survey, SCRA students are less than impressed in terms of the effort put forth by their respective programs toward the acquisition of student cultural competence. The largest proportion of students (39%) described the efforts as "sufficient" rather than "great," while another 32% described those efforts as "minimal."

If we as graduate students are to become culturally competent professionals, we must first become agents of change in our own development. Competence of any kind, in fact, requires nothing less; and so our personal effort, just as that put forth by our training programs, is vital—even when the institutional support afforded to us is optimal and especially when it's less than adequate. In this spirit, and considering the aforementioned, I offer four recommendations.

From Intellectual to Behavioral.

As graduate students, we are skillful in navigating a labyrinth of convoluted postulations. Important as they are, intellectual exercises hold minimal social utility unless paired with action. The role-play,

in this regard, remains one simple and useful method to transform words into actions and trigger the developmental process of culturally competent skills. So, next time you are in class and someone is waxing poetic about the intersections of community psychology, imperialism, and the importance of client advocacy, muster up the courage to say, "Wait! Let's role-play how this might look!" What will ensue is an experiential exercise that will not only help bring to light the elements of an intellectual discussion that are most salient to the lives of those we seek to help, but it will also offer you an opportunity to transform beautifully woven words into a meaningful intervention.

Reinforce the Positive.

In general, people are quicker to rebuke than they are to praise, especially when it concerns professorial efforts in diversity issues. For the culturally inclined student like myself, professors sometimes make it too easy to, as the saying goes, call them out. But as countless studies on behavior have shown, shaping behavior requires emphasizing what others are doing right; what your professors are doing that work for you as a trainee. And as a brief aside, I should remind the reader that cultural competence requires even our most seasoned psychologist to remain life-long learners, thus making our student contributions to faculty development relevant and valuable. I am sure all of us wait with restless impatience to submit the end-of-semester course evaluation to offer that positive reinforcement. But reinforcement in the moment, such as a verbal gesture of gratitude, can be just as effective. Moreover, the immediacy can counter the chronic doubt frequently experienced by proponents of cultural competence who often take risks as they seek new ways to educate their students in institutions with rigid and outdated pedagogical approaches.

Engage the Resistance.

We are all bound to encounter the professor or practitioner bent on funneling disproportionate amounts of efforts on teaching a purely universal approach to counseling or consulting, maybe even publicly discrediting the usefulness of culturally tailored interventions. But as a mentor of mine once said, "Don't resist the resistance, engage it!" Doing so requires taking a position that is diametrically opposed to the resistance already present. Instead, engage them with an open and curious wonder. Make genuine attempts to understand their position. With a little bit of practice (as I acknowledge this might be easier said than done), this approach can effectively disarm all parties and open a line of communication that is less hostile and more conducive to learning the other's world view—a central tenet of cultural competence. Along the way, you might also succeed in planting seeds in the resisting "other" that student cohorts behind you might benefit from.

Start at Square One: Yourself.

It is my belief that the acquisition of cultural competence as a graduate student is all about you—your awareness, your knowledge, and your skills. Accordingly, as we work towards fortifying our culturally competent selves, we must dually work at gaining ownership of it. Demand more experiential exercises in class. Share your praise to those taking risks. Walk towards the resistance and engage it. Strengthen your courage to admit to yourself and to others that in order to successfully have a positive impact as a community psychologist, be it a practitioner, consultant or researcher, you must first equip yourself with an arsenal of higher order awareness, relevant knowledge, and purposeful skills. Only by becoming agents of change in our own education, will we have an honest chance of becoming agents of change for the

groups we continually seek to help.

References

Henderson-King, D., and Kaleta, A. (2000). Learning about social diversity: The

undergraduate experience and intergroup tolerance. The Journal of Higher Education, 71(2), 142-164.

Philogéne, G. (2004). Racial identity and context: The legacy of Kenneth B. Clark. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Sue, D. W., Ivey, A. E., and Pederson, P. B. (1996). A theory of multicultural counseling and therapy. San Francisco, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing.

Toporek, R. L., Gerstein, L. H., Fouad, N. A., Roysircar, G., and Israel, T. (2006). *Handbook for social justice in counseling psychology.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fernando is a doctoral student in counseling psychology at Arizona State University and a former National Student Representative for SCRA. He welcomes your thoughts at fernando.estrada@asu.edu. ⊕

Announcements

Winner of the Best Dissertation on a Topic Relevant to Community Psychology

Examining relations in childhood relational aggression: The role of peer social networks

Jennifer Watling Neal, Ph.D.
University of Illinois at Chicago,
Department of Psychology
2008

Abstract:

Although relational aggression is defined as an attempt to harm others through the manipulation of social relationships, few studies have explored the role of peer social networks in the use of these behaviors by children and adolescents. The current study adopted a structural approach to the study of relational aggression among urban, elementary school students. A subset of 99 students with parental consent and seven teachers provided behavioral and social network data on 144 demographically diverse third through eighth grade students at one urban Midwestern elementary school. Descriptive findings revealed demographic differences in features of children's grade-level peer networks. Although girls had smaller grade-level networks than boys, a significant grade by sex interaction revealed that these sex differences attenuated as children grew older. There was also a significant quadratic relationship between grade and ego network density for third through seventh grade students, suggesting evidence of a "degrouping process" in early adolescence. As hypothesized, features of individuals' grade-level peer social networks influenced levels of teacher-rated and peer-nominated relational aggression above and beyond demographic characteristics (e.g., sex, grade, and race). Results revealed that ego network density had a significant positive effect on teacher-rated relational aggression. Moreover, network size had a significant quadratic effect on peer-nominated relational aggression. These findings reveal that relational aggression is influenced not only by who children are, but also by where they are located in their peer social networks. Implications for future research and intervention are offered. ⊕

Winner of the Emory L. Cowen Dissertation Award for the Promotion of Wellness

Family Processes Promoting Achievement Motivation and Perceived School Competence among Latino Youth: A Cultural Ecological-Transactional Perspective

Natalie J. Wilkins
Georgia State University,
Department of Psychology
2009

Abstract:

This longitudinal study uses a cultural ecological-transactional perspective (Garcia-Coll, et. al., 1996; Kuperminc, et al., in press) to examine whether relational factors (familism and parental involvement) predict processes of motivation and achievement one year later among 199 Latino adolescents from immigrant families. Parent involvement predicted higher present-oriented and future-oriented motivation, and familism predicted higher present-oriented motivation. Future-oriented motivation predicted higher perceived school competence, while present-oriented motivation predicted lower perceived school competence. Both future and present-oriented motivation increased over time for recent immigrants significantly more than for US-reared youth. Findings suggest that

1) familism and parent involvement relate significantly to processes of achievement motivation among Latino youth; 2) future-oriented and present-oriented motivation are distinct from one another and are linked to perceived school competence in unique, and inverse ways among Latino youth; and 3) immigration age plays an important role in the motivational processes of Latino youth over time. ⊕

Submit your dissertation for a SCRA Dissertation award

Is it possible that you just happened to write one of the most relevant dissertations in the field of community psychology and/or wellness in the last 2 years????

Well…YES! It is possible!

But – you will never know if you don't try.

We are currently accepting nominations for two dissertation awards.

DEADLINE FOR NOMINATIONS: December 1, 2010

Best Dissertation on a Topic Relevant to Community Psychology:

The purpose of the Society for Community Research and Action annual dissertation award is to identify the best doctoral dissertation on a topic relevant to the field of community psychology completed between **September 1, 2008 and August 31, 2010** — any dissertation completed within these dates may be submitted. The completion date for the dissertation refers to the date of acceptance of the dissertation by the granting university's designate officer (e.g., the graduate officer), not the graduation date. Last year's nominees (excluding the winner) may resubmit dissertations if the dates are still within the specified timeframe.

Criteria for the award:

Relevance of the study to community psychology, with particular emphasis on important and emerging trends in the field; scholarly excellence; innovation and implications for theory, research and action; and methodological appropriateness.

Emory L. Cowen Dissertation Award for the Promotion of Wellness:

This award will honor the best dissertation of the year in the area of promotion of wellness. Wellness is defined consistent with the conceptualization developed by Emory Cowen, to include the promotion of positive well-being and the prevention of dysfunction. Dissertations are considered eligible that deal with a range of topics relevant to the promotion of wellness, including: a) promoting positive attachments between infant and parent, b) development of age appropriate cognitive and interpersonal competencies, c) developing settings such as families and schools that favor wellness outcomes, d) having the empowering sense of being in control of one's fate, and e) coping effectively with stress. The dissertation must be completed between **September 1, 2008 and August 31, 2010** — any dissertation completed within these dates may be submitted.

Criteria for the award:

Dissertations of high scholarly excellence that contribute to knowledge about theoretical issues or interventions are eligible for this award.

For Both Dissertation Awards:

The winners of both dissertation awards will each receive a prize of $100, a one year complimentary membership in SCRA, and up to $300 in reimbursement for travel expenses in order to receive the award at the APA meeting in 2011.

Materials required:

Individuals may nominate themselves or be nominated by a member of SCRA. A cover letter and a detailed dissertation abstract should be submitted electronically to the Chair of the Dissertation Awards Committee. The nomination cover letter should include the name, graduate school affiliation and thesis advisor, current address, phone number, and (if available) email address and fax number of the nominee. The abstract should present a statement of the problem, methods, findings, and conclusions. Abstracts typically range from 4-8 pages and may not exceed ten double spaced pages, including tables and figures. Identifying information should be omitted from the abstract.

Evaluation process:

All abstracts will be reviewed by the dissertation award committee. Finalists will be selected and asked to submit their full dissertation electronically (finalists whose dissertations exceed 150 pages may be asked to send selected chapters). The committee will then review the full dissertations and select the winners.

Nomination Process and Deadline for Submission:

Submit an electronic copy of the cover letter and dissertation abstract to the Chair of the Dissertation Awards Committee, Jennifer Watling Neal, by **December 1, 2010** at jneal@msu.edu. ⊕

SCRA Award Nominations 2010-2011

DEADLINE FOR ALL AWARD NOMINATIONS:
December 1, 2010

Award for Distinguished Contributions to Theory and Research in Community Psychology

The Award for Distinguished Contribution to Theory and Research in Community Psychology is presented annually to an individual whose career of high quality and innovative research and scholarship has resulted in a significant contribution to the body of knowledge in Community Psychology. This award was initiated in 1974.

Criteria for the awards shall include:

1. Demonstrated positive impact on the quality of community theory and research;

2. Innovation in community theory and/or research. That is, scholarship of a path-breaking quality that introduces important new ideas and new findings. Such distinguished work often challenges prevailing conceptual frameworks, research approaches, and/ or empirical results; and

3. A major single contribution or series of significant contributions with an enduring influence on community theory, research and/or action over time.

Initial nominations should be sent to Pat O'Connor at oconnp@sage.edu by **December 1, 2010** and include:

1. The name and contact information of the nominee; and

2. A 250-500 word summary of the rationale for nomination.

Finalists for the award will be contacted by the committee and asked to provide more information.

Past recipients are:

2009 Marc Zimmerman

2008 Christopher Keys

2007 William Davidson

2006 Kenneth Maton

2005 Abe Wandersmann

2004 Roger Weissberg

2003 Lonnie Snowden

2002 Ana Marie Cauce

2001 Rhona Weinstein

2000 Stephanie Riger

1999 Irwin Sandler

1998 Dickon Reppucci

1997 Leonard Jason

1996 Marybeth Shinn

1995 Ed Trickett

1994 John Newbrough

1993 William Ryan

1992 Irwin Altman

1991 Kenneth Heller

1990 Edward Seidman

1989 Edward Zigler

1988 Richard Price

1987 Murray Levine

1986 Julian Rappaport

1985 George Fairweather

1984 George Spivack and Myrna Shure

1983 Rudolf Moos

1982 Charles Spielberger

1981 George Albee

1980 Barbara and Bruce Dohrenwend

1979 Emory Cowen

1978 James Kelly

1977 Bernard Bloom

1976 Ira Iscoe

1975 John Glidewell

1974 Seymour Sarason. 🌐

Award for Distinguished Contribution to Practice in Community Psychology

The Award for Distinguished Contributions to Practice in Community Psychology is presented annually to an individual whose career of high quality and innovative applications of psychological principles has demonstrated positive impact on, or significant illumination of the ecology of, communities or community settings, and has significantly benefited the practice of community psychology. The person receiving this award will have demonstrated innovation and leadership in one or more of the following roles: community service provider or manager/ administrator of service programs; trainer or manager of training programs for service providers; developer and/or implementer of public policy; developer and/or implementer of interventions in the media (including cyberspace) to promote community psychology goals and priorities; developer, implementer, and/or evaluator of ongoing preventive/ service programs in community settings; or other innovative roles.

Criteria for the award include the following.

The first criterion applies in all cases; one or more of the remaining criteria must be present:

1. Engaged at least 75% time, for a minimum of 10 years, in settings such as government, business or industry, community or human service programs, in the practice of high quality and innovative applications of psychological principles that have significantly benefited the practice of community psychology; past winners cannot be nominated;

2. Demonstrated positive impact on the natural ecology of community life resulting from the application of

psychological principles;

3. Challenged the status quo or prevailing conceptual models and applied methods; and

4. Demonstrated personal success in exercising leadership based on applied practice.

Initial nominations should be sent to Pat O'Connor at oconnp@sage.edu by **December 1, 2010** and include:

1. The name and contact information of the nominee;

2. A 250-500 word summary of the rationale for nomination; and

3. A statement, which can be from the nominee, that documents clearly and specifically his or her eligibility for this award by describing how he or she "engaged at least 75% time, for a minimum of 10 years, in settings such as government, business or industry, community or human service programs, in the practice of high quality and innovative applications of psychological principles that have significantly benefited the practice of community psychology." This statement can consist of a brief list of the years, the settings, and the activities, but it should be sufficiently detailed so that there is no doubt about the eligibility.

Finalists for the award will be contacted by the committee and asked to provide more information.

Past recipients are:

2009 Andrea Solarz

2008 Richard Jenkins

2007 Jerry Shultz

2006 Adrienne Paine Andrews

2005 Peter Dowrick

2004 David Julian

2003 Jose Toro-Alfonso

2002 Debi Starnes

2001 Ed Madara

2000 Will Edgerton

1999 Thomas Gullotta

1998 Vivian Barnett-Brown

1997 Steve Fawcett

1996 Joe Galano

1995 Bill Berkowitz

1994 Gloria Levin

1993 Maurice Elias

1992 David Chavis

1991 Beverly Long

1990 John Morgan

1989 Frank Reissman

1988 Betty Tableman

1987 Donald Klein

1986 Anthony Broskowski

1985 Thomas Wolff

1984 Carolyn Swift

1983 Saul Cooper. ⊕

The Ethnic Minority Mentorship Award

The purpose of SCRA's annual Ethnic Minority Mentorship Award is to recognize an SCRA member who has made exemplary contributions to the mentorship of ethnic minority persons. Mentorship may be provided in various forms. It may entail serving as the academic advisor of ethnic minority graduate or undergraduate students; developing strategies to increase the acceptance and retention of ethnic minority students; involvement in efforts to recruit and retain ethnic minority faculty members; or providing opportunities for ethnic minority persons to become involved in positions of leadership within community-oriented research or intervention projects.

Specific criteria for the award include two or more of the following:

1. Consistent, high quality mentorship and contributions to the professional development of one or more ethnic minority students and/or recent graduates involved in community research and action;

2. Contribution to fostering a climate in their setting that is supportive of issues relevant to racial/ethnic diversity and conducive to the growth of ethnic minority students and/or beginning level graduates;

3. A history of involvement in efforts to increase the representation of ethnic minority persons either in their own institutions, research programs, or within SCRA; and

4. Consistent contributions to the structure and process of training in psychology related to cultural diversity, particularly in community programs.

Nomination Process:

Both self-nominations and nominations by students or colleagues will be accepted. Those submitting nominations should send:

1) A nomination letter (no more than 3 pages long) summarizing the contributions of the nominee to the mentorship of ethnic minority persons;

2) Name and contact information (address, telephone, email) of at least one additional reference (two if a self-nomination) who can speak to the contributions the nominee has made to the mentorship of ethnic minority persons (see above criteria)-- at least one reference must be from an ethnic minority person who was mentored; and

3) A curriculum vita of the nominee. Collaborative work with ethnic minority mentees, as well as other activities or publications relevant to the criteria indicated above, should be highlighted.

Please submit nominations by **December 1, 2010** to Rhonda Lewis-Moss at Rhonda.lewis@wichita.edu, or to Department of Psychology, 1845 N. Fairmont, Wichita, KS 67260-0034. Submissions by email would be especially appreciated.

Past recipients are:

2009 Meg Bond

2008 Stephen Fawcett

*2007 Craig Brookins,
     Hirokazu Yoshikawa*

2006 Robert Sellers

2005 Yolanda Balcazar

2004 Mark Roosa

2003 William Davidson II

2002 Shelley Harrell

2001 Ed Seidman

2000 Gary Harper

1999 Isaiah Crawford

*1998 Maurice Elias;
     Ricardo Munoz*

1997 Beth Shinn

1996 Melvin Wilson

1995 Irma Serrano-Garcia

1994 Oscar Barbarin

1993 Hector Meyers

1992 Forest Tyler

*1991 Leonard Jason;
     Stanley Sue.* 🌐

Award for Special Contributions to Public Policy

The purpose of SCRA's Award for Special Contributions to Public Policy is to recognize individuals or organizations that have made exemplary contributions in the public policy arena. Those whose work contributes to public policy, whether from community agencies, academia, or non-government agencies, both national and international, are eligible for consideration. Priority will be given to a living member of SCRA, an allied discipline, or an organization involving individuals who have made important contributions to public policy, broadly defined.

Nomination Process:

Both self-nominations and nominations by students or colleagues will be accepted. Those submitting nominations should send:

- For an individual: CV or resume (full or abbreviated), statement (maximum of four pages) regarding major social policy contributions of the individual, and up to three letters of support.

- For an organization: CV or resume for organization head or key individual, organization description/mission statement, statement (maximum of four pages) regarding major social policy contributions of the organization, and up to three letters of support.

Please send nominations by **December 1, 2010** to Chair of the Social Policy Committee: Nicole Porter, nporter@depaul.edu, or to Center for Community Research, 990 W. Fullerton, Suite 3100, Chicago, IL 60614. Submissions by email would be especially appreciated.

Past Recipients:

2009 Steven Howe

2007 Leonard Jason. 🌐

Outstanding Educator Award and the Excellence in Education Programs Award

These two awards are sponsored by the SCRA Council of Education Programs (CEP).

Criteria for these awards include two or more of the following:

1. Promotion of innovative strategies in education that integrate community psychology theory and action;

2. Significant contributions to the structure and process of education in community psychology, research, and action;

3. Consistent, high quality teaching and mentorship contributing to the professional development of students and/or recent graduates involved in community research and action; and

4. Contribution to fostering a positive climate that supports undergraduate and graduate students in their setting.

Collaborative work with students, activities, publications, and curricula relevant to the criteria indicated above, should be highlighted. ⊕

Outstanding Educator Award.

The purpose of this annual Award is to recognize a SCRA member who has made exemplary and innovative contributions to the education of students about community psychology and community research and action.

Nomination Process:

Both self-nominations and nominations by students or colleagues will be accepted. Those submitting nominations should send:

1. A nomination letter (no more than 3 pages long)

summarizing the innovative educational strategies promoted by the nominee, and how they contribute to the education of community psychologists and the development of the field of community research and action (and speak to the criteria listed above);

2. One letter of reference (2 letters if the nomination is a self-nomination);

3. Course evaluations and other types of evaluations from students/recent grads; and

4. A curriculum vita of the nominee.

Past Recipients:

2009 Sylvie Taylor

2008 Marek Wosinski

2007 Patricia O'Connor

Excellence in Education Programs Award.

The purpose of this biannual Award is to recognize an exemplary undergraduate and/or graduate program that has innovative structures, strategies, and curricula that promote development of the field of community psychology and community research and action.

Nomination Process:

Both self-nominations and nominations by individuals or organizations outside the program will be accepted. Those submitting nominations should send:

1. A nomination letter (no more than 4 pages long) should describe the basis of the recommendation and summarize the features of the program that would qualify it for the award (in relation to criteria specified above). The nomination letter should also

include a listing of the program faculty and other resources (e.g., community-based organizations, community expertise), relevant publications, and the ways in which they contribute to the education of undergraduate and/or graduate students; and

2. One letter of reference (2 letters if the nomination is a self-nomination). Reference letters should come from individuals outside the program, and may include representatives of community agencies/organizations with whom the program is associated, graduates of the program (out for at least 3 years), or colleagues in other programs in the college/university or outside the college/university.

Past Recipient:

2007 DePaul University

Please send nominations for both awards by **December 1, 2010** to: Bret Kloos, Ph.D., Department of Psychology, University of South Carolina or email kloos@sc.edu. ⊕

John Kalafat Award

John Kalafat's life work integrated the principles and research of community psychology with their practical applications. John left a rich legacy in the published literature and in the many communities he helped strengthen. To continue his vision, two annual awards have been created in his honor.

The Community Program Award

This award will honor programs or initiatives that demonstrate a positive impact on groups or communities as validated by program evaluation; build foundational bridges between theory, research, and improving the world, and/or demonstrate excellence in integrating training and program development in crisis intervention.

*2009 Screening for Mental Health, Inc
SOS Signs of Suicide
Prevention Program*

The Practitioner Award

This award will be a monetary stipend to an individual who exemplifies John's unique characteristics as mentor, teacher, and advocate, and especially his passion in making the benefits of community psychology accessible to all.

2009 Bill Berkowitz

To make a nomination, e-mail kalafataward@scra27.org by **December 1, 2010.**

More at www.johnkalafat.com. 🌐

NOW IS THE TIME TO NOMINATE SCRA FELLOWS!!

**DEADLINE FOR NOMINATIONS:
December 1, 2010**

What is a SCRA Fellow? SCRA seeks to recognize a variety of exceptional contributions that significantly advance the field of community research and action including, but not limited to, theory development, research, evaluation, teaching, intervention, policy development and implementation, advocacy, consultation, program development, administration and service. A SCRA Fellow is someone who provides evidence of "unusual and outstanding contributions or performance in community research and action." Fellows show evidence of

(a) sustained productivity in community research and action over a period of a minimum of five years; (b) distinctive contributions to knowledge and/or practice in community psychology that are recognized by others as excellent; and (c) impact beyond the immediate setting in which the Fellow works.

Applications for Initial Fellow status must include the following materials:

1. A 2-page Uniform Fellow Application (available from Anne Bogat--see email and address at end of section) completed by the nominee;

2. 3 to 6 endorsement letters written by current Fellows,

3. Supporting materials, including a vita with refereed publications marked with an "R," and

4. A nominee's self-statement setting forth her/his accomplishments that warrant nomination to Fellow Status.

SCRA members who are Fellows of other APA divisions should also apply for SCRA Fellow status if they have made outstanding contributions to community research and action. Fellows of other APA divisions should send to the Chair of the Fellows Committee a statement detailing their contributions to community research and action, 3-6 letters of support, and a vita.

Nomination Process:

Complete nominations should be submitted by **December 1, 2010** to Maurice Elias email: rutgersmje@aol.com, or to U.S. mailing address: Rutgers University, Tillet Hall, Room 405, 53 Avenue, Livingston Campus, Piscataway, NJ 08854-8040. 🌐

Society for Community Research & Action
Membership Application

Membership Contact Information:

First Name: _____   Last Name: _____

Address line 1: _____

Address line 2: _____

Address line 3: _____

City, State, Postal Code: _____   Country: _____

Telephone: _____   Email: _____

Academic or Institutional Affiliation: _____

Primary Job Title: _____

Secondary Job Title: _____

*** Please complete the following information ***

APA Membership Status: _____ Not an APA member

_____ Fellow   _____ Member   _____ Associate   _____ Student   _____ Lifetime Member

APA Member Number (if known): _____

Please indicate any Interest Groups or Committees you would like to join:

_____ Aging
_____ Children & Youth
_____ Community Action
_____ Community Health
_____ Cultural & Racial Affairs Committee
_____ Disabilities
_____ Interdisciplinary Committee
_____ International Committee
_____ Lesbian/Gay/Bisexual/Transgender Concerns
_____ Councile of Education Programs

_____ Organization Studies
_____ Prevention & Promotion
_____ Rural
_____ School Intervention
_____ Self-Help & Mutual Support
_____ Social Policy Committee
_____ Environmental Justice
_____ Women's Committee
_____ Indigenous
_____ Council for Community Psychology Practice

May we include your name and contact information in the SCRA Directory? _____ Yes _____ No

The following questions are <u>OPTIONAL</u>; however, this information helps us better serve our members.

Sex: ___ Female ___ Male

Race/Ethnicity (check all that apply)

_____ Native American, Alaskan Native or Native Hawaiian
_____ Asian or Pacific Islander
_____ Black/African American

_____ Hispanic/Latino
_____ White/Caucasian
_____ Other: _____

Do you wish us to indicate in the database that you identify with a sexual minority group (e.g., lesbian/gay/bisexual/transgender)? _____ Yes _____ No

Do you wish us to indicate in the database that you are a person with a disability? _____ Yes _____ No

What year did you graduate? _____

Membership dues enclosed (please write in amount):

United States Member	$ 75.00	$ _____ . _____
Student Member	30.00	_____ . _____
International Member	60.00	_____ . _____
Senior Member—must be 65 or over, retired, and a member of SCRA/Div 27 for 20 years Are you retired? __ Yes __ No What year were you born? _____ What year did you join SCRA? _____	15.00	_____ . _____
Please consider supporting the following SCRA Initiatives by contributing to the following funds	Please Consider Giving	
SCRA Student Initiatives Fund: Your contribution will help support student initiatives, e.g., conference travel awards, poster presentation awards, and the mentoring initiative. If most members gave $10, this fund would gain $10,000 for student initiatives this year.	5.00 (10.00) 15.00	_____ . _____
SCRA International Travel Grants Fund: Your contribution will help bring international members to the Biennial Conferences. If most members gave $10, this fund would gain $10,000 to support international travel to future Biennials.	5.00 10.00 15.00	_____ . _____
TOTAL	$ _____ . _____	

Payment by:

☐ Enclosed check (made out in United States dollars, paid to the order of SCRA)

☐ Charge to my credit card: ____ Visa ____ MasterCard

Name on Card: _____

Billing Address: _____

City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____

Security Code: _____

Authorized Signature: _____

Expiration Date: _____ / _____
                  month / year

Please send form and credit card payment information or check to:
SCRA (Div 27), 4440 PGA Blvd #600, Palm Beach Gardens, FL 33410.
Name on Card
Annual membership is based on a calendar year, January 1st through December 31st.
One year's dues are payable in full with application.
Those joining in November or December will be extended through December 31 of the following year.

Thank you for your support of the
Society for Community Research & Action

A PUBLICATION OF THE SOCIETY FOR COMMUNITY RESEARCH AND ACTION