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Editor's Column

By Paul A. Toro, Wayne State University, Detroit, Michigan

The First "Community Practitioner" and Other Features of this Issue

This issue of TCP includes the first edition of the "Community Practitioner," which we are planning as a twice per year feature. For this first edition, Editor David Julian has identified three interesting papers. We are excited about the prospect of this regular publication outlet for community psychologists and others working in applied settings. David is looking to identify more papers for future editions of the "Community Practitioner" (see his description and "Call for Papers" later in this issue). The next edition is scheduled to appear in the Fall 2002 issue of TCP.

We also have a number of other interesting items in this Winter 2002 issue of TCP. We have a substantial line-up of regular columns. The Public Policy column includes a thoughtful piece by Seven Howe on changes in the Medicaid system. We have a substantial line-up of book reviews and a "reflection" on the recent Inter-American Congress of Psychology that took place in Chile (by Mark Borg).

"Special Features "in the Pipeline"

Jack Tebes is currently completing the review of a set of papers for a Special Feature on "systems change" that will appear in the Spring issue of TCP. Jim Cook and others are working on another Special Feature on "clinical-community psychology" that is planned for the Summer issue. Both of these Special Features were stimulated by Abe Wandersman (see his President's Column in the Fall 2001 TCP). Other Special Features "in the works" include an issue on HIV/AIDS (with a focus on Asia and Asian-Americans), one on Racial and Minority issues, and one on training issues. Please let me know if you have any ideas for additional Special Features for future issues of TCP. We are also planning to produce a new Membership Directory issue of TCP. This will be a "stand alone" fifth issue of TCP and we hope to have it ready by the end of this coming summer.

"Trials and Tribulations"

My initiation to the job as TCP Editor was not entirely smooth. I expected that I would need to devote lots of time to the position (especially around deadline times), develop working relationships with my editorial staff (two Associate Editors and a Production Editor), and identify and begin working with the various Column Editors and other contributors to TCP. The main unexpected problems involved the switch to producing TCP in a "camera-ready" format using the PageMaker publishing program (my predecessors handled the production of TCP in "the old-fashioned" way by creating hard copy that the printer would then "photograph" and print). It has taken my Production Editor and I considerable time to master PageMaker (not the most "user friendly" of programs). Largely because of these problems, the Fall issue of TCP was seriously delayed (most members didn’t get it until late in the winter of 2002). Now that my Production Editor is facile with PageMaker, I’m expecting we’ll be able to get TCP out in a more timely fashion. I apologize for this delay and hope that we will get your TCPs to you in a more timely fashion, beginning with the Spring issue (the present issue will likely arrive in your mailboxes somewhat late).

Enhancing the Appearance of TCP

With the flexibility that PageMaker allows, we have begun to include some photos and other interesting graphics in TCP. We would like to do much more of this in the future. In order to accomplish this, I would like to ask all persons submitting material for publication in TCP in the future to try to also include digital photos or graphics along with their pieces. Such photos/o graphics might be especially relevant for material that is part of Special Features. Please help me in my efforts to make TCP more "visually appealing."

SCRA WEB PAGE

http://www.apa.org/divisions

The SCRA Listserv enables SCRA members and others to engage in stimulating discussions. It also provides access to job postings, grant opportunities, and information about SCRA events. To subscribe, send your e-mail to: Listserv@Listserve.UIC.EDU. Leave the subject area blank, and in your message area type: Subscribe SCRA-L <yourfirstname> <yourlastname>.

The SCRA Women’s Listserv enables SCRA members and others to access the best source of information and comment relative to women in SCRA. It is also the main source of communication about issues relating to the SCRA Committee on Women. To subscribe, send your e-mail to: Listserv@Listserve.UIC.EDU. Leave the subject area blank, and in your message area type: SUBSCRIBE SCRA-W <yourfirstname> <yourlastname>.

The SCRA Student Listserv is student initiated, run and maintained. Steve Russo, from the University of Kansas deserves credit for the listserv’s audacious start. The SCRA Student Listserv also has "social coordinators," who will implement special events on the listserv, like having a "guest of the month," to elicit Q&A, etc. To subscribe, send your e-mail to: listproc@ukans.edu Leave the subject area blank, and in your message area type: SUBSCRIBE S-SCRA-L <yourfirstname>
President's Column

Where the Research, Action and Funding Are: National and State Initiatives That Focus on the Community

By Abraham Wandersman

The attention being paid to communities by funders of education, public health and social service interventions is enormous. The need for community research and action has never been greater. I doubt that the funding for community-based initiatives for health (medical and mental) has ever been greater. Therefore, community psychology should be growing by leaps and bounds. This column is both a point of information and a call for membership recruitment. In this column, there are two examples of large community-based initiatives: one is a national initiative from the United Kingdom and the other is a state initiative in Kentucky (written by Knowlton Johnson). Knowlton Johnson, of the Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation, provides a brief description of applied research and evaluation. This material complements the "Community Practitioner" that is a special feature in this issue of TCP (edited by David Julian). These sections are followed by a message about membership recruitment.

Developing Community-Based Early Childhood Programs: A National Initiative

In January, I attended an international meeting on developing comprehensive Community-Based Early Childhood Initiatives held in Los Angeles. The meeting examined innovative state and national early childhood initiatives in the U.S., Canada, England and Australia. A major goal of the meeting was to have an evidence-based exchange of information about the development and implementation of early childhood systemic reform initiatives. Topics covered included strategic planning and the development of results accountability frameworks, financing issues, and approaches to evaluation and program improvement.

The meeting was jointly sponsored by the UCLA Center for Healthier Children, Families and Communities, the I Am Your Child Foundation (founded by Rob Reiner), and the National Center for Children in Poverty. It was funded by the Commonwealth Fund, the Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality, the Maternal and Child Health Bureau, the Hewlett Foundation, and two California agencies. The funding sources are noteworthy because they indicate the variety and wealth of interest.

Sure Start: A National Neighborhood-Based Initiative in the United Kingdom

Sure Start aims to improve the health and well-being of families and children before and from birth, so children are ready to flourish when they go to school. It does this by: a) setting up local Sure Start programmes to improve services for families with children under four, b) spreading good practice learned from local programmes to everyone involved in providing services for young children.

Sure Start is a cornerstone of the Government's drive to tackle child poverty and social exclusion. It is based on firm evidence of what works. By 2004, there will be at least 500 Sure Start local programmes. They will be concentrated in neighbourhoods where a high proportion of children are living in poverty and where Sure Start can help them to succeed by pioneering new ways of working to improve services in the areas of Family support, Advice on nurturing, Health services, Early learning.

To work with parents-to-be, parents and children to promote the physical, intellectual and social development of babies and young children - particularly those who are disadvantaged - so that they can flourish at home and when they get to school, and thereby break the cycle of disadvantage for the current generation of young children.

Objective 1: Improving social and emotional development. In particular, by supporting early bonding between parents and their children, helping families to function and by enabling the early identification and support of children with emotional and behavioural difficulties.

Objective 2: Improving health. In particular, by supporting parents in caring for their children to promote healthy development before and after birth. Parenting support and information to be available for all parents in Sure Start areas. All local programmes give guidance on breast feeding, hygiene and safety.

Objective 3: Improving children's ability to learn. In particular, by encouraging high quality environments and childcare that promote early learning, provide stimulating and enjoyable play, improve language skills and ensure early identification and support of children with special needs. All children in Sure Start areas to have access to good quality play and learning opportunities, helping progress towards early learning goals when they get to school. Increased use of libraries by families with young children in Sure Start areas.

Objective 4: Strengthening families and communities. In particular, by involving families in building the community's capacity to sustain the programme and thereby create pathways out of poverty. All Sure Start programmes to have parent representation on the local programme board. All Sure Start programmes to have developed local targets for ensuring links between the local Sure Start partnership and Employment Service Jobcentres.

Core services and key principles. The design and content of local Sure Start programmes will vary according to local needs. But we expect all programmes to include a number of core services: outreach and home visiting, support for families and parents, support for good quality play, learning and childcare experiences for children, primary and community health care, including advice about family health and child health and development, and support for children and parents with special needs, including help getting access to specialised services.

Key principles. To ensure a consistent approach, we expect every programme to work from a shared set of key principles. Sure Start services must co-ordinate, streamline and add value to existing services in the Sure Start area; involve parents, grandparents and other carers in ways that build on their existing strengths; avoid stigma by ensuring that all local families are able to use Sure Start services; ensure lasting support by linking Sure Start to services for older children; be culturally appropriate and sensitive to particular needs; and promote the participation of all local families in the design and working of the programme. (The above was excerpted from Sure Start materials.)

Using Evaluation to Change a State-level Substance Abuse Prevention System (by Knowlton Johnson, Pacific Institute for Research and Evaluation, Louisville)

A recent state and community-level systems change initiative, the
Kentucky Incentive for Prevention (KIP) project, provides a textbook case study of evaluation results in action. Evaluation can occur in many ways, including getting potential users to simply think about issues or using results to legitimize or justify decisions made before the results are produced. Sometimes results are also helpful in debates. Instrumental use is the ultimate type of use of results. This type of use occurs when results are linked to decisions about organizational policy, procedures, structure, and practice.

A large-scale evaluation of the KIP project was conducted with funding by the Center for Substance Abuse Prevention under its State Incentive Grant program and the Kentucky Division of Substance Abuse. The evaluation focused on the extent to which KIP strengthened the state-level Youth Substance Abuse Prevention System (YSAPS) in Kentucky by increasing (1) readiness of key stakeholders to change the system, (2) collaborative behavior among key stakeholders in the system, and (3) interagency collaboration and infrastructure development to support the system.

A process evaluation provided results throughout the project to make intervention-related changes. KIP project staff reported use of process evaluation results to make important modifications in the implementation of the KIP project, including making changes in infrastructure, comprehensive planning, and training and technical guidance.

A multi-faceted outcome evaluation using quasi-experimental methods produced results showing that the KIP project did, in fact, strengthen the state-level YSAPS in Kentucky. These results have been used to increase awareness of KIP’s impact on the substance abuse prevention system at the state level, to justify future funding of the KIP infrastructure, and to enhance political and tactical debates.

Membership

In community psychology, there is a growing knowledge base on communities and neighborhoods, on community coalitions, on citizen participation and empowerment and other substantive areas related to the types of initiatives discussed above. Why aren’t more community psychologists involved in these types of initiatives?

While the participants in the international meeting were varied in background (including pediatricians, sociologists, psychologists, and lawyers), most of the participants were psychologists and pediatricians. Why aren’t more of the psychologists members of SCRA?

Our membership numbers are declining. The decline began prior to our switch in membership services from APA to a membership services firm. Why are they declining. What can we do about it? The SCRA executive committee is developing a new membership committee, chaired by Jack Tebes (member at large). The committee will be working on ideas for recruiting and retaining members. However, this is a challenge that involves every one of us. I urge you to recruit members yourself and to pass good ideas on to Jack and his committee. There will be more information about this committee in the next TCP.

What can students do about it? In addition to above, I would like to encourage you to use your knowledge about behavior change, community development etc. and apply it for the good of the Society. For example, are there possibilities for a masters thesis to increase membership using behavioral community psychology?

To all members of SCRA, I ask you to think about SCRA as a community. Please use community development theory and research to increase our membership and the vitality and contributions of community psychology.
to a process of mentoring with someone rather than for someone; specifically, “musing is a process that focuses on inspiring and encouraging” (p. 36). While the column can hardly replace the personal and organic relationships that develop between women, we hope you will use this column to share your insights, successes and stories to reach out more broadly and support the work of women in the field of community psychology. This is important given that many of us work in isolation from other women in community psychology and do not have daily opportunities to interact. So, feel free to share your wisdom and experience. This request is directed to all women at all stages of their careers (students, assistant professors, senior research associates, etc.) and in all settings (e.g., applied, academic).

We want to finish this introductory column by introducing ourselves:

**Nicole Allen** - I am currently an assistant professor at the University of Illinois Urbana Champaign in the Clinical Community Division of the Department of Psychology. I graduated from Michigan State University in May 2001 with a degree in Ecological Community Psychology. My current research focuses on two areas: multiple stakeholder collaboration and the coordinated community response to intimate partner violence against women. I am interested in examining the processes that contribute to the effectiveness of collaborative endeavors, particularly with regard to how diverse stakeholders overcome power differences (to avoid cooption in the collaborative process) and divergent viewpoints to promote social change in their communities. In addition, I am interested in understanding survivors’ lived realities of coordinated community response efforts and how these efforts contribute to and/or diminish their safety and well-being over time.

I look forward to co-editing the Women’s Column with Christina Ayala-Alcantar. First, I am thrilled to have the opportunity to collaborate with Christina—a wonderful friend and colleague with whom I have a long history of processing ideas and exploring the complexities of gender, race, power and social change. Second, I am committed to holding a space for women in community psychology—and all community psychologists exploring the lives of women—to share their insights, experiences, scholarship and action. I hope this column continues to be a forum and container for the exploration of ideas—even those that are still in process. Finally, I hope editing this column and hearing from all of you will be a way to meet a broad array of scholars and activists within this field. Please be in touch with your ideas. I look forward to learning from you.

**Christina Ayala-Alcantar** - If it were not for Dr. Maxine Baca Zinn (a Chicana sociologist) at Michigan State University, I’m not sure I would identify as a feminist. During my last semester of graduate school I took a course entitled “Gender and Power” which was taught by Maxine. This class transformed my entire life because it exposed me to multiracial feminism. This framework challenged my thinking skills. My research interests are Latinas and reproductive health, multiracial feminism, and mentorship among students of color.

I am thrilled to be working with Nicole again and look forward to co-editing the column with her. I am most excited about the opportunity to process and share ideas with women in community psychology. We welcome entries from all community psychologists who are addressing the themes we put forth and are also open to your suggestions if there is something you would like to share that does not fit neatly within these themes. For more information, please email Christina Ayala-Alcantar at christina.ayala-alcantar@csun.edu or Nicole Allen at allenne@uiuc.edu. We look forward to hearing from you.

**Christina Ayala-Alcantar, Ph.D.**
California State University, Northridge
Chicano/a Studies Department
christina.ayala-alcantar@csun.edu

**Nicole E. Allen, Ph.D.**
University of Illinois Urbana Champaign
Department of Psychology
Clinical Community Division
allenne@uiuc.edu

---

**Student Column**

By Michèle Schileoher-Sutton and Bianca D.M. Wilson

**Student Initiative Fund.** We would like to thank those students who have contacted us with suggestions on how to use the available money in the student initiative fund. We have proposed a small grant program aimed at supporting non-dissertation research in under-funded areas of student scholarship. Look for updates on the proposal status in the next TCP Student Column!

**APA.** The annual APA convention is an excellent opportunity for students to present their work and meet leading researchers in their field. In addition, the annual APA convention provides SCRA student members from a number of diverse programs with the opportunity to meet and socialize. As you are aware, this year’s APA convention will be held in Chicago from August 22nd to 25th. We are currently in the process of organizing student-centered activities for the convention, and would like your input: what types of activities would you be interested in attending? Please email your suggestions and comments regarding scheduling student activities at the APA convention to Michèle Sutton at michelle.sutton@ceu.edu.

**APA Travel Awards.** Applications for the APA travel awards will be due in late Spring. Please look out for announcements on the SCRA student listservs. If you have any questions, you can contact Michèle at michelle.sutton@ceu.edu.

**Student Articles.** We’d like to encourage you to share your community psychology-related experiences with SCRA members through The Community Psychologist and its semi-annual issues of The Community Student.

**Call for Papers.** The Community Student is published twice annually and includes articles written by students about their experiences within community psychology. We encourage you to begin sending in articles for the Summer edition of the Community Student, with submissions due in March. We will accept articles...
By Gary Harper and Alicia Lucksted

When the LGBT Interest Group within SCRA was established, we wanted to give LGBT-identified community psychologists a place to feel comfortable discussing the intersections of these two facets of our lives, and we wanted to offer straight allies working on LGBT issues a venue for sharing ideas and discussing their work. Additionally, we also wanted to create a mechanism for informing all SCRA members about the many interesting and valuable ways that LGBT communities are relevant to all of community psychology's work. And we wanted to invite people of all sexual orientations to join in the various efforts towards improving the well-being of LGBT people and communities.

Many community psychologists (and others!) simply do not know what LGBT communities (however defined) are like; what facets are unique or commonplace, similar to or different from other communities. They may view "LGBT" as one homogenous "community," not recognizing that it includes a range of sexual orientation identities (i.e., lesbian, gay, bisexual, and transgender), nor that within each of these categories there is a diverse array of individuals and sub-groups, each of whom have many other facets. There is a rich variety of people with widely ranging life experiences who together create the landscape of LGBT communities.

Because they are marginalized and because it is still difficult to find information about LGBT communities, many people lack information and familiarity. Thus many community psychologists do not know whether or how settings and groupings within LGBT communities may or may not be valuable to their work. Often, LGBT issues and communities are still seen as a "niche" interest, primarily addressed by LGBT-identified researchers and activists, not as part of the central fabric from which all of community psychology draws its work and innovations. Additionally, the invisibility that LGBT people and communities sometimes adopt for self-protection often means that they are not as many obvious reminders that we are part of every community.

Because of this invisibility and status as a "special population", many people are only dimly aware of the various forms of oppression and discrimination that LGBT people endure, and how these struggles both share similarities with other marginalized groups and involve unique aspects. For example, in many instances LGBT individuals do not share the same basic human rights as others in society, as witnessed by the prohibition of same-sex marriage in all but a couple countries, the legality of employment and accommodations discrimination based on sexual orientation in many US states and elsewhere, prohibitions against LGBT people serving in the military, common use of LGBT identity as grounds for termination of parental rights, and myriad statistics and stories of "gay bashing" and street harassment. More covert discrimination also confronts many LGBT people who refrain from talking freely about their partner, love interests, and life activities for fear that others will harass, degrade, dismiss, or even injure them.

In some circles, expressing interest in LGBT communities can itself be stigmatizing. If, for example, a community psychologist wants to include a Lesbian-focused fertility clinic in her work regarding other fertility services, homophobia is common enough that this might cause another service to decline taking part in her project, and/or it might lead someone to "accuse" her of being a Lesbian. Oppression does not only harm its direct targets: in this case, if the psychologist or a project coalition has to choose between including the Lesbian-identified clinic or including the objecting clinic, everyone loses the perspective of one or the other. If the psychologist's being called a Lesbian is upsetting to her or others, the work could be undermined.

Since LGBT people have been actively engaged in organizing and social action efforts since (at least) the early twentieth century, there exists a vast range of community organizations focusing on LGBT issues. These community-based efforts often resulted from grassroots organizing and have utilized many tenets of community psychology to educate the general public about LGBT issues and to empower LGBT people.

For example, GLSEN (Gay, Lesbian, and Straight Education Network), both as a national organization and through local chapters across the U.S., has worked in many ways to make schools safer and more hospitable for LGBT youth. Are they included in relevant community psychology school-related prevention inquiries? Community psychologists would likely discover, for example, insights valuable to fighting many kinds of discrimination and school disruption by looking into the formation of gay-straight student alliances that have developed across the US in recent years, where youth look at prejudice together and take action.

LGBT community centers now exist in many major cities and some small towns across the US — some more than 30 years old. Also, LGBT-focused health centers started decades ago due to lack of services and respect from mainstream providers and continue today. Are either of these included in studies of community cohesion and activism? In work on community support systems and services? They can be bases from which community samples can become more inclusive of LGBT citizens, a source of cultural brokers and guides, and important components in research and action concerning aspects of their operations other than those directly related to LGBT identities, such as studies on community health care or the working of voluntary associations.

Community psychology as a discipline and the Society for Community Research and Action as a society have been advocates and allies for many marginalized groups and have had a strong focus on addressing issues of diversity and working toward equity and empowerment in many ways. Looking forward, we need to continue to deepen and broaden these commitments, including a commitment to concerns confronting LGBT people and communities. This, in turn, will create fertile ground for examining and using community psychology principles and insights through an array of methods.

An upcoming special issue of the American Journal of Community Psychology will highlight advances within the field of community psychology regarding LGBT-related research and action. It offers a call to action for all of community psychology to integrate the knowledge and skills that lie within LGBT communities with community psychology's existing models of intervention, prevention,
and social change in order to build better theory and better interventions, for LGBT people and communities, and for others. There is much to learn and much work to be done—is there a role for you in this emerging area?

**Prevention & Promotion**

In the current column, I invited Draco Forte, a community activist who works with me on a prevention project to reduce exposure to HIV among Chicago’s young African American gay and bisexual men, to reflect on what he learned about prevention and community psychology when he attended the 2001 Biennial Conference in Atlanta. I have had the privilege to work with Draco for several years and have benefited greatly from his insights. As Draco’s comments reflect, community psychology offers a promising vision of research-community prevention partnerships, but must go further to put its vision into practice. Though the refrain is not necessarily new, it is always important for us to look at ourselves in the eyes of the communities with which we work, rather than measure our progress to enact our vision solely by the accomplishments heralded in our journals and other professional fora. Draco assists us to look at ourselves more closely through his observations.

As of August 2001, I completed my term as editor of the Prevention and Promotion column. I am pleased to announce that Richard Wolitski will assume the role of column editor and chairperson of the Prevention and Promotion Interest Group, effective January 2002. For those who do not know him, Rich is a talented scientist in the Behavioral Intervention Research Branch at the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention’s Division of HIV/AIDS Prevention. Please send ideas for columns and essays for his consideration to him at his email address: Rwolitski@cdc.gov.

— Robin Miller

**Looking In from the Outside: SCRA 2001 and the Evolution of Community Psychology**

**By Draco Forte**

The SCRA experience gave me a new perspective on what I thought of the field of psychology. Although my undergraduate degree is in psychology, I have never attended a psychology conference before. I never felt that psychology was directly relevant to my life, until I began work on the CITY Project at the University of Illinois at Chicago. As part of the CITY Project research team, I was able to attend SCRA in June 2001 and see another aspect of the field of psychology. It was nice to witness a community of researchers investigating what some consider everyday or real-life issues or phenomena at SCRA. The fact that the theme of SCRA was Social Change in the 21st Century suggested that the field of psychology was far beyond what I learned in undergrad. There were many people who seemed genuinely concerned with how to apply theory and philosophy in a way that is meaningful to those outside of academic institutions. It was also pleasing to know that there is an environment where methods of inquiry other than strict logical positivism are accepted and embraced. The SCRA experience highlighted a true connection between “book sense” (as my grandma would call it) and human intuition, which validated many of my personal beliefs about education, psychology and the “real world.”

However, my SCRA experience was incomplete and I did not figure out what was missing until the closing activity. One of the student participants commented on who was missing during a discussion of diversity. It was at that point that I recognized that there were almost no community representatives at the conference. This was somewhat disturbing because in my mind the absence of community representation negated the heralding of collaboration that permeated the conference. Researchers highlighted their collaborative efforts with community-based organizations (CBOs), government agencies, and other institutions. They also highlighted how these efforts were the best approach to investigating community issues. Why then, were there so many sessions about collaboration and partnerships that did not include representatives from outside of the academic world? I then began to wonder what it means to be in a partnership or collaborative effort with the “community.”

I think of partnership in a very simplistic way. When parties agree to work together, they all give what they can, and they all take part in the outcome—all parties give and take. If the field of community psychology really hopes to achieve human rights through social change, then it must engage in working relationships in a manner that recognizes that all parties are contributors and beneficiaries of the relationship and its outcomes. It seems as if there is more emphasis on outcomes of the collaborations (taking) rather than the relationships created therein (giving.) It is the difference between conducting research on, conducting research for, and conducting research with a partner agency, office, or institution.

Research on a partner is when researchers enter into partnerships to investigate phenomena, which they perceive as not affecting them directly. Useful and meaningful data can come of this partnership; however, there is the risk of exploiting the partners and no recognition of how the partners’ input is beneficial to the researchers and their institutions. The partners remain in a passive role, and their only contribution is access to the target population. In this relationship the researcher has all of the influence and resources. Research for a partner is when researchers enter into partnerships to build resources or enhance services of the partner. Researchers learn about the partner and are interested in the success of the partner. However, there is little recognition of how the researcher benefits from the partnership. In this relationship the researchers give some of their resources to the partner.

Research with a partner is when community partners can co-present on the investigation; not only can they offer a community perspective, but they can offer insight into the methodology and rationale behind the work. Research with a partner is when university staff is familiar with social norms of their partner agencies and actively participate in regular activities, not just those associated with the investigation. Research with a partner recognizes that all parties are essential and offer richness not just to the project under investigation, but also to the institutions that are in the pursuit of knowledge. The relationship becomes just as valuable a resource as the grant-made dollars.

To move toward achieving social change in the 21st century, the field of community psychology must work to blur the lines between researchers and community partners. The field must recognize that researchers do not and cannot ever have all the answers and that “community” issues are researchers’ issues. I look forward to attending the upcoming SCRA biennial and attending a symposium chaired by a staff person of a CBO. It will be a great step toward social change.
Cultural & Racial Affairs

By Lorna H. London

The Racial and Cultural Affairs Committee is poised to do some important work in the coming year. With Lorna H. London, Ph.D. and Emilie Phillips Smith, Ph.D. serving as Chair and Chair-elect respectively, a number of projects are underway.

At the 2001 Biennial meeting of the Society for Community Research and Action, a few important issues were addressed. First, a number of students present for this meeting discussed an interest in exploring ways to ensure that graduate programs in community psychology are doing their best to train future community psychologists to become culturally competent researchers, teachers, and practitioners. Questions were raised about finding ways to explore how graduate programs reflect a commitment to issues of diversity. Specifically, students expressed concerns about graduate programs’ ability to 1) adhere to a curriculum designed to prepare students to be culturally competent community psychologists, 2) recruit and retain students and faculty from diverse backgrounds, and 3) respond to the needs of students from diverse backgrounds.

The committee held an open session at the 2001 annual meeting of the American Psychological Association in San Francisco, CA. During this meeting, plans were discussed as to how to most effectively address the aforementioned needs of the students. Plans were made to collaborate with the Accountability Task Force regarding minority issues in graduate training. The importance of accurately reflecting the diversity of our members was also addressed at this meeting, and efforts were made to ensure that minority issues not only reflect ethnic minority issues, but also those of other marginalized or underrepresented groups.

During the 2001-2002 year, the committee plans to do the following:

a. Represent issues of cultural diversity brought about by members or student representatives of SCRA
b. Promote concerns of people of color and of other marginalized groups as a focus of community research and intervention
c. Promote training and professional development of people of color interested in community psychology
d. Advise the Executive Committee on matters of concern to people of color
e. Inform and educate the Executive Committee regarding the implications of decisions as they pertain to people of color
f. Begin the process of examining graduate programs through student surveys and data collection from program directors, and look to promote best practices in graduate training programs.

Goals that have already been met for this year include developing a listserv for members to allow for ease of communication. If you would like to be added to this listserv, please forward your contact information to me. We have also requested that a special issue of The Community Psychologist be dedicated to issues pertaining to racial and cultural issues. Anyone interested in submitting a manuscript for possible inclusion in this issue is invited to contact me via email at london@luc.edu.

We are in the process of accepting nominations for the Ethnic/Minority Mentoring Award. The recipient of this award will be acknowledged at the 2002 meeting of the American Psychological Association.

It has been a busy year, filled with ideas, energy and a renewed commitment to promoting the needs of the members of the SCRA. We look forward to a year of continued dialogue and productivity.

Public Policy

By Editors: Diane I. Costello, Alison J. Martin, Kathy HoganBruen

Steven Howe provides our first contribution to the discussion on the policy issues relevant to psychologists. Steven discusses the adverse impact of Medicaid, the US federal health insurance program for low-income people, on its targeted population. He calls for changes to state and federal legislation and challenges psychologists to become involved in Medicaid policy activities.

Medicaid Expansion Requires State Enabling Legislation, and Community Psychologists Can Help

Steven R. Howe, Department of Psychology, University of Cincinnati

Medicaid, the federal health insurance program for low-income people in the U.S., is a joint federal-state program. Mandatory categorical eligibility requirements and insurance benefits have historically been determined in Washington, with the federal government paying the majority of the costs (currently 58% in Ohio, for instance). But Medicaid has always involved state participation in two significant respects. States are required to pay the remaining portion of the cost of Medicaid benefits (42% in Ohio, for instance), and to administer the program, including determining eligibility. The federal government establishes certain groups of adults to whom states are required to provide Medicaid, such as mothers who receive Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), low-income women with infants, and low-income disabled or elderly people who receive Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits. Medicaid eligibility for non-disabled members of families is not based on medical need, and so, in principle, can help such persons gain access to preventive and emergency care.

Medicaid is to be distinguished from Medicare. Persons who pay into the Social Security system, and their dependents, are eligible for Medicare upon retirement at the age of 62, or at such time as they may become certified as disabled and unable to work. Persons with disabilities who have accumulated enough quarters of employment to be eligible for Social Security benefits receive Medicare along with Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI). Medicare is also available for persons with disabilities who are not eligible for Social Security benefits but who do meet certain income, asset and disability standards that qualify them for Supplemental Security Income (SSI). To complicate matters further, persons eligible for Medicare, who meet certain income and asset limits, may also be eligible for Medicaid to assist with health care expenses not covered by Medicare Part A.
(Hospital Insurance). For example, Medicaid will pay Medicare Part B (Medical Insurance) premiums; Medicaid also covers prescription drug costs.

**Federal Policy Changes**

One of the more far-reaching policy changes adopted by Congress in the 1996 Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act (PRWORA), popularly known as “welfare reform,” was that Medicaid eligibility and receipt of TANF cash assistance were decoupled, and states were given the latitude to extend Medicaid eligibility to new groups defined, for example, on the basis of income. One rationale for this change was that states could provide an incentive for women to obtain employment and leave TANF without losing Medicaid eligibility. Similarly, the new Children’s Health Insurance Program (CHIP, health insurance for persons under the age of 18 from low-income families) was intended to ensure that parents would not continue receiving TANF simply to maintain health insurance for their children. In making eligibility determinations for Medicaid, states still must assess a person’s assets; however, low income alone is not sufficient to establish eligibility.

A policy impact is said to be perverse not merely when it is unintended, but when it has effects that run counter to what is intended. Congress feared that maintaining the linkage between Medicaid and welfare might have perverse effects, such as preventing working parents from stabilizing in employment, and so gave states the option of expanding Medicaid coverage.

Similarly, advocates for persons with disabilities have long argued that rules concerning limits on earnings have perverse policy effects that encourage persons with disabilities who are capable of working to earn only as much income as would allow them to maintain Medicare and/or Medicaid eligibility. The following case example from Vickie van der Kar of the Ohio Rehabilitative Services Commission illustrates the dilemma some persons with disabilities face (the name has been changed to protect the person’s confidentiality).

Ann is a 39-year-old single mother of a 3-year old. Ann has multiple disabling conditions. She is on SSDI and receives a check for $873 each month. She has Medicare and Medicaid with a $409 spend-down (meaning that she must document that she has paid $409 in medical expenses each month before Medicaid pays for anything). Ann’s Medicaid coverage is critical since her prescriptions alone cost more than $1,000 every month. Ann has completed computer and office administration training. She found a job paying $8.00 an hour for 25 hours a week but learned that taking the job would cause her Medicaid spend-down to increase to $806 a month. In addition, she would have to pay her Medicare Part B premium, she would lose food stamps, and her child would lose Medicaid coverage. Ann’s response was, “Does this make any sense? I try to get a job... and am penalized to the point where I am better off on welfare!”

Two pieces of federal legislation — the Balanced Budget Act (BBA) of 1997 and the Ticket to Work and Work Incentives Improvement Act (TWWIIA) of 1999 — allow states to create Medicaid buy-in programs. Unlike Medicaid expansion programs for the working poor that can be established under PRWORA, under TWWIIA a state may design a buy-in program for persons with disabilities who have substantially higher incomes, and states can also charge people premiums to participate. Persons with disabilities might find it impossible to obtain health insurance through their employer or from a private insurance. For them, a Medicaid buy-in program that guarantees their ability to purchase health insurance can be critically important. For example, under a Medicaid buy-in program, Ann could purchase Medicaid at a premium based on her income. Depending on the detailed provisions of such a plan, her Medicaid premiums would likely be less than her spend-down requirement.

**State Opportunities**

Medicaid expansion of either type discussed here — for low-income persons under PRWORA or for persons with disabilities under TWWIIA — requires state enabling legislation. In other words, the federal legislation permits states to create new groups of Medicaid-eligible persons and commits the federal dollars necessary to pay the federal share of program costs. But the legislation does not require states to expand Medicaid eligibility. Thus, advocates for expanded coverage must fight their battles on a state-by-state basis.

One effect of the need for state enabling legislation is that wide disparities now exist among the states in Medicaid availability for the working poor. In Minnesota, working parents with two children can be eligible for Medicaid with incomes up to 275% of the Federal poverty guidelines, whereas in Alabama, such parents would lose eligibility when their income reached 21% of poverty. The effects of these different standards for eligibility is dramatic; when Ohio increased its income standard for working parents from 33% of poverty to 100% of poverty, approximately 70,000 parents availed themselves of coverage under the expanded program within the first 12 months of operation.

Medicaid buy-in programs for persons with disabilities serve smaller populations than the working poor but can still reach significant numbers of persons. Minnesota has the most liberal eligibility guidelines among the ten or so states that have established such programs to date. Since its inception in July 1999, the Minnesota program has enrolled over 5,000 persons.

According to Leighton Ku, of the Center for Budget and Policy Priorities (CBPP) in Washington, DC, the recent change in administration should not impede the ability of states to implement Medicaid expansion programs if they have not already done so. While the Bush administration probably has little interest in expansion efforts, the federal legislation allowing such efforts is still in place. Of greater concern is the fact that state Medicaid costs are going up faster than expected. Ku notes that there are several efforts currently underway to cut back on state Medicaid costs; for example, by restricting reimbursements for prescription drugs.

**An Issue for Psychologists**

I am not of the opinion that psychologists need to restrict their policy activities to problems that are inherently psychological in nature. There is a psychological perspective on any policy issue imaginable, ranging from missile defense (artificial intelligence, human factors) to housing (decision-making, values). As someone with interests in urban poverty and its relationship to other urban systems, especially employment and housing, I am motivated to research policy options involving health insurance quite apart from any consideration of mental health per se.

Nevertheless, Medicaid coverage is also an issue that deserves the attention of psychologists who might favor a far more narrow interpretation of the role of psychologists in the policy arena. Mike Hogan, the Director of the Ohio Department of Mental Health, in an email to me, wrote “Medicaid has been extremely problematic with regard to mental health care (although it has also become the single largest payer of mental care in the country).” In Ohio, for example,
approximately 40% of all SSDI/SSI payments are to persons with mental disabilities.

One reason why Medicaid has not been an unadulterated positive for persons with mental illness, according to Dr. Ku, is that different state health agencies have different motivations and policy priorities with respect to mental health services. For example, within a state, a department of mental health may advocate for improved services for persons with mental illness while across the street a department of health and human services charged with program operations is trying to restrict services to save money. At a National Listening Session for the Bush administration's New Freedom Initiative, Dr. Hogan struck a similar note when he testified, not just about Medicaid, but about a variety of programs, as follows: "Many federal agencies are or should be lifelines for people with mental illness. Yet, almost without exception, these programs are not primarily mental health programs, and mental health concerns are not a major priority in each program. As a consequence, these programs do a poor job of meeting mental health needs."

If you have interests in Medicaid expansion, get involved! You can learn more about federal health insurance programs at the website of the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, formerly known as the Health Care Finance Administration: [www.cms.gov](http://www.cms.gov). The CBPP has played a leading role in educating advocates about the potential for state expansion efforts, and its website has a variety of useful pages. Information about your state's health insurance programs is probably available at the website of your state Medicaid agency, and a handy page that provides links to most of these sites is [www.firedenver.org/medicaid](http://www.firedenver.org/medicaid). Medicaid coverage has been a concern for many researchers who have examined the effects of welfare reform. And you may be able to connect with advocates for expanded health insurance coverage through regional or state organizations such as United Ways or legal services programs.

Acknowledgements: In addition to the people mentioned by name, Tamara Jackson and Col Owens contributed editorial comments and suggestions. Dr. Jackson is an APA Congressional Fellow and Mr. Owens is an attorney at the Legal Aid Society of Greater Cincinnati and played a critical role in the creation of the expanded Medicaid program in Ohio known as Healthy Families Medicaid.

If you are interested in submitting an article to the Public Policy Column, please contact the editors via email: dicostello@lotus88.com, smartin@eudoramail.com, KHoganBruen@msha.org. Submissions on all policy topic areas are invited. For our next column we are seeking submissions focused on the policy implications from the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, both at national and international levels.

---

### Book Reviews

**Hobfoll's Stress, Culture, and Community, New York, NY: Plenum Press, 1998.**

Reviewed by Edison J. Trickett, University of Illinois at Chicago

In Stress, Culture, and Community, Steve Hobfoll makes the ambitious leap of blending social history, epistemology, culture, and community in the study of stress. Drawing on a wide range of intellectual precursors, he furthers the contextualization of the stress process begun in his earlier book, The Ecology of Stress. The book's 9 chapters begin with the social and historical context within which the stress concept and stress research evolved. It includes an effort to place stress in an evolutionary perspective which ties its importance to group survival through the accrual of resources designed to serve that end. From this emphasis on resources comes a presentation of Hobfoll's Conservation of Resources theory, centering on the role of resource loss as a prime activator of stress and as a framework for subsequent coping. As Hobfoll defines it, "people strive to obtain, retain, and protect that which they value" (p. 55). Throughout the book are references to the communal aspects of life within which this resource acquisition/loss dialectic is played out. Indeed, the postmodern dance of individualism and collectivism is central to placing the stress process in context. It is this framework that informs the multiaxial model of coping presented in Chapter 6. Here, the coping process is defined by three related though distinct dimensions: the active-passive axis, the social axis involving a prosocial/antisocial dimension, and a directness axis whose distinctiveness reflects the individualistic emphasis on directness with the more communal emphasis on indirectness. The final chapter discusses the intervention implications of the "individual-nested-in-family-nested-in-social-organization" theme. In addition, it cites both social settings (Hull House) and fields (community psychology) as examples of social efforts to place behavior in a sociocultural context.

There is much to appreciate in the book. Some of the underlying themes, such as the undue emphasis historically placed on the counterfactual, acultural, ahistorical individual in psychological research, break no new ground. However, the extensive drawing on social and cultural history and the focus of that history on stress research represent welcome and convincing elaborations. In addition, the emphasis on the processes through which people cope with stressors by "tying adaptation to the orchestration of resources" is nicely framed to emphasize coping as a multifactoral process. The presentation of interpersonal connections in the coping process as fluid also represents a refreshing antidote to the more static conception of person-environment fit and the predator-outcome black box research tradition. Further, Hobfoll's emphasis on the "real" nature of stressors as contrasted simply with their appraisal pushes an appreciation of context that reminds us that not everything is simply in the mind of the beholder; rather, that some events, particularly catastrophic ones, occupy the minds of many beholders of the event. Further, the discussion of the three axes of the multiaxial coping model is a lucid and conceptually meaningful integration of individualistic and collectivistic aspects of life within a coping framework. Overall, the book is an ambitious one that should influence how stress research is thought about and conducted in the future.
There are also caveats that influence the overall impact of the book. While there are wonderfully articulate and persuasive parts to the book, it is somewhat loosely written both within and between chapters overall, with the first chapter not clearly setting up the remainder of the volume. Hobfoll's assumption of cultural homogeneity with respect to the similar construing of stressful events is overdone, and he confuses levels of analysis in trying to make the case that the striving for individual resources is neatly tied to group or collective survival. This leads him to suggest that "with the advance of culture to its modern level, survival becomes a matter of obtaining, money, position, job security, and status" (p. 28), a seemingly individual level set of potential resources that sound suspiciously American and entrepreneurial.

The most difficult aspect of the book for me involved discussions of Conservation of Resources (COR) theory, a conceptual centerpiece to the work. Resources are defined in terms of what people value, an individualistic image that relies on the same issue of appraisal as more traditional areas of stress research. Further, COR theory is in different parts of the book elaborated to cover a range of research "consistent with" but not emanating from COR theory. How this wide swath of work is consistent with COR Theory is not always clear, and a more elaborated theoretical chapter would have aided in this process. On p. 12 there is a nice section entitled "beware when buying a theory that fits a little too well" that focused on the overextension of cognitive models in psychology and biological model in psychiatry. This same caution seems potentially relevant to COR theory as well.

In addition, the concept of resources as what people value seems potentially tautological and narrowly defined if one is focusing on a person-nested-in-context view. Why, for example, could not resources include people or settings in the social context not valued by the individual but that emerge as a resource in response to a particular crisis? Why should resources not include those aspects of people that only emerge in response to a disaster and of which they were unaware beforehand? There is also the issue of whether at least some aspects of COR theory involve old wine in new bottles. For example, how are efforts toward resource gain different conceptually from coping (p. 75)? What example of successful coping does not involve resource gain as defined by COR theory? There may indeed be meaningful ways to differentiate these constructs, but some confusion arose in my reading about what they were.

While harboring the reservations mentioned above, I found Hobfoll's book to fulfill one of the most stringent tests of a worthwhile piece of work. It engages the reader and causes the reader to think. Sometimes the thoughts involved an appreciation of an idea well developed or an historical piece of information which sensibly contextualized stress and coping in a manner I had not previously considered; at other times I found myself constructing mental counterarguments and having fantasy debates with Hobfoll over what seemed an outrageous overextension of COR theory or what seemed to be regression to the individualistic rather than person-in-context focus. However, throughout I was engaged in the importance of the issues the book helped me to consider.

---


Reviewed by Anita Davis, Department of Psychology, Rhodes College.

At a time when race relations between blacks and whites continue to be strained, Steinhorn and Diggs-Brown's, By the Color of Our Skin promotes an honest dialogue about the state of racial affairs in America by examining the ideal of integration. The book is divided into 3 sections in which the authors (1) focus on how we hold on to the illusion of integration in America, (2) examine how we came to be a non-integrated society, and (3) encourage a more honest discourse about race in America and offer some thoughts on how to bring about more racial interaction.

In the preface, the authors identify themselves as being a black woman and a white man. Although this entices us to believe that they are living the integration ideal, they immediately shatter this "dream" by telling us that, despite this collaboration, their private worlds remain separate from their work worlds and there is no indication that this will change. Steinhorn and Diggs-Brown also state that they do not provide a happy ending to the integration issue which pushes the reader to question what continuing to read this book will do to his or her beliefs about integration. Regardless of where one stands on this issue, however, people who truly want to understand more about interactions between blacks and whites, and are not threatened by the thought of looking at themselves in the mirror, will be unable to resist reading further.

Chapter one is succinct and gets at the heart of their thesis. Aptly titled, "The Integration Illusion," this chapter convincingly argues that America is not integrated. The authors juxtapose integration with desegregation and suggest that integration is tougher to achieve because you must change people's hearts rather than just implement laws. This chapter (and actually the entire book) is full of emotionally-laden examples dealing with racial issues (e.g., The Supreme Court's Brown decision, Martin Luther King's "I have a dream" speech, O.J. Simpson's murder trial). This is a clever tactic, as the authors seem keenly aware that many readers will shift between a complex interplay of intellectual curiosity and emotion as they engage this text. The authors discuss how white Americans feel that they are "living up to their end of the integration bargain" given such things as the large numbers of blacks in important positions in all facets of American life (e.g., Colin Powell, Oprah Winfrey), affirmative action legislation, and even a national holiday for Martin Luther King, Jr. Steinhorn and Diggs-Brown accurately point out, however, that examining race relations with a keener eye yields a very different view. The authors argue that what white Americans say about racial integration (e.g., that they accept complete racial integration and support racial equality) does not mesh with their behavior (e.g., whites avoid living around blacks and sending their children to schools with large numbers of black children).

Chapter one is very solid and convinced me that true integration does not exist in America. Actually, the authors did not need to do much to convince me. As a black woman professional living in Memphis, Tennessee, I am constantly reminded of the different worlds in which blacks and whites, regardless of class, live in our society. Given this, I was disappointed by chapters two and three of the text. While these chapters document the separate worlds of
blacks and whites in numerous areas, the examples seemed redundant. I found myself wondering for whom the authors are writing. Do white people need to be convinced of this in such great detail? Do blacks?

The authors’ goal in chapter four is to dispel the myth that America almost accomplished integration in the early 1960s. To do so, the author’s backtrack to the racial situation of the late 1940s. Their concise handling of historical information is enticing for the non-historian. Once in the chapter, however, you realize that the authors’ attempt to discuss in 30 pages the tumultuous era for race relations from post World War II to the early to mid-1960s is too ambitious. Some treatment of the diverse types of interactions between blacks and whites throughout the country is also lacking. Furthermore, examples with women are conspicuously missing (this is actually a weakness throughout the book). For example, how did the racial climate in Montgomery, Alabama prior to 1955, and the activism of black women influence the bus boycott?

In part two of the book (chapters 5-9), the authors do some of their best work in articulating what factors have precluded and continue to preclude true integration. In chapter five, the authors explore why whites and blacks seek out segregated worlds. The authors suggest that for white people this can be best explained by their fear of black violent crime, despite statistics indicating that most violent crime occurs among people of the same race and that fewer than 1% of blacks are actually charged with violent crimes. They explain that blacks choose separate social worlds because of the effort required to live in a white world on a daily basis.

In chapters six and seven, Steinhorn and Diggs-Brown consider the influence of the media (especially television) on reinforcing the image versus the reality of integration. Chapter six is perhaps the strongest in the book. Here the authors introduce their concept of virtual integration, positing that the increased visibility of blacks on television has created the belief that we are an integrated society. Although the authors applaud the increased positive visibility of blacks on television, they argue that this imagery leaves people, especially white people, believing in the integration illusion. The authors contrast this illusion, however, with the numerous televised images of black men committing violent crimes. Their argument is captivating, but this is not surprising given their media expertise.

Chapter eight also stands out because it touches the reader on a personal level. It raises the issue of how our fear of being misunderstood by someone of another race often leads to avoidance and silence (a type of “contrived politeness”) when it comes to race issues. More than any other, this chapter demonstrates how black and white people often view the world differently and the effort that it takes to recognize and appreciate the other’s perspective. This chapter is both disheartening and encouraging at the same time. Although some may read this chapter and feel hopeless about racial reconciliation, other readers will want to prove that it can be done, and still others will feel both of these things intermittently.

The final section of the book deals with future possibilities for enhancing race relations. Chapter ten entertains the possibility of overcoming the silence (a type of “contrived politeness”) when it comes to race issues. More than any other, this chapter demonstrates how black and white people often view the world differently and the effort that it takes to recognize and appreciate the other’s perspective. This chapter is both disheartening and encouraging at the same time. Although some may read this chapter and feel hopeless about racial reconciliation, other readers will want to prove that it can be done, and still others will feel both of these things intermittently.

Critique of Pure Reasonableness

The case for pragmatic psychology by Daniel B. Fishman (New York University Press, 1999), Reviewed by Eric Stewart

Veterans Affairs and Stanford University Medical Centers

I guess this is a difficult time for psychology. I’ve been hearing it, reading about it, and even teaching about it myself since I became serious about psychology as a career. However, the ubiquity of an observation (or concern, complaint, or even in some cases a hope) does not establish its truth. The rumors of a “crisis” of direction or relevance (or consensus or epistemology or status, or any of the terms in which the crisis has been framed) in psychology seem to me exaggerated and self-absorbed. A lot of the anxiety is probably perennial. There have always been discontents and malcontents in psychology, and few recent developments are truly new enough to constitute a crisis. Nonetheless, real challenges do exist, and some renovation is probably in order. I hear quite a few different bases for the insecure appraisal of the field, depending on stage of career, sub-discipline, research commitments or whether research is a commitment, employer and/or alma mater, as well as political, methodological and epistemological tendencies. There’s no need to bore you here with a full listing of worries, but a few leaders might be concerned over resources (including jobs, tenure, grants, publication opportunities, political capital), the corporation of both academic and service-delivery settings, and seemingly widening rifts between sub-disciplines or methodological and epistemological “camps.” Community psychologists as a group may be more sensitized to these concerns than are many other psychologists. At some point, many of us have had to defend the assumptions, goals, methods, allegiances and/or the effectiveness of our interventions and research (or felt like we did), even to those with whom it seems we should have common cause. These concerns, discontents and areas of defensiveness are topics of Daniel Fishman’s (1999) The Case for Pragmatic Psychology. However, far beyond being a catalog of grievances and defensive arguments (of which many are already in print), Fishman’s book also offers some concrete, contextualized, well-analyzed and referenced solutions.

The book, as the jacket quotations from an impressive collection of big names proclaim, is an excellent work. The scope is so broad and the arguments so well detailed that it is occasionally vertiginous. But Fishman provides a tight and, given much of the subject matter, heroically clear development of his argument for a methodologically and epistemologically pluralistic psychology of cases, including...
contexts of meaning. "Case," in this instance, can mean anything from a single psychotherapy client to large-scale social programs (thus offering the same flexibility and indefinite qualities as "context" and "community"). Fishman uses the term "pragmatic" in the philosophical sense, the Pragmatism of Pierce, James, Dewey and Richard Rorty, rather than in the sense of practical or expedient. The central thesis (forgive the reductionism) might be: "problem-driven, contextualized, pragmatic understanding is 'deeper' and 'more effective' in developing successful human service programs than understanding that is theory driven and based in artificial, experimentally controlled conditions" (p. 195). Aside from that forced opposition, what community psychologist could disagree? Furthermore, this understanding derives from a methodology that employs both qualitative (interpretative and "thick") and quantitative (including standardized "objective" measures) observation and analysis. Ideally, these case studies will form a large database, allowing researchers, interventionists and policy-makers to make determinations about generalizability, comparability and applicability for problems and solutions in specific cases. Fishman provides concrete examples for application, most extensively from psychotherapy and education though many other contexts are covered along the way. Readers especially well-versed regarding specific ideas, contexts or problems will find points of contention here and there, but that is unavoidable in a text that covers so much ground. I can't imagine many community psychologists will find the central argument anything but perfectly, inarguably, reasonable. And, because the book is well-argued and supported, many not already in the choir may be, if not converted, a little more non-denominational. Anybody feeling defensive about case-based research, qualitative methods, or any work at odds with the established criteria for validity and reliability will find help here in authoritative arguments for pluralism, 21 pages of references, and a real manifesto to steel your resolve.

The book does ring with a certain tone of defensiveness. Only about half the text is devoted to direct discussion of actual methodology and application, that is, what pragmatic psychology is and precisely how it is done. The first 130 pages are an explication of the philosophy of knowledge as it has evolved in the past four centuries, leading up (in this narrative) to the revival and partial reinvention of Pragmatism as the "transcendence of the dialectic" between positivism and postmodernism. This explication of the history, logic, major themes and players in epistemology serves several purposes, but it is in itself an impressive, extremely clear and useful contribution to the social science literature. For anybody repelled or simply confused by the dense, frequently (and, I suspect, sometimes intentionally) impenetrable rhetoric and vocabulary of postmodernism or the so-called culture wars, I will find an invaluable resource in Fishman's description and analysis (including charts and diagrams!). Furthermore, Fishman explicitly links these epistemological and ontological debates to the profession of psychology, establishing their relevance and reasons for an at least nodding acquaintance with them. Because Kenneth Gergen may represent the extent of many psychologists' knowledge of social constructionism, let alone postmodernism, these chapters represent an important service.

But this analysis serves other purposes in the book's development. First, it provides a framework for arguing that Pragmatism represents the "way out" of an epistemological, even existential, bind that psychology finds itself (or in which Fishman finds psychology). The other is that by establishing a dichotomy (untenable) extremes—postmodernism and positivism (both presented, after an initial disclaimer, as monolithic categories)—Fishman can then present his pluralistic, pragmatic position as the reasonable "middle way." There is a certain, but limited, accuracy to the arrangement (positivists right, postmodernists left, pragmatists in the center), to the extent that he calls for a pluralist approach that draws methods and concerns from each wing (e.g., objective and interpretative, quantitative and qualitative). In all fairness, he does acknowledge the problems in collapsing complex ideas and relationships into reduced categories. But by collapsing the actual complexity of peoples' work and ideas into dichotomous categories much is lost, including the places where modernists and postmodernists meet in their criticisms of pragmatism, not to mention that the term postmodern may have become less than useful for describing the current ideological terrain. Some readers will take exception with the categories as they are laid out here (pp. 99-100 & 156-163), especially those who identify with either positivist (are there any left?) or postmodernist impulses. But, then, that's the beauty of establishing the middle road between two extremes, as people will want to put themselves in the reasonable, pluralistic center. I am picking on this less to critique Fishman—this kind of abbreviation is unavoidable in this circumstance—than from a concern that a too neat summing up will lead to a complacent dismissal of important ideas and accomplishments on both sides, those being the extremes to be avoided.

Pragmatism (the philosophy) is not quite the middle road between positivism and postmodernism. Rather, it is in many ways, at least in the contemporary incarnations that Fishman references, much more akin to postmodernism. According to Rorty, ideas like "truth" and "accurate representation" are really just "compliments that we pay to sentences" that we find useful in negotiating the world. To say that science is useful in predicting and controlling nature because it describes the true nature of the world is a tautology; we have no reference by which to judge if we have a description of the "true nature of the world" except success in predicting or controlling nature. (Note that while this does not fit true positivist epistemology, it probably would be fine by most modernist scientists.) Furthermore, once you accept that science is considered successful only insofar as it helps us achieve certain goals, than you also have to accept that other forms of inquiry can be considered just as successful at achieving different goals, without ever having to establish that one form of inquiry is better at describing the way the world "really is." As Rorty and others have argued, all claims about the world, regardless of form or method, are ultimately and inescapably made in terms of language. One implication of all this is a leveling of the knowledge hierarchy, making science, philosophy, literature, et al, all just different ways of knowing and negotiating the world (very postmodern, it seems). For the pragmatist, what matters is how useful claims of knowledge (and ways of arriving at them) are for predicting and controlling the world. Truth statements, then, are really justification statements. What may or may not be obvious is that questions are left over about who determines what is justified and how, what is useful, and what are the things that should be changed or controlled. By setting aside foundationalism and all the sorts of knowledge that philosophers have tried attain, we are left to ourselves. The answers to those questions become not just pragmatic but political.

So far, pragmatists and postmodernists are on the same page (they share some common relatives). Where the ways part is in the response to that last point, that determinations of utility, of goodness
and justification are political, and really whether the word “political” invokes a positive or a more pessimistic feeling. I think it’s fair to say that postmodernism in general worries more about power, forms of its “abuse,” how power and knowledge are inseparable, and the ways in which discourse shapes our experience of ourselves (thus limiting our ability to be true political participants). Pragmatists, on the other hand, see politics as the conversation by which we decide answers to the questions above; these are matters of consensus, however provisional. Pragmatists are, in general, more optimistic than are postmodernists when it comes to the idea of consensus. One can ask many questions about the terms of this conversation and participation in it, how illusory, elusive, or even desirable (think 1984) consensus might be, and return to reiterating the question of who determines what is useful and good for us and how. And here modernists and postmodernists find common cause. Rorty and other pragmatist philosophers have drawn fire from both “sides” for a political naiveté and for substituting one form of metaphysics with another—a fundamental human reasonableness and egalitarian impulse. Modernists feel that a blithe disregard for objective truth will actually undermine society’s moral, intellectual, and social integrity. Postmodernists point to the many ways consensus has been and continues to be “manufactured,” and people recruited into ideologies that in fact oppress them and others, in grand and local ways. Modernist and postmodernist unite here in their radical skepticism. Fishman seems to believe these problems (e.g., Hitler’s Germany, Stalin’s Russia) are in the past and unlikely to reemerge (see p. 130). Well, perhaps, but there are new and also some less majestic ways in which truth is decided by fiat. But then I’m not sure Fishman is really prescribing Pragmatism as an encompassing social philosophy, perhaps his idea is more a local epistemology for guiding social inquiry, but then many of the concerns remain the same just less ominous.

So, what does all this have to do with case studies, methodology, and psychological research and intervention? Good question, but it’s one to answer for yourself. It’s a good book and you should read it. If the ideas of combining quanta and qualia in inquiry and intervention, of contextualism and a focus on improving the lot of people, are already familiar to you, you will still get quite a bit out of it. If these ideas seem marginal, and if epistemology seems an idle and alien concern to you, then you perhaps ought to be required to read it. In some ways, the last chapters of the book, those addressing methodology and application, could have stood alone, as could the first chapters. I’m guessing that readers will find themselves more interested in some sections than others. It is great to have the methodological approach so well supported and illustrated. But, I find it even more valuable to have the approach presented against the background of an explication and analysis of the epistemological assumptions and debates that inform our methodological and evaluative choices. I suspect Fishman felt a need to provide a sturdy argument against both sides of the “culture war,” but it seems it is the positivists who require both the “proofs” and the persuasion. Postmodernists, good ones anyway, know the references already, and anyway they aren’t the ones making editorial or tenure decisions that affect us. Pragmatism may not offer truly complete answers to the epistemological, political, and structural difficulties that some of us have decided to confront, though it’s not clear anything will do that for everybody. But then I haven’t seen much evidence that strong epistemological convictions hold any robust correlation to quality of work in psychology. If Pragmatism provides a justification for doing work that’s meaningful to somebody besides ourselves, for doing things that improve some aspect of life for some part of the world, and if it gets us past petty debates over method, analysis and interpretation, then let’s be pragmatic about it.


The Handbook of Rural Health provides one-stop shopping for almost any statistic on the topic. The book comprises 19 chapters by different authors. Several are on specific health topics such as infectious diseases, oral health, and family violence. A number address particular subgroups of the rural community, including American Indians, migrant workers, women, and youth. Others address rural health policy, methodology, and education.

This book has many strengths. The chapters are generally well written and provide a solid background in their area. They would make good introductory chapters for students. The book is an excellent reference for anyone seeking the latest available data on prevalence rates for any number of diseases and conditions in the rural U.S., or among various groups within the rural population.

Many individual chapters were strong. Mueller provides a clear and knowledgeable overview of rural health policy, and does a good job of outlining the intended and unintended consequences of recent health policy. Aday and colleagues present a sophisticated analysis of health inequity for rural residents based on distributive justice, social justice, and deliberative justice perspectives. They urge the development of health policy and practice that addresses rural access, outcome disparities, and participation in policy development.

Several chapters nicely outline the special health needs of particular rural groups. Winstead-Fry and Wheeler offer a sound overview of issues that differently affect rural women, including family planning and domestic violence. Abbott and Olness adopt a similar approach regarding pediatric and adolescent health. One important topic addressed by Abbott and Olness are the health benefits of living in rural areas. They found little data on benefits, but suggest that rural children are more likely than urban children to see the same health care provider over a period of time, be more physically active, and be better known and more connected to their communities. Goldberg and Napolitano contribute a very readable chapter on migrant farmworkers that documents not only their special health considerations but also housing problems, pesticide exposure, and other issues that contribute to their specific health needs.

Armitage and Sinclair point out that agriculture and hunting may expose rural dwellers to infectious agents that are rare in urban populations, such as Lyme disease. Chronic diseases, such as heart disease, and risk factors for chronic disease, such as obesity, which have higher rates in rural than urban areas, are discussed by Dennis and Pallotta. Their chapter is nicely balanced with discussion of urban-rural similarities in health problems, and, disorders that have higher rates in urban areas. Isman makes a persuasive argument that oral health should receive more attention as a primary care health issue, especially given that prevention, even community-wide efforts such as water fluoridation, can be remarkably successful and cost-effective.

The chapters on mental and behavioral problems generally found few differences between urban and rural rates. Levin and Hanson note that mental health providers are even scarcer than other providers in rural areas, and that telehealth and other alternatives are
proving prohibitively expensive in many locations. Rebhun and Hanson present an historical perspective on rural and urban substance use differences, such as the role of rural areas in the production of alcohol, tobacco, and other substances. This context is lacking in many chapters. Murty’s review of rural family violence focuses on the need for services that are tailored to rural areas, which might include transportation or embedding violence interventions in other health services so as to reduce the stigma for clients.

A chapter by Baer and Nichols with an unfortunately rather general title of “Ethnic Issues” presents helpful information on the health care beliefs and practices of several ethnic groups of the American South: European Americans, African Americans, Mexican Americans, Mixtecs, Guatemalans, and Haitians. American Indian groups who reside in the south are not included. This chapter’s authors present a rather dismal forecast for rapprochement of scientific and spiritual/emotional views of medicine. Non-Western societies are often more comfortable with a “both-and” instead of “either-or” approach to paradigms, and people may seek help from Western physicians and spiritual healers at the same time. Even many Western physicians now encourage this. Rhoades’ description of the Indian Health Service (IHS) presents a rosier picture of the relationship between Western medical providers and non-Western communities. Rhoades downplays the role of tribal self-determination in shrinking and remaking IHS and minimizes the serious discrepancies between the health status of American Indian and other U.S. ethnic groups. On the plus side, he points out IHS’s emphasis on maximizing the health status of American Indians, focus on preventive care and injury control, and wide array of available services in even the remotest areas.

Loue and Morgenstern address the critically important issue of the definition of “rural.” Lack of a uniform definition complicates the interpretation and comparison of research. They cite the need to consider factors such as isolation from major urban centers in addition to population size. Unfortunately, they do not recommend a specific definition, although they do provide helpful descriptions about several definitions currently in use.

The final three chapters of the book shift the focus to programs. The first, by Elder and colleagues, is on health promotion, and also gives a good analysis of the challenges in developing a definition of “rural.” This chapter provides pithy overviews of ten major health promotion models (e.g., the transtheoretical model), and reviews their suitability for rural settings. Soare’s chapter on health education is the only one to emphasize the contributions of the U.S. Cooperative Extension Service, schools, and nonprofit organizations to rural health promotion. Agencies such as these, rather than health clinics or hospitals, implement many prevention programs. She recommends training community members to deliver services as a way to improve the communication between program organizers and their target audience. The final chapter by Robinson and Guidry focuses on the well-known challenges of recruiting and retaining health professionals in rural areas.

The Handbook, despite its length, oversimplifies some issues. Throughout the book, rural residents are often mistakenly equated with agricultural workers. As Stallones points out, the farm worker population has dropped by over 70% in the last 50 years. Most estimates of the rural population put the number at well over 50 million, but less than 8 million work on farms. Many rural residents work in tourism or small factories, and small businesses and self-employment are a way of life for many. Others rely on natural resources like timber and fish for their income. Retirees are an increasingly large sector of the rural population. With the exception of some discussion by Elder and colleagues, these lifestyles are generally neglected in this handbook.

Migrant and seasonal farmworkers are also equated in many places throughout the text, with data on migrant workers applied to seasonal workers as well. In many places, however, these are two very distinct groups. Seasonal farmworkers, who work only when large tasks such as harvesting are needed but do not move from place to place, are not as predominantly Latin American as migrant farmworkers in many parts of the country. For example, in rural Maine, many people work different seasonal jobs over the course of the year. These include some farm jobs such as berry picking and wreath making, but also include non-farm jobs such as those in tourism. While many Latino workers migrate to Maine for the berry harvests, seasonal workers who already live in the area tend to be of Wabanaki Indian or European American descent.

Many issues could have been remedied by a stronger editorial hand. A one-page preface takes the place of the usual introductory chapter by the editors. A few authors could have been encouraged to use more recent citations. For example, Baer and Nichols use a 1970 source on southern women from 1830 to 1930 to claim that despite recent moves towards egalitarianism, women are still expected to be modest and ladylike. The chapters also vary widely in how descriptive or analytical they are, with a few reading almost like a glossary while others present sophisticated conceptual models. Of course, some variability is inevitable in a large edited volume and most of these issues detract only slightly from the overall utility of the book. The Handbook of Rural Health is likely to become a frequently cited resource.

Reviewed by Molly Dragiewicz and Kimberly K. Eby
Cultural Studies New Century College
George Mason University

1Order of authorship is alphabetical; the contributions by the two authors were collaborative, equal, and inseparable.

Stephanie Riger, Professor of Psychology and Women’s Studies at the University of Illinois at Chicago, has collected twelve of her most important publications in this useful volume. The book is divided into two sections, “Knowing Gender” and “Gender, Policies, and Practices.” The first section addresses feminist responses to the traditional epistemologies that go unrecognized and unchallenged in much of psychological research. The second section illustrates the importance of feminist analyses to the study of social issues, particularly with regard to organizational and governmental policies affecting women.

Taken as a whole, this collection of articles shows how transforming psychology is about creating interdisciplinary and/or cross-disciplinary inquiry and using a range of methods in order to answer complex questions about contemporary social issues. Riger integrates feminist theories with theories prominent in community psychology, particularly ecological paradigms. This is valuable because while ecological models are familiar to those in a number of psychological subdisciplines, they are relatively unknown in feminist circles.
Although Riger does an excellent job of introducing feminist critiques of psychology and the scientific method to psychologists, readers would have benefited from introductory essays to each of the articles. Given the nature of this collection and the fact that the publications span nineteen years, information summarizing recent developments (particularly with respect to some of the policy issues presented) and indicating the context in which the articles were originally written would have been appreciated. Because the articles were written for a number of different venues (e.g., American Psychologist, Violence Against Women, American Journal of Community Psychology, Feminist Studies, etc.), introductions would also have clarified the intended audience for each piece. Likewise, as Riger has so effectively adapted her voice as a writer to different audiences in various fields, identifying her position as an author would explain differences in tone and emphasis between the essays that can sometimes be disconcerting when the collection is read as a unified text. Overall, the book encourages psychologists to consider the importance of gender in the production, interpretation, and deployment of their research, and offers practical points for consideration during the process of knowledge production around multifaceted research problems.

In the first part, "Knowing Gender," Riger situates important feminist commentaries on objectivity, bias within scientific methods, normative masculinity, and sex and gender dimorphism and conflation in relation to psychology. She also addresses the need for researchers to be activists in the production and dissemination of their work, emphasizing the need to consider how their work will be taken up in the community.

For example, Chapter 2, "Epistemological debates, feminist voices: Science, social values, and the study of women," is an excellent resource for those trained in traditional research methods because it uncovers assumptions about the scientific method and its presumed objectivity. Specifically, Riger addresses biases within the psychological study of women, and describes how assumptions about objectivity are used to legitimize social inequities such as racism, sexism, and class-based discrimination. Her overview of feminist responses to the criticisms of science emphasizes the necessity of asking questions about whose interests are served by different ways of framing social research. As Riger argues, the belief that mainstream psychology is value-free reinforces the status quo by obscuring the identity and interests of the researcher(s). For this reason, she emphasizes that both researchers and subjects have multiple (and sometimes contradictory) identifications across social categories, and she accordingly asserts that contextualized understanding is a requirement for all components and phases of the research process.

In Chapter 3, "Rethinking the distinction between sex and gender," Riger draws our attention to the fact that sex and gender dimorphism are culturally constructed. She builds on the idea that sex (maleness, femaleness, and intersexuality) and gender (masculinity, femininity, and androgyny) exist on continuums, rather than as binary oppositions, to discuss the relationship between nature and culture. Riger describes this as a transnational exchange in which there is mutual influence between biological and cultural factors.

Chapter 3 also discusses the 'threshold of convincibility,' the theory that researchers more readily accept conclusions that accord with their own beliefs. This is important because it alerts researchers to the need to examine their own assumptions as they interpret their results and frame their conclusions. Moreover, journalists who disseminate research findings are subject to this same tendency to frame stories in accordance with their own beliefs, often reinforcing the status quo.

Riger's discussion of feminist responses to criticisms of science is broadly informative, but creates false boundaries and forced choices across feminist positions. Specifically, her characterization of feminist standpoints and postmodern epistemologies oversimplifies, and therefore sometimes misrepresents, this diverse body of feminist work. It is difficult to avoid such oversimplifications in a brief summary; however, in the absence of a caveat to this effect, readers unfamiliar with feminist epistemologies may draw inaccurate conclusions about the field.

Additionally, the chapter, "Working together: Challenges in collaborative research on violence against women," seems to contradict Riger's earlier recognition that researchers inhabit multiple subject positions by creating a false dichotomy between advocates and researchers. She does acknowledge that this is a pragmatic tactic for constructing her argument, and it is true that there are many negotiations that are part of conducting community-based research on violence against women. However, her assertions that antagonistic relationships are the norm overshadow the numerous instances of collegial cooperation.

In Part Two, "Gender, Policies, and Practices," Riger shows how gender and sex differences play out in relation to specific social policies, including those related to sexual harassment and welfare reform. Through an analysis of unequal pay and the underrepresentation of women in management, Riger also illustrates the shortcomings of explanations for inequity that are individualistic or that omit gender as a category of analysis.

The importance of gender and sex as categories for analysis is manifested in Chapter 8, "Gender dilemmas in sexual harassment policies and procedures." Riger explains how the 'reasonable person' standard often used in formal and informal sexual harassment grievance procedures assumes a masculine norm while being touted as gender-neutral. In light of this, Riger convincingly asserts that policy-makers and administrators must consciously consider gender differences with respect to conflict and dispute resolution, as well as the gendered differences in status and power that are endemic to many organizations.

The chapter, "What's wrong with empowerment?" demonstrates how even community psychology approaches can unintentionally fall back on individualistic measures of empowerment to the neglect of social factors. Riger argues that researchers in the field must be sure that a sense of increased empowerment is not conflated with increased opportunity and freedom from oppression, which requires affecting the distribution of power and resources, as well as attitudes and perceptions. Chapter 10, "Women in management: An explanation of competing paradigms," provides yet another example of the inadequacies of person-centered accounts for the low number of women in management positions.

The articles in this collection have been influential across multiple fields of study. Riger's call for interdisciplinary inquiry and the formation of cross-disciplinary research teams has been widely recognized as necessary to understanding, preventing, and intervening in complex social problems, and in understanding social relations more generally. Her integration of feminist and psychological theories is particularly appropriate reading for researchers who are unfamiliar with feminist theories and their contributions to social research.
Candidates for President-Elect

Clifford R. O'Donnell

Current Position

Professor of Psychology, University of Hawaii. Founding and current Director, Community and Culture Graduate Program. This program integrates community and culture psychology within a multi-disciplinary curriculum that includes Certificate options in Planning Studies and in Disaster Management and Humanitarian Assistance.

SCRA Involvement

SCRA Fellow (1996)
Column Editor for Training Issues, The Community Psychologist
Ad hoc reviewer for American Journal of Community Psychology
Participant at 7 Biennials, presenter at 6

Recent Accomplishments

1. Council of Program Directors in Community Research and Action 2001 Award for “Outstanding Contributions to Training and Education in Community Research and Action”
2. Delinquency Prevention. Development of a delinquency prevention mentoring program, called the Buddy System, was selected as one of several “Promising Programs” by the national Communities That Care (CTC) project, as one of the programs that “have shown positive effects in adequately controlled studies.” The program currently serves as a model for several delinquency programs across the United States.
3. Chair, Council of Program Directors in Community Research and Action (CPDCRA), 1995-96 and 1999-2000; Executive Board member 1993-2000. Among the accomplishments while on the Board are the expansion of membership in the Council to programs in Africa, South America, and Europe, creation of community psychology reading lists for authors of introductory psychology, TCP articles on cultural compatibility and distance learning, edited books on education in community psychology and employment in community psychology, and the creation of the student exchange program.
4. Executive Board member of the Consortium for Children, Families, and the Law, 1988-present. Among the accomplishments as a Board member are U. S. Congressional testimony and briefings on the U.N. Convention on the Rights of Children, minority over-representation in the justice system, methods to reduce firearm injuries and deaths, the relationship of child maltreatment to delinquency and violence, and on the overrepresentation of youth with disabilities in the juvenile justice system; and publications on child abuse and neglect, firearm deaths among children and youth, cultural compatibility, and a special issue on school violence.
5. APA Council of Chairs of Training Chairs (CCTC), 1995-2000. Council accomplishments included the drafting and subsequent approval of the CCTC policy statement recommending that various community psychology experiences count toward clinical practicum and internship hours. While a Council member, also served as Liaison to the APA Board of Educational Affairs.

Personal Statement

Community psychology has a proud history based on values of diversity, participation, empowerment, cultural compatibility, social justice, and empiricism. Throughout my career, I have embraced these values and integrated them in my work on social programs for disadvantaged children and youth. If I were honored as President of SCRA, I would strive to develop initiatives for our members to increase the influence of our values on public policy, recruit and facilitate the participation of international members, collaborate with professional organizations from related disciplines and, in cooperation with the Council of Program Directors in Community Research and Action (CPDCRA), encourage more students to enter the field of community psychology. Members of SCRA have valuable expertise ranging from clinical problems to community development, all with a sensitivity to diversity and an empathy for the disadvantaged. I would seek to develop channels of opportunity for our members to use their expertise to contribute to public policy that advances our values. Also, the recruitment and participation of greater numbers of international members would make SCRA more of a multi-cultural organization. We would be enriched and become more diverse in the process. Collaboration with related professional disciplines would promote an intellectual synergy to expand the visibility and recognition of SCRA in psychology and related disciplines, and increase the excitement and pride of membership in SCRA. It is toward these goals that I would work as SCRA President.
Candidates for President-Elect

Paul A. Toro

Current Position

Associate Professor, Department of Psychology, Wayne State University. Director, Research Group on Homelessness and Poverty. Director, Community Psychology Doctoral Training (open to students in our Clinical, Social, Developmental, and Industrial/Organizational programs).

SCRA Involvement

I have been a committed member of SCRA for the past 23 years, first as a graduate student at the University of Rochester, then in a post-doctoral position at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, and then as a faculty member at the University at Buffalo and now at Wayne State. I became a Fellow in 1998. My involvements in SCRA have included an ongoing interest in supporting international collaborations. I served for 6 years as the Co-chair of SCRA’s International Interest Group (now a standing Committee) and have also been SCRA’s Liaison to APA’s Office of International Affairs and Committee on International Relations in Psychology. Since 1998, I have been a program contact person for the Council of Program Directors in Community Research and Action. I have been active in the scholarly activities of SCRA, regularly reviewing articles for AJCP (Editorial Board for 3 years), serving as a guest editor for special issues of TCP and JCP, reviewing proposals for APA and our Biennials, and helping to organize regional conferences (e.g., EPA, 2 Midwest ECOS). My students and I regularly publish in community outlets (see list below) and make presentations at SCRA-sponsored conferences.

Elected by the SCRA membership as Regional Network Coordinator (RNC), during my 3-year term (1998-2001) I was an active member of the Executive Committee (EC). For example, several EC members and I worked together to help SCRA develop an effective negotiating position with AJCP’s publisher (Kluwer/Plenum), which led to an agreement that will give SCRA full ownership of AJCP in a few more years (in the meantime, we’re getting an increasing portion of the royalties, which is helping SCRA’s budgetary situation enormously). I have remained active with the International Committee (IC), maintain many contacts with community psychologists around the world, and was the EC’s liaison to the IC when I served as RNC. Most recently, I was appointed as TCP Editor and have now produced my first two issues (Fall 2001 and Winter 2002).

Goals for SCRA

1. Membership Development. If elected as President-Elect, a key goal for me would be to work hard to draw in new members and retain our current members. Over the past 10-20 years, we have seen a slow but steady decline in our overall membership. The decline has been especially notable among APA members (particularly in the past year). I believe that we must work very hard on multiple fronts in order to increase our membership base. Efforts that I would propose include: Reaching out to the “new generation” of young members and reaching out to groups that are under-represented in SCRA, such as women, persons of color, and those from applied contexts. Abe Wandersman has recently made membership development a major thrust of his own Presidency. He and others on the EC are actively working on multiple fronts. I would very much like to continue this thrust.

2. Fostering an “International” Community Psychology. Another important way for SCRA’s membership to grow is in the international arena. Helping SCRA to become a truly international organization is very consistent with the value community psychologists place on cultural diversity. There are active groups of community psychologists now in Australia/New Zealand, Europe, and Latin America. We can learn a lot from our international colleagues and I would like to work to strengthen our ties to existing groups and help to develop others around the world.

3. Extending SCRA’s “Voice.” Over the years, many SCRA members have bemoaned the relative lack of impact of community psychologists on public policy. We have so much to offer here! While there are obvious limiting factors, I believe that collectively we can do more to influence policy at the local, state, federal, and international levels. As an organization, SCRA can become more involved and we can identify ways to encourage our members to become more involved. For example, as our financial status continues to improve, we may be able to provide “small grants” to support policy-related activities among our students and other members.

4. Enhancing SCRA’s Web Site. One way to help achieve all of the above goals is to improve our web site in various ways. For the past few years, I have advocated a major overhaul of our web site. I was pleased that, at its most recent meeting, the EC voted to pursue such an overhaul, which might involve providing a “members only” section (with TCP and other timely content) and allowing members to join and pay dues online, among other features. As President-Elect, I would like to assist in the design of our new web site and help accomplish its implementation soon.

Selected Recent Publications


*Authors include one or more of my students.

Learn more about my research and see a copy of my CV on my web site at www.science.wayne.edu/~pioro/.
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President, President-Elect, Past-President (1997-2000)
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Recent Work


Personal Statement
During the past five years I have sought to increase SCRA's linkages with various APA divisions so our voice and influence on issues of shared concern could be amplified. As co-chair last year of the Divisions for Social Justice (Divisions 9, 17, 27, 35, 43, 44, 45, 48, 51), discernible progress was made among the participating divisions in joint sharing of nominations to APA committees, and in joint activities contributing to the APA Public Interest agenda. As part of the Interdivisional Minority Pipeline initiative (Divisions 9, 16, 17, 27, and 45), I have been working with representatives from other concerned divisions to generate and disseminate knowledge about data trends and best practices concerning minority graduate student recruitment and retention. Finally, in the context of the interdivisional Strengths Based Research and Policy initiative (Divisions 27, 37), joint publication and policy advocacy activities are underway to promote a strengths-based, rather than a deficits-based, orientation to research and policy.

As APA Council Representative for SCRA, I would work to extend and deepen our collaborative relationships with allied divisions, and with allies within APA more generally. In so doing, I would hope to enhance our voice and influence within APA, to keep our Executive Committee informed of important developments and opportunities, and more generally to represent our field's values and interests.

Selected Papers


Personal Statement
The main purpose of my career is to use scientific findings to inform the development of intervention programs and public policies that maximize the well-being of communities, especially those that do not have adequate economic resources. In many cases this involves documenting, celebrating and disseminating the under-appreciated activities community members are already doing on their own, most particularly operating grassroots mutual help organizations that address personal and social problems. My contact with mutual help organizations as well as my study of 20th century African-American history have led me to be more skeptical than many psychologists of the proposition that well-intended professional intervention always makes life better, and I want to be clear that I would carry this perspective with me were I elected to be our APA council representative.

Were I elected, I would pursue two goals: (1) To bring SCRA's values and viewpoints to APA, and, (2) To bring APA's resources to SCRA. On the former point, to the APA council I would represent community psychology as an alternative set of principles for intervention, as this perspective is sorely needed in a clinically-oriented organization that often does not appreciate the importance of prevention, early intervention, mutual help initiatives, and population-based models of health. On the latter point, I would attempt to link SCRA to the component of APA I know best, which is their public policy/advocacy activities. APA's public policy offices have significant influence on psychology itself and on legislation that affects everything community psychologists care about: poverty,
community development, race, and schooling, to name only a few. By linking our efforts and values with APA's, our organization can increase its impact; I would be committed to making this potential a reality.
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**Statement**

I am honored to be nominated for the position of Member-at-Large, and would consider it a privilege to serve the society in this capacity. If I am elected to this position I envision having an impact on SCRA through my interactions on the Executive Committee and as the coordinator of SCRA's program at the Annual APA Conference. As a member of the Executive Committee, I would encourage the committee to continually examine SCRA's actions to assure that we are inclusive of all forms of human diversity and to strive to break down barriers that may exist between "academic" Community Psychology and applied community work. With regard to the APA Annual Convention, I would have two primary goals: 1) increase the representation of community agencies and community members in the conference, and 2) increase the representation of students and "emerging" community psychologists in the conference. I feel that it is critical to invite members of various communities, especially those whose voices are often not heard, to academic conferences so that we can expand our views of social/psychological issues and so that we can share new findings with those in applied settings. This inclusion helps to keep us connected to the community work that we are doing and gives recognition to those who are working daily to bring about social change. I also believe that students and those who are new to the field often have innovative and interesting perspectives that may not be heard at conferences when the majority of the presentations are given by more established professionals. An ideal conference would blend those speaking from a perspective of experience with new and emerging voices.

I have experience organizing the SCRA one-day conference that takes place as part of the annual Midwestern Psychological Association conference, although it is not on the same scale as the larger APA program. In that capacity, I expanded the program by negotiating with the larger association to give us more meeting space, thus doubling the number of presentations that could be accepted. I created a new category of presentations for the conference that focused on the presentation of applied community intervention activities and strongly encouraged all presenters to include community members in their presentations. I also have worked to bridge the gap between the "community" and academic conferences by co-organizing a town hall meeting at the most recent Biennial conference where we invited members of several LGBT-related community organizations to meet with members of SCRA to discuss how community psychologists could better assist community groups in their LGBT-related work. In addition I worked with the APA Office on AIDS to organize a conversation hour and reception at the 2000 APA Convention that focused on collaboration, and it included members from community-based HIV service organizations and psychologists/students working in the HIV field.
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Personal Statement
The goal of my work is to understand how the information generated by prevention scientists is used by community organizations to inform practice. I also seek to document the perspectives of community organizations on their work so that the knowledge bases developed by scientists and practitioners may be more tightly coupled and mutually informative. I have sought to understand these issues within the context of HIV prevention, particularly programs focused on men who are both sexual and racial/ethnic minorities. With its emphasis on the pursuit of community well-being, social justice, and extra-individual change and its belief in diversity and citizen-scientist partnerships, community psychology has provided me an ideal home from which to approach this emotionally and intellectually challenging work. As Member-at-large, I hope to continue our fields’ efforts to develop a model of science that enriches and improves communities and that brings a diverse array of citizens and scientists together to work toward common goals.

One of the principal responsibilities of the Member-at-large is to coordinate our program at the American Psychological Association annual meeting. I am currently completing the final year of a three-year term as annual conference chair for the American Evaluation Association. I have also served the AEA as local arrangements chair and associate conference chair. The AEA conference is an annual multidisciplinary and international gathering that attracts about 1,200 participants. As chair, I oversee all aspects of the conference from the review process for the 600 to 900 session proposals we receive each year to session scheduling to developing conference policy to designing social events. Throughout my chairpersonship, the conference committee and I have expanded opportunities for student and community participation, professional development, and networking, and introduced novel session formats. I have also implemented policies and procedures to insure that diverse voices are represented on the program and worked with my AEA colleagues to improve our efforts to evaluate the conference and use the evaluation results. My AEA experience has provided me with an invaluable opportunity to learn how to coordinate and shape an exciting conference that responds to the needs and interests of academic and non-academic practitioners alike. I would like to bring similar enhancements to our APA program. In particular, it is my aim to increase the involvement of nonacademic practitioners and community members in our meeting. I would like to explore ways we can diversify the formats on our program to encourage scholarly exchange and debate. I also aim to nurture our recent efforts to embrace diverse research methods and attend to the voices of those that have heretofore not had a voice in our field. I view this latter goal as important for the health of our conference program and for the intellectual and spiritual growth of our field as a whole.
The “Community Practitioner” is a regular feature of The Community Psychologist providing an opportunity for practitioners and others working in applied settings to define critical incidents, describe innovative examples of practice and discuss ethical dilemmas and other issues related to community practice in a journal format. The editors hope that the “Community Practitioner” will serve as a means of defining professional role(s) for community psychologists and other practitioners, informing practice in a variety of settings and promoting action designed to address social problems.

The “Community Practitioner” will be published one or two times per year depending on the number of submissions received. The editorial board will make decisions concerning publication of manuscripts. Manuscripts submitted to the “Community Practitioner” will receive blind, peer review by at least two reviewers. Articles should be brief (six to eight double spaced pages) and should conform to the publication standards of the fifth edition of the Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association. The editors may recommend that some articles be expanded for dissemination in other formats (electronically, publication in another journal, etc.). Future plans include featuring longer articles about practice and inviting them to submit their stories to the “Community Practitioner.”

A. The format for articles for the “Community Practitioner” is flexible. However, authors should note that the primary purpose of the “Community Practitioner” is to inform practice. Major articles should include the following information: Description of the issue/project/dilemma
B. Why the issue/project/dilemma is important from the perspective of community practice
C. Context or setting(s) in which action related to the issue/project/dilemma took/is taking place
D. Explicit definition of the role(s) of the community practitioner
E. Lessons learned about community practice/social change that could be applied in other settings

Submission of manuscripts implies that articles have not been published elsewhere. Authors should also ensure that projects comply with APA ethical standards for research and interventions. Authors who have questions should contact Dave Julian at djulian@communityresearchpartners.org or (614) 224-5917 (ext. 101).

An Introduction to the First Issue of the Community Practitioner
By David A. Julian
Community Research Partners, Columbus Ohio

The impetus for developing the “Community Practitioner” goes back to a meeting convened by Bill Berkowitz and Maurice Elias at the Society for Community Research and Action Biennial Conference in New Haven in 1999. There was a great deal of discussion at this meeting and in the months that followed concerning the purpose and importance of developing a practice journal and the most appropriate format for conveying information that would be useful to community practitioners. Many of the individuals involved in this conversation pointed out that a large part of the audience for the “Community Practitioner” was most likely not affiliated with SCRA, nor were many members of this audience likely to be community psychologists. However there was a high degree of consensus that community psychology had much to offer community practice. A major challenge was to develop a format and promote a writing style useful to practitioners in the field. The current incarnation of the “Community Practitioner” evolved out of this debate.

I’m pleased to present three articles that make up the first issue of the “Community Practitioner.” I’m also pleased that there are several articles in the “pipeline” that should be ready for the next issue. Finally, it is interesting to note that several authors of current articles and articles in review are from disciplines other than psychology (sociology, social work, education) and several practitioners have expressed interest in writing about their experiences. I would like to suggest that readers seek out individuals in their communities who have something to contribute to our understanding of community practice and invite them to submit their stories to the “Community Practitioner.”

I would like to suggest that readers seek out individuals in their communities who have something to contribute to our understanding of community practice and invite them to submit their stories to the “Community Practitioner.”

Davie Julian
The Concord Neighborhood Network: A Distinctive Organizing Model

By Bill Berkowitz, University of Massachusetts, Lowell

In community organizing, and in community practice more generally, there is a mismatch between what is possible and what exists. What exists in most American neighborhoods and communities - there are exceptions - is limited social cohesion and formidable personal distance. What is possible, at the very least, is to raise the cohesion and lower the distance by multiple degrees.

Should this occur? Most people choose their communities; most report being happy where they live. Yet if vibrant and embracing community life really does promote physical and emotional well-being, reduce crime, and yield better outcomes for children—if it really does convey multiple benefits, both personal and social, as many recent studies suggest (see Putnam, 2000, for a detailed review)—then community practitioners ought to reexamine and reinvigorate their efforts to make those benefits come about.

One way to do so is to seek out and publicize distinctive community organizational models. This short article describes the origin and functioning of a simple, elegant, timely, and replicable model (the Concord Neighborhood Network), suggests some factors that have made it successful to date, and considers some implications for community practice.
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The Network

The Concord Neighborhood Network operates in a suburban Massachusetts town of about 16,000 residents. Its dual purposes are to promote neighborliness and to strengthen emergency preparedness. To accomplish its purposes, almost the entire town has been organized within micro-neighborhoods of about 25-40 households each.

How did it start? The network was formed in 1999, largely in response to Y2K. Concord residents, like those in many other communities, were unsure of how much of a threat Y2K would really be. Like many others, they felt it was prudent to prepare. But unlike many communities elsewhere, they organized. More than 100 neighborhood contacts were recruited, each agreeing to take lead responsibility for a limited geographic area.

Mobilized by the possible threat, the neighborhood contacts drew up lists of people in their small neighborhoods, especially those who were elderly or who had special needs. Using an inventory sheet, they checked off their neighbors' resources and skills, particularly those connected with emergencies. (Who is a nurse? Who has a generator?) They made sure their neighbors were properly prepared for what might lie ahead. As development progressed, the police became increasingly interested and involved, for they saw the network as having the capacity to reach and serve most of the town.

Town-wide meetings were organized and the neighborhood contacts were briefed by local officials on basic emergency procedures and responses. When all that work was done, everyone waited.

Of course, when Y2K came, nothing happened. Not surprisingly, the network went dormant for a while. Yet it never died, for the initial focus had been on building stronger neighborhoods as well as on preparing for emergencies. The potential emergency had receded, but the neighborhood-building work would be ongoing. Gradually, the network revived. Among its activities in 2001:

- The neighborhood contacts agreed to bring the people in their neighborhoods together at least once a year, if only to visit with each other and to have a good time.
- The neighborhood contacts made or facilitated visits and calls to elderly, handicapped, or ailing neighbors, especially in severe weather conditions. This would make it easier to get help in a snowstorm, or if a special need arose.
- The network organizers created an e-mail list to notify the neighborhood contacts of updated crime and crime prevention information, as well as public safety and health advisories.
- In cooperation with the Concord police, the network also began to supply the neighborhood contacts with similar information by phone, using a DialLogic automated phone notification system, akin to a “reverse 911.”
- Working again with the police, the network revitalized an FM radio station based at the high school for rapid dissemination of public information to all townspeople during emergencies. A bonus here was providing high-school youth with what has turned out to be the school’s most popular extracurricular activity.

Then the events of September 11 and following occurred, which gave the network an entire new reason for being. I was fortunate to attend a meeting of the full network as a guest this past October. The meeting was exceptionally well planned, with roving greeters, color-coded name tags (for breakout groups), crisply-designed overheads and a strictly timed agenda. A large full-color standing map, created...
through the town’s geographic information system, showed all the neighborhood areas in fine detail. More than 80 of the neighborhood contacts were present. They were first addressed by the Town Manager, the Police Chief, and the Fire Chief, each of whom endorsed the network heartily - very understandably so, for a citizen network and town government are natural and symbiotic allies.

Next came the main agenda item: The original steering committee had decided to dissolve, and evolve instead into a more structured board of directors. Job descriptions were circulated, including those for co-chairs, plus separate chairs for education/outreach, fund-raising and emergency management. Board members could also be team leaders for a cluster of neighborhood groups. A nominating committee submitted names for the various chair positions and a vote was taken. The breakout groups then discussed network needs for the immediate time ahead before reconvening to agree on short-term goals and ratify an action plan.

Readers of this article will not be strangers to community meetings, nor am I, but I have rarely attended any meeting so well organized, so effective, or, for that matter, so exciting. An entire community was being interconnected. The network is still evolving; its future can’t be as- sured. But for the moment, the transforming possibilities of community organizing were being realized.

Some Precedents

The Concord Neighborhood Network may be a distinctive organizational model, but it also has distinctive historical precedents. Community organization and civic participation tend to be higher in times of war. As Robert Putnam reports in Bowling Alone, 16,000 block captains in Chicago were sworn in at a mass civic ceremony in a public stadium in 1942. There were 7.5 million American Red Cross volunteers in 1945, more than 12 million registered members of the civil defense corps before that, and nearly 20 million victory gardens throughout the country, providing 40% of the nation’s wartime vegetables (Putnam, 2000, pp. 269-270).

Another, almost-forgotten precedent, dates back more than 80 years. In 1917, the Mohawk-Brighton neighborhood of Cincinnati was chosen by citizen vote to become a demonstration site for the newly-formed Cincinnati Social Unit Organization. The neighborhood was divided into 31 blocks of about 500 people each. Each block elected its own block council, which in turn elected a block worker to the larger neighborhood organization (block worker election turnout was 71%).

The citizen organization generated activities ranging from block parties to community sings to drama clubs. But the centerpiece project in Mohawk-Brighton was a child health center, through which over 5,000 visits were soon made to more than 500 babies. Shortly thereafter, the neighborhood organization sponsored prenatal and post-natal care, preschool medical exams, bedside nursing, and disease prevention programs. As Robert Fisher concludes in his compelling account, “In two short years the Cincinnati Social Unit Organization had established one of the most comprehensive, effective, and cooperative public health programs in the nation” (Fisher, 1984, p. 25).

Victory gardens are now a faint historical memory, Mohawk-Brighton fainter still. But if achievements like that can happen once, and if achievements like the Concord Neighborhood Network can happen now, they can happen again, and elsewhere. They will be more likely to happen if we are wise enough to learn from prior experience, to synthesize the key lessons learned, and to put them into practice. We can identify some lessons here:

One is that forming community organizations, even town-wide community organizations, can be conceptually simple. One divides up the territory, finds a leader in each territorial unit, promotes creativity and autonomy within those units, forms a coordinating structure, and lets things fly. Managing the details is another story, to be sure. But the basic organizational concept is within the grasp of most, and the basic action steps are within the reach of many.

A second is that to create such an organization, large or small, does not require specialized training, technical skill, or professional community development experience; it does not even require money. Not that these assets aren’t helpful, far from it. But the co-founders and co-leaders of the Concord Neighborhood Network were and are a retired Selectman and the owner of a floral essence business. They were formally untrained. In shaping the network, they were steering by the seats of their pants, and quick to admit it. And the network started with no budget at all - even though now, having found success, its leaders are looking.

The key success ingredients, at least in Concord, were situational, operational, and personal. Situationally, there was an outside threat, the timing was right, local government was supportive, and the network leaders had strong community ties. Operationally, the network had a dual emphasis—neighborliness and emergency preparedness—so that there was always an action agenda. The network structure also encouraged individual neighborhood creativity (“Let 100 flowers bloom” was a byword), promoted a bottom-up philosophy and maintained nonpartisanism, all the while providing centralized guidance and support. Personally, the leaders had a vision for their community, they were motivated and tenacious, and they had good interpersonal skills, so that they could both articulate their goals and persuade others to follow them. When you combine the right situation, the right operational structure, and the right personal qualities, extraordinary things can happen. Sometimes they do.

A third lesson has to do with the role of the community psychologist. What should it be, with respect to initiatives such as this? We have numerous productive options. Direct implementation is one of them, though possibly not the best choice. The heavy lifting of implementation can be good for you—it surely builds character—but that work may better belong to community residents, whose community and neighborhood it is, and who know more about it than we do.

Professionals have potentially more useful roles: Consultant, in the best sense of the word (Advisor* might come closer). Informal or formal supporter, a role not to be underestimated, for professional support can do much to legitimize an initiative in everyone’s eyes. Catalyst of similar organizing initiatives. Disseminator of outstanding examples and best local practices. As is being attempted here. A good community practitioner is in the import-export business. Finally, dreamer or inventor, for our belief is that there are many more organizing models waiting to be created and adopted by someone. We don’t yet know what they are, but if we are motivated, we can apply our energies to their conception.
Necessity may be the mother of invention, but motivation may claim paternity. With attentive parents such as these, nurturing new community ideas, we can be optimistic about the future of community practice.
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Recommendations for Enhancing School/Social Services Partnerships in an Urban School District
By Jerry Bean, Kathryn Runyon, David Julian & Roberta Garber
Community Research Partners, Columbus, Ohio

In 1997, the Battelle Memorial Institute in Columbus, Ohio provided a small grant to the local United Way to generate recommendations regarding the delivery of health and social services in the Columbus Public Schools (CPS). CPS is a large, urban district with almost 70,000 students. The state of Ohio recently placed CPS on “academic emergency” status indicating that the district has failed to meet minimum state standards on a variety of academic indicators. This project was guided by the premise that strengthening linkages between health and social service providers and schools would result in improved outcomes for students including better attendance and academic performance. The United Way Education Vision Council (EVC, one of six United Way planning and policy groups) assumed responsibility for setting the direction of the project.

The project, as conceptualized by the EVC, focused on the role of social service providers in the schools and how best to invest resources in such programs. The local United Way provided financial support to a wide range of community organizations that delivered services in and through CPS. However, members of the EVC experienced some difficulty in making decisions about how to best invest education related dollars to achieve academic outcomes consistent with state standards. Decision makers often did not have a clear picture about what services were provided in various schools and there was often limited information about the scope and effectiveness of school based/linked services. Historically, it proved difficult for EVC members to identify gaps, duplication of effort and circumstances where services should be expanded or curtailed. The EVC commissioned a study designed to generate a set of recommendations to address these issues. This paper provides brief background information related to school-community partnerships, an overview of the project methodology, recommendations for funders of services and school district personnel and a summary of lessons learned that might have application in other communities.

Background
In the past decade, there has been an explosion of interest in understanding and developing partnerships between schools and communities/social service agencies. In fact, for many, the concept of educational reform has moved well beyond the traditional instructional and management emphasis and now includes considerable attention to the importance of having parents and communities actively involved in the academic lives of children. A number of models have been proposed (Adelman & Taylor, 1999; Melaville & Blank, 1993; U.S. Department of Education, 1996; Lawson & Hooper-Briar, 1994, 1997) that share a common focus—how to provide social services to families that reduce barriers to student learning and/or build upon the strengths and positive aspects of students’ lives.

It is clear that many students benefit if social service are provided in schools or are linked to schools. Such services are often directed toward reducing non-academic barriers to learning or promoting parental/community involvement in the educational process. Recent studies (Hooper-Briar & Lawson, 1994; Kalafat & Filback, 1998; Slavin, Karweit & Wasik, 1994) demonstrate that students have the greatest chance for academic success if families can create home environments that encourage learning, express high expectations for their children’s achievement and become involved in their children’s education. Specific benefits for students include higher test scores and grades, better attendance, higher graduation rates and greater enrollment in post-secondary education. Also, there are tangible benefits for teachers and school administrators when families and the community institutions become involved in the educational process and when non-academic barriers to learning are addressed. Table 1 identifies seven principles of effective school-community partnerships. These principles are based on a selected review of the literature (Center for the Future of Children, 1992; Crowson & Boyd, 1993; David & Shields, 1991; Dryfoos, 1994; Emerging Coalition for Community Schools, 1998; Kalafat & Filback, 1998; Kirst & Kelley, 1995; Kirst, 1994; Melaville & Blank, 1993; Slavin, Karweit & Wasik, 1994; US Department of Education, 1994; Wang, Haertel & Walberg, 1994; Weinstein, Soule, Collins, Cone, Mehlhorn & Simontacchi, 1991).

Study Methodology
The principles identified in Table 1 below provided a framework or a guide for the current study. The study methodology included five steps. The research team: 1) identified two elementary schools where administrators expressed an interest in participating in the study; 2) conducted a service inventory in the pilot schools; 3) collected data related to the status of social service programs in the pilot schools; 4) provided training and technical assistance to representatives of social service programs provided in the pilot schools; and 5) developed recommendations for providers, funders and school personnel to facilitate partnerships between social service agencies and schools. The study methodology yielded several key findings related to the current status of social service in the CPS. These findings are indicated in Table 2.

Recommendations
The recommendations for school-social service partnerships defined in Figure 3 emerge from the findings identified above. These recommendations are designed to increase the capacity of schools to develop effective partnerships with community social service
providers. The recommendations are aimed at assuring that service providers design and implement programs based on the needs of students and families served by the school and focus on outcomes for those students and families that contribute to the academic mission of the schools.

The recommendations in Table 3 imply that school personnel, funders of programs and program providers must work together as an organized system for school/community partnerships to be effective. Such collaboration requires actors to devote significant resources toward common goals. Thus, effective collaborations in a school setting require program providers to develop programs with specific outcomes linked to the academic goals of local schools. To be maximally effective, providers must also measure and report outcomes. In turn, funders of programs in school settings must invest in those programs that demonstrate a contribution to academic goals. Thus the notion of an integrated system is critical to the success of school/social services partnerships.

Lessons Learned

As is true for community practice in general, the lessons learned in this project focus on the practitioner’s opportunity to facilitate a well planned and thoughtful process for change. The community practitioners involved in this study developed a four-stage process for facilitating school-social service partnerships. This process provides the opportunity for school personnel, funders and social services providers to adopt many of the behaviors suggested in Table 3. This process would appear to have application in any community interested in fostering and/or strengthening school-social services partnerships.

Step #1: Conduct needs assessment. Community actors must become aware of family and student needs. This might occur through a formal community needs and resources assessment that identifies significant family conditions which present barriers to learning for students. Such an assessment should be conducted at the building level and might be undertaken through a partnership between the school district and local funders of school-based/linked programming. Several models for needs assessment are available, including student and parent surveys and/or key informant interviews. The goal of such research is to understand the nonacademic barriers faced by students in a particular school building. Such assessments might also identify community resources available to address specific conditions in the schools.

Step #2: Identify potential school-based/linked programs. The second step involves identifying programs and services that can systematically address community/family conditions. These programs and services should be both school-owned and school-linked. There should be a mixture of service types such as prevention, early intervention and treatment. School personnel and program providers should also assure that programs and services are accountable for outcomes and that there are clearly defined pathways from identified barriers to anticipated outcomes (sound program models).

Step #3: Select services to be provided in the building. Step three requires building administrators to review the catalogue of potential services and select programs to be provided during a specific time period (usually a specific academic year). The services selected should address the needs identified by families and students, contribute to overcoming non-academic barriers to learning and be defined in terms of specific outcomes to be achieved. The link between program outcomes and the academic mission of the school should be apparent.

Step #4: Evaluate impact. Step four requires program providers, school personnel and funders of school-based/linked services to evaluate the impact of programming. This should include two components. Providers must measure outcome achievement at the program level. Program outcomes may or may not contribute to academic achievement. For example, a student health program might focus on improved health status. (It is important that the program model link improved health to academic achievement.) The second form of evaluation that must be undertaken in this situation is measurement of academic success. The combination of the evaluation of program outcomes and student performance at the building level provides the opportunity to assess the impact of specific services on a variety of academic indicators.

The establishment and support of a district-wide, comprehensive strategy for school/community partnerships using the model described in this article should result in a number of benefits. Some of these benefits include: 1) increased support of children, parents, and families through strengthened community resources and relationships; 2) support for families and schools to solve immediate problems and to develop the capacity for prevention of student failure; 3) establishment of collaborative activities among the community in support of schools; 4) involvement of a wide range of community resources in support of student success; and 5) a common understanding, framework, and language across schools and providers focused on the needs of children and families. Partnerships between schools and community organizations have the potential to improve academic achievement and ultimately to promote lifelong success for the students of urban school districts. Community practitioners are ideally positioned to design, implement and evaluate such partnerships.
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**Table 1. Principles of effective school-community partnerships.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Principles of Effective School-Community Partnership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Services must be systematic, comprehensive and coordinated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Services must be responsive to the needs of families and children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Services must be accessible (provided at opportune times with support such as child care).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Family and parental participation is key ingredient.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. A balance approach focusing on prevention, early intervention and remediation is important.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Leadership and long-term commitment are critical to success.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. A commitment to outcomes and results that relate to academic goals is essential.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table 2. Key findings regarding school-community partnerships in two Columbus Public Schools.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Findings Regarding Partnerships in Columbus Public Schools (CPS)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. CPS does not have an overarching policy or set of guidelines to govern relationships with service providers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There are few formal mechanisms that attempt to facilitate relationships between schools and service providers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Service providers are not integrated into the mission of the schools.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Programs in schools are most often the result of ad-hoc processes and may or may not be focused on needs related to CPS’s educational mission.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table 3. Recommendations for enhancing school/social services (community) partnerships**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Providers Must:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Develop sound program models.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Specify expected program outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Measure and report outcome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Link program outcomes to the school’s academic mission.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program Funder Must:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Look to schools to identify academic outcomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Partner with schools to define needs of children and families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Partner with schools to build intervention models.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Invest in school based programs that conform to school recommendations.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Building Administrators Must:**

1. Work with providers to gain access to targeted families and children.
2. Integrate community services into school planning.
3. Continually evaluate the impact of school based programs on the school’s academic mission.
4. Measure and report academic outcomes at the building level.

---

**District Personnel Must:**

1. Act as a centralized authority to set policies and support programming.
2. Provide annual orientation to program providers summarize district requirement for school based/linked programs.
3. Ensure that providers understand and address the academic mission of the school.
In Search of the Holy Grail: Affordable Housing
By Leonard A. Jason & Cordelia M. Holbert, DePaul University

“Affordable housing” sounds like a topic that warrants the attention of community psychologists, particularly those with interests in individuals with disabilities and/or those with low incomes who are in need of this type of assistance. For many years, we have seen the consequences of inadequate housing for those with controversial disabilities, such as chronic fatigue syndrome (CFS), multiple chemical disabilities (MCS) and Fibromyalgia (FM). These individuals are not only fatigued but also have multiple viral and other somatic complaints that make their quality of life among the lowest of all disability groups. Many medical personnel and social service agencies question the legitimacy of these conditions, and services such as affordable housing are rarely provided.

In November of 2000, the first author heard about a Housing and Urban Development (HUD) program called “811.” In brief, this HUD grant allows an organization to request funds to buy land and renovate or construct new housing. Once the housing was constructed, at government expense, the rent for those in the building would be subsidized by HUD so that a person would never have to pay more than 30% of her/his adjusted gross income on rent. In addition, services could be provided to those in the building, again funded by HUD, so that residents could be driven to a supermarket or medical appointment, or a person could be hired to cook meals for the residents. The government distributes hundreds of millions of dollars each year for these types of housing initiatives. Our group at DePaul University began to collaborate with officers of the Chicago Chronic Fatigue Syndrome Association, a local self-help and advocacy organization, on an 811 grant application.

In December of 2000, we contacted Brian Gillen, a Community Builder at HUD, and he provided our group with information on requirements for this particular grant. Brian mentioned to us that in order to submit an 811 HUD application, one needed to have site control over the land—what this meant was that the owner of the land had to sell our group an option that reserved the land for our use. We also needed to hire a consultant to work on the actual writing of the grant application. In order to submit a competitive application, Brian said that our group would need funds to pay for an environmental site assessment (which would cost about $20,000), $10,000 to cover up front costs to pay a housing and grant consultant, and $10,000 for what is called a minimal capital investment, to pay for things such as site control over the land.

Brian also mentioned that he knew the Housing Commissioner of Chicago, Jack Markowski. Brian was confident that Jack would give us money for such a worthy cause.

The next step was finding a consultant. We were given a list of consultants who had successfully written 811 applications in the past. We called one of the consultants, Katie Grand, and she said that she would work with our group, and that we could pay her the consultation fee in late May, when the grant needed to be submitted. She also said that she would begin actively working with us once we had secured a site for the building. Katie mentioned to us that HUD funders might question our ability to actually manage an expensive housing project. In order to deal with this issue, Brian gave us a list of the agencies in the Midwest that had previously submitted these types of grants, and we called several of the individuals who represented these agencies. Jane Smaga at Lutheran Social Services of Illinois had considerable experience managing 811 projects and agreed to have her agency submit the grant. Her agency and she would subsequently establish a not-for-profit board to manage the building (members of the Chicago CFS Association would be appointed to be members of this board). It seemed as though everything was now in place: A consultant with experience in writing these grants, an agency with experience in managing these types of projects, and a possible source of funds to cover the costs of land and other grant related expenses. At this point, we had talked to about 30-35 different organizations in Chicago that had experience with housing issues, and our group felt that we were on the path to success.

The next two months were spent looking for available land, and while we located several buildings that could have been renovated, it appeared that HUD preferred to have vacant land because it cost more to renovate buildings to be compliant with Americans with Disabilities Act housing standards than to build a new building. In addition, it was learned that the funds from HUD would generally not cover demolition costs or the costs of purchasing a building that was to be demolished, so it was imperative that we find vacant land. Our group soon realized that the City of Chicago had very few vacant plots of land in safe areas that were not already purchased for commercial purposes.

In February of 2001, a meeting was arranged with the Commissioner of Housing for Chicago, Jack Markowski. There were 12 people invited to this meeting, representing a variety of different organizations including the President, Vice President and Board members of the Chicago CFS Association; Jane Smaga from Lutheran Social Services; Katie Grand our grant consultant; our realtor, and several representatives from DePaul University. On the day of the meeting, the Commissioner’s secretary said that an emergency meeting had been called with the Mayor, and the Commissioner would not be able to make our morning meeting, but would be available at 2:00 PM. We quickly called those that had been invited to this meeting, and most were able to change their schedules to be available for the afternoon meeting. At 1:45, two of the Commissioners’ assistants came into the meeting room and mentioned that the Commissioner had been delayed but would eventually get to the meeting. Bill Povalla, the manager of program development, and Ellen Sahli, the person in charge of special needs housing, talked to us until 3:00 when the Commissioner entered the room. After we gave him a brief presentation about the need for affordable housing for people with CFS and other types of fatigue-inducing illnesses, the Commissioner mentioned that he could help us secure land in empowerment zones, but such land would be in high crime areas. Katie Grand said that HUD would probably not approve grants in these areas, particularly as the residents would have disabilities and safety issues would be involved. The Commissioner also mentioned that we could apply for a capacity building grant, but we could only apply for $5,000. If we wanted a pre-development loan, which could be for a larger amount, it would have to go before the City Counsel, and we would not get the loan before May when our grant was due. In addition, if we were to get these funds, the site for the building...
Group, but it would be best if there were not people currently living in the units. For if there were people currently living in the units, then a building that had not yet been built. The reason for this was that it was to be built and that we could not just purchase apartments in the building needed to be built so that HUD inspectors could insure arrangement with the owners to have certain units purchased by our already constructed, and met ADA standards. We could establish an arrangement with the owners to have certain units purchased by our group, and we would have to pay relocation fees to the current occupants. And that we needed to have site control over the land and entire building have commercial space within the building. However, when Brian checked with our Community Builder at HUD, and Brian said that this would involve paying for our grant consultant. Our group then learned of a real estate company that owned several parcels of land in the suburbs. We left with neither.

The meeting had left our group very disappointed, however, we had several other possibilities that had been brought up in the meeting. For example, on Lincoln Avenue, there were several Tax Increment Financing (TIF) districts, and an Alderman and a representative from the City Planning Department scheduled a meeting with our group to discuss the building of our HUD project on land that was in this TIF district. The TIF is land or buildings that are problematic and need to be redeveloped. The particular building in this instance was a motel that was being used for illegal activities, and Pat O'Connor, the Alderman, wanted to rid his district of these motels. When we met with the Alderman, he stated that he would write us a letter indicating that we could have site control over the land in his district where a motel was located, but that the motel owner would probably sue us for loss of his business. He was confident that we would win the legal battle, but that the judge would probably make us pay a higher than market value price for the building because the owner would not only be losing the motel but also his means of making a living. Alderman O'Connor said that if our building was income generating, he could possibly get the cost of acquiring the motel and land donated to us by the City, but because we were a non-profit and would not be generating income, he could not get the City Counsel to get us this property for free. The Alderman was hoping that the HUD funding would pay for this motel and legal costs, but we informed the Alderman that the HUD funds would not pay for either the building or demolition costs. In only two and a half months the grant needed to be submitted and we were in a race to find vacant land and funding.

Through another series of contacts, our group learned of a real estate company that owned several parcels of land in the suburbs. Our group went to see this land and we learned that it had been zoned for commercial purposes on the first floor, but it could be residential on the higher floors. Mike Pontarelli the realtor said that he would construct the building and then sell our group 10-15 units for our HUD project. This would solve many problems, for we would not have to pay about approximately $10,000 for site control and we would also not have to pay to do an environmental assessment on the land. This meant that the only cost for our group to submit the grant would involve paying for our grant consultant. Our group then checked with our Community Builder at HUD, and Brian said that this would be a novel application, and that he liked the idea of working with a realtor in developing a project that would house individuals from our group as well as others from the general community, and also have commercial space within the building. However, when Brian checked with his legal department in Washington, we were informed that we needed to have site control over the land and entire building that was to be built and that we could not just purchase apartments in a building that had not yet been built. The reason for this was that the building needed to be built so that HUD inspectors could insure that it met ADA standards. However, we were told if the building was already constructed, and met ADA standards, we could establish an arrangement with the owners to have certain units purchased by our group, but it would be best if there were not people currently living in the units. For if there were people currently living in the units, then we would have to pay relocation fees to the current occupants, and the HUD grant would not be able to pay for these expenses. If the building had been built by a developer and met ADA standards but was not occupied, we could negotiate with the owners to take possession of certain units. The only problem with this scenario was that if the building was built, the owners would not be able to get funds from the HUD grant for over a year, so they would lose income for that period of time, and as you can imagine, no owner would enter into such an arrangement.

Our final experience involved a second grant consultant, Roberta Nechin, who mentioned that the Ada S. McKinley Agency, was both a developer and a social service agency. Timothy I. Monahan, a manager at McKinley met with our group and he was very excited about putting up a building on land that the agency owned. The good thing about this prospect was that this agency could both pay for the grant writer and had possession of the land, so there were no expenses that would accrue to our group. In the last three weeks before the 811 grant deadline, we recognized that this was our last chance, at least for the 2001 year (there is only one opportunity a year to submit an application for this HUD program). Unfortunately, the next week, we were informed that the land had been scheduled to be used for another purpose, and without the land, our group was unable to submit the application for the May 2001 deadline. At this point in time, our group is continuing to build relationships with social service agencies, not-for-profit organizations, individuals and foundations with the objective of moving this project forward for the next application date in May 2002.

What had seemed a relatively straightforward and simple task, to write a HUD grant application, turned out to be complex and difficult. Every time our group pursued a particular course of action, we would confront problems of identifying land that would fit our needs for the HUD grant. Our group found that gaining the resources to even apply for the HUD grant was extremely problematic. Our group has gained a much better perspective on why so few grants are actually written in this area. It is now clear why those that tend to write the 811 grants are relatively large not-for-profits with considerable economic resources. It is painful to describe ongoing difficulties in working for social and community change. This could help explain why the obstacles in working for change are harder to communicate or less often discussed at our meetings and conferences.

Requests for reprints should be sent to Leonard A. Jason, Ph.D., Director, Center for Community Research, DePaul University, 990 W. Fullerton Ave., Chicago, IL 60614.
A Response to Cherniss
By Christopher Corbett

Cary Cherniss, SCRA's new President, to his credit, has extended multiple invitations for members to respond with ideas and suggestions to promote greater participation, inclusion and membership in our research organization (Cherniss, 2000; 2001). Further, in his latest Presidential Column, he notes that the executive committee has established a task force that will examine not only SCRA’s mission statement but also all of SCRA’s other public documents (Cherniss 2001, p.4). In this brief response, I propose concrete suggestions for consideration by the membership and the task force in this endeavor of extraordinary implications.

First, I would like to strongly urge that the review of SCRA’s public documents include what I believe to be the single most important—yet overlooked—set of foundational documents of nonprofit organizations. Specifically, I am referring to the bylaws. I never appreciated the importance of bylaws until conducting research on the best practices of nonprofit organizations in an effort to understand the underlying causes of many high profile nonprofit scandals that continue to plague the country (Corbett, 1995). In this effort, I surveyed 101 “A” rated nonprofit organizations and requested copies of their bylaws. As a result of examining, comparing and summarizing these documents, coupled with additional research, it is my conclusion that bylaws have a profound potential to influence an organization as the bylaws help shape the “behavior setting”. Of course, if no one has a copy of the bylaws and has no idea of what is in them, the potential role of these documents remains untapped. Moreover, it is my hypothesis that it is the process of their development and modification with the full participation of the membership which holds the greatest promise for influencing and shaping the research organization’s behavior setting.

Good faith organizations must take their bylaws seriously as they help frame and shape the behavior setting. The bylaws have the potential not only to promote accountability by board members but to operationalize participation in an organization’s processes. For example, it has been proposed that resolving the “applied versus academic researcher dilemma” can be achieved by establishing an evaluation committee elected by the membership (Corbett, 1997). Also, it has been proposed that greater participation and inclusion in SCRA could be accomplished by expanding SCRA’s bylaws to open them up to be more inclusionary. Currently, Article II of our bylaws limits membership to persons who have an active interest in the field of community psychology. Yet, the vast majority of society’s social problem solvers have never even heard of community psychology. It has been proposed that Article II of SCRA’s bylaws be expanded to include “Any individual researcher, practitioner, student, government official, policymaker or other person or organization that supports the activities of the Society (Corbett, 1999, 2001). This would expand our membership across field, discipline and employer to potentially include representatives of government which is essential to expand SCRA’s influence to national and state social policymaking. Further, this would expand beyond our limiting orientation at the individual level of membership to include organizations, including foundations. Effective social problem solving requires the involvement and interplay of both the government and nonprofit sectors, including nonprofit organizations that deliver critical goods and services to advance the public good. This could expand SCRA’s influence to increased focus on systems level change and also potentially attract economic support from the many foundations which fund many of society’s social problem solving efforts. We talk about promoting inter-organizational linkages—but are there concrete changes to SCRA’s behavior setting which could expand and operationalize that goal?

It has been proposed to explicitly expand SCRA’s membership to include international members and organizations (Corbett, 1999). While SCRA has significant international membership, that class’ unique identity is not formally captured through membership. Given the very different economic conditions internationally, a different dues structure to encourage greater participation of individuals and organizations would then become possible.

While making these changes will not revolutionize SCRA overnight, exploring such changes and whether and to what extent changes are supported by SCRA’s membership becomes the first step in transforming an organization to promote its evolution. Finally, this is a sampling of ideas that ideally should generate reactions, counter-proposals and further discussion as to how the membership wishes, or is willing, to evolve. Some of the cited references contain excerpts from SCRA’s existing bylaws and propose actual draft language with their rationales. I urge that the task force include a strong focus on reviewing the bylaws which have not been revised since August of 1994 and involve the membership in a thorough exploration of who we think we are and what, if anything, the membership is willing to do to potentially alter SCRA’s behavior setting and potentially promote an expansion of SCRA’s influence for more progressive social change.
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Response to Christopher Corbett
By Cary Cherniss

Christopher Corbett has raised some interesting ideas that deserve serious consideration by SCRA members and the Executive Committee. I would only like to clarify one aspect of his piece, and that concerns the task force to which he refers at the beginning of his response. The task force had a more limited focus, and life, than Christopher suggests. It was created only to examine how well our public documents reflect our commitment to the value of diversity. The task force completed this work in about 3 months and submitted its recommendations to the Executive Committee. This fall the membership has been voting on whether to accept those recommendations, which concern the wording of our mission statement and goals. After the task force completed its assigned task, it was dissolved and no longer exists.

Although I am no longer "SCRA’s new president," I hope that our new president, Abe Wandersman, along with the other members of the Executive Committee, will consider Christopher’s ideas, and I appreciate the time and effort that Christopher has taken to formulate them.

Community Psychology In Chile:
Report on the 28th Inter-American Congress of Psychology
By Mark B. Borg, Jr.

I recently attended and presented a paper at the 28th Inter-American Congress of Psychology in Santiago, Chile (July 27 – August 3, 2001). The overriding theme of the conference was “Toward a Psychology for Human Well-Being.” The conference celebrated the 50th anniversary of the founding of the Inter-American Congress of Psychology and held, as it’s general focus, a need for psychologists in the Americas to shift our focus from pathology and deficit to a perspective that is more oriented toward human potential and well-being.

This report details certain aspects of my experience of the conference, South American community psychology, and on some of my passing sociological observations of community life in Chile. The audience and other panelists’ reactions to my paper were telling in this regard. My paper was titled, “Conflict and Resolution in Community Psychology.” I primarily focused on active intervention approaches to community psychology, empowerment, and primary prevention. I presented detailed descriptions of a number of community revitalization projects that I have been involved in. My main point was how active community interventions, in contrast to purely empirical or assessment-oriented approaches, can address the real and problematic circumstances of communities characterized by acute and/or chronic trauma (Borg, Garrod, & Dalla; 2001). I focused on how an active empowerment intervention can assist community members in formulating collaborative solutions to self-defined problems in living (Rappaport, 1986; Zimmerman, 2000). The ways that such problems may become highlighted and malleable in the context of a community crisis were also explored. Details of a model for community revitalization and the potential means of tapping into the synergistic potential (Katz, 1984) inherent in a specific community’s, often unrecognized, resources (i.e., service agencies, resident advisory councils, etc.) was elaborated.

Three main points were addressed in discussing a model of community action. These points were developed through the explication of a number of community revitalization projects that have been applied to acute and chronic crisis in a number of intervention settings (e.g., post-riot South Central Los Angeles, the current tertiary educational system in South Africa, and the transitional living situation of a number of New York City residents deemed “Homeless/Mentally Ill”). The three points were:

1. Point of Impact: The point of impact is the intersection between a current traumatic event and the historically experienced and shared pain/more chronic pain in the community. It is the emotional epicenter of chronic and traumatic pain in a community that can be unlocked through a current acute crisis/trauma (e.g., the riots in South Central Los Angeles, a natural disaster, political violence).

2. Community Experience: Individuals generally experience trauma in relative isolation with a general lack of understanding as to its long-term impact (Herman, 1997). Through the point of impact, trauma in a community, experienced at the group level, can be shaped and shared through common language. This common language can serve to link the individual experiences of community members to relational and historical bonds that may not be recognizable in the context of a community that has, perhaps necessarily, detached itself from the chronic and everyday experience of trauma (e.g., oppression, poverty, disenfranchisement).

3. Community Character: Like an individual, community members (especially in the context of chronic trauma) can develop characteristic ways of interacting with each other that manifest in rules, regulations, sanctions, and taboos that work to maintain security and decrease awareness of overwhelming levels of anxiety within a community (Borg, Garrod & Dalla, in press).

I have gone into some detail regarding the content of my presentation with the aim of describing how the participants in the discussion received these ideas, most poignantly the idea of an active and participatory community intervention. I presented my paper in a forum with four other community psychologists working in South America: two women from Brazil, a woman from Chile, and a man from Argentina. I was the only English-speaking presenter and provided a summary of my paper in Spanish for the other presenters and the attendees. I spoke in English to an audience of Spanish- and Portuguese-speaking people who had apparently interested, though quizzical, looks on their faces. My face, most likely, looked similar to the synergistic potential (Katz, 1984) inherent in a specific community’s, often unrecognized, resources (i.e., service agencies, resident advisory councils, etc.) was elaborated.

The other presentations focused on empirical research and highly academic presentations of work in South American community psychology. The studies focused on the outcome measures and assessment techniques utilized to obtain an epidemiological understanding of what are and where are the problems and/or crises in specific geographical areas in various South American regions. As I attended other community psychology presentations, I observed that this was the general approach presented within the overall context of the conference.
There was a woman in the audience whom I recognized from other panels and presentations that I had attended. She had a very strong reaction to my presentation. During the discussion portion of the panel, she began an emotional dialogue with the panel coordinator, Dr. Beatriz Viscarra Iarranaga, a professor at the University of Temuco in Chile. Their conversation moved at a pace and intensity that, in my already relatively sparse understanding of her Spanish, I could not, at least content-wise, make out.

Dr. Iarranaga translated this Chilean woman’s reaction and discussion for me. The woman was describing what Martin-Baro (1990) referred to as “psycho-social trauma,” which is wide-scale trauma experienced at a societal level that threatens the social contracts generally maintained between people in a given culture. Martin-Baro was a Central American community psychologist who was murdered specifically related to his work in the community that was considered “subversive” by members of a revolutionary force, who were utilizing the same tactics of the totalitarian regime that they were opposing. The woman discussed emphatically that Chile’s history of such (psycho-social) trauma was infrequently addressed in terms of its impact on still oppressed and disenfranchised communities in the country, as well as in other Latin American countries.

The atrocities experienced in Chile under the Pinochet regime required the promotion of a countrywide repression, where political views that ran counter to the regime’s were not tolerated. This resulted in the use of the terrorist technique of disappearance (e.g., the ‘desaparecidos’ – the missing) of those whose views were considered to be threatening to the regime. There are not yet reliable figures on the number of lives lost through the tactic of disappearance in Latin American countries (Spooner, 1999). Thus we begin to make sense of the depth of the “siling,” even among psychologists, that the Chilean practitioner was referring to. Pinochet’s regime reigned in Chile from 1973 through 1990, and neither Pinochet, nor members of his regime have yet been held accountable for the atrocities committed “against humanity” in any meaningful way (Spooner, 1999). In the discussion that continued after the presentation, community psychology in South America was critiqued for its passivity (silence and inaction) in response to the “politics of disappearance” (Virilio & Lotringer, 1997, p. 89).

Relevant to community psychology and the political history of Chile is the concept of colonization. Cultural theorists utilize the concept of colonization to describe the processes wherein one culture imposes its values and assumptions on another (Fuery & Mansfield, 2000). This process results in the perpetuation of self-hatred, feelings of inferiority (in contrast to the “dominant” culture), and severely entrenched ambivalence about the resources, value of personal potentials, and opportunities available in the environment. In the totalitarian regime enforced by Pinochet and the Chilean military, it was the culture of the military, rather than an imperializing and hostile foreign force that colonized Chilean citizens. This form of colonization, wherein one group colonizes another group within the same country is called “endocolonization” (Virilio & Lotringer, 1997, p. 95). Endocolonization is ultimately perpetuated when one identifies with the oppressive force and, in turn, continues to oppress others in one’s own population (or culture, or family). Colonization becomes internalized and perpetuates itself within a culture, resulting in a state of enforced invisibility (Moses, 1995).

Endocolonization can result in a widespread sense of uncanny confusion that can lead to vast areas of unacknowledged experience in individuals (Bromberg, 1998; Sullivan, 1953) and within the character structure of the community (Borg et al., 2001). This process relates to the condition wherein the very sources of security and protection are simultaneously the sources of oppression and terror. In the intervention conducted in South Central Los Angeles and New York City, there was not an expressed or overt sense of being traumatized by a totalitarian and omnipresent government regime. Yet, community residents consistently expressed a sense of underlying anxiety related to the overwhelming and all-encompassing experience of not knowing who was the “enemy” or where the “danger” was coming from. In this sense, the more chronic aspects of trauma among the South Central LA and New York communities are not so dissimilar from the expressed and reported experiences in South Africa (Merideth, 1999; Welsh, 1999) and Chile (Spooner, 1999; Verdugo, 1990).

As it was translated to me, the woman’s question was, “When will community psychology in Chile address the ways that our own history of trauma has been silenced and how this silence still manifests itself in the ‘missing’ people who exist on the periphery of our society? When will we find a way to see the people who have been silenced and sanctioned off into invisibility by our inability or unwillingness to become actively involved in addressing the manifestations of wide-scale silencing of problems such as the poverty, hopelessness, and despair that still exists here?” I cannot say that this woman verbalized a general sentiment of South American, or even Chilean, community psychologists. She attended many of the presentations that I attended and it was only in the panel that I have been discussing that she shared these sentiments. However, the participants in the discussion certainly seemed to empathize with this woman’s sense of frustration and indignation about their concerns for the community.

As I traveled to Chillan, which is a city that is about 480 kilometers South of Santiago, I thought about this woman’s questions and her sense of urgency regarding active, participatory intervention in the disenfranchised communities throughout Chile and other Latin American countries. Along the roadside, especially at the peripheries of major cities such as Santiago, there are numerous shantytowns constructed of plywood, cardboard, and other seemingly disposable materials that one might find among the refuse of a metropolitan city. There is, in general, no running water and no electricity in these communities. The “social events” travel brochure for the conference, while detailing the archeological wonders of Easter Island, the ominous and enchanting Atacama Desert, and the wonderful beach resorts along the coast in Vina del Mar, made no reference to these places as places of potential interest to psychologists. One of the travel brochures suggested that tourists “zoom en/in on Chile” (Panselino, 2001, p. 54), though I feel fairly certain that this kind of an exploration is not what the author had in mind.

In touring these makeshift roadside communities, I observed that innumerable families cram themselves into whatever space they can scrape together. According to the post-panel discussion, in such places, people live their lives in a kind of silenced anonymity. Perhaps in these places people are safe from emotional investments in the hope for a future in the aftermath of an essentially genocidal political regime wherein no one knew exactly who or where the danger was coming from. There are reports of neighbors turning each other in and family members reporting “communist” activities of other...
family members (Spooner, 1999). Perhaps in these communities the trauma of living in years of terror has become part of the general architecture that separates these people from a hostile and apathetic world. In such places, dreams for the future and trust in the social and political environment can be well hidden. Perhaps they are hidden, at least in part, from the community members themselves. Thus, the “politics of disappearance” remain enshrined in the character of these disenfranchised and (almost) unseen communities.

In her argument, the Chilean community psychologist insinuated that a longstanding, leftover, and implicit resistance continued to be held by South American psychologists, hindering their intervention in the community. This resistance, she stated, manifests in wide-scale and perpetual “silence” and “perpetual inaction.” If this is true, it may be imperative to address the point that practitioners in health-related fields operate within the social, economic, and political systems wherein they work (Arendt, 1958; Foucault, 1978). Being a mental health practitioner in no way implies being sheltered from systems of oppression. In fact, in most totalitarian regimes being a psychologist, community, clinical, or other, represents a subversive act (Martin-Baro, 1990; Montgomery, 1995). Therefore, addressing such a possible resistance for community practitioners may necessitate the difficult process of working through and coming to terms with one’s own history of victimization. Perhaps in this context silence represents a kind of action potential that is shared by practitioners and members of the communities they serve.

What might one observe if one tapped into that action potential? There are numerous oasis-like service centers between Santiago and Chillan along the main highway. These are gas-station/food-market/restaurant/bathroom (often with showers)/social-gathering places. These multi-purpose centers are clean, modern, and infinitely welcoming. Nice attendants take your 150 Pesos (roughly equivalent of about a quarter) as you enter, stating “buenos días,” “tardes,” or “noche” according to the time of day or night that you might arrive at the open-all-night/open-all-week/open-all-year service center. Behind many of these centers, serving as counter-point to the general ambiance of prosperity, exists the make-shift communities that I referred to. A psychodynamic question might be: do these brilliant, though forlorn way stations, in some way, represent the glimmering, dissociated, and projected hope inherent, but unreachable, or at least unsustainable, within these communities?

At one such service station just outside Chillan, there exists a massive community made up of plywood and cardboard. The woman who took my 150 Pesos at the service station said that she lived there. As I looked at her community I stopped and stood between the multi-station and the complex makeshift city that, from the highway, was not quite hidden. I looked back toward the road and saw the familiar sign that many of these service stations utilize as an advertising slogan, a silly cartoon popsicle character stating through a gleeful smile, “Pronto!” From where I stood, it seemed as if that sign symbolized the answer to the questions posed by the woman at my panel. Essentially, her question to the community was: when might we come together to break the imposed silences that still exist? “Pronto!” The sign stood out as a silent though urgent response that, in my imagination, was coming straight from the community existing behind the shimmering icon of modern society stating (in translation): “Right Away!”
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MONTEREY DECLARATION OF CRITICAL COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY
Drafted by Holly Angelique and Ken Kyle

(Names appear in alphabetical order. Each person contributed equally.)

Preface

From August 5th through August 9th, 2001, a small group of community psychologists and friends attended the Inaugural Critical Psychology Conference in Monterey, California. Following two presentations on the need for critical perspectives in the field, by Holly Angelique and Ken Kyle, a group of attendees decided to create a Declaration of Critical Community Psychology. Under the editorial direction of Kyle and Angelique, members met in working groups at the conference to discuss the Declaration and later provided feedback via electronic communication. Following is the resulting document. We hope this will serve as a foundation from which to move the field forward.

Preamble

Whereas the Swampscott Conferees of 1965 were motivated in part by a desire to prevent or reduce individual suffering, and by a vision of a more just world,

whereas the Conferees acknowledged that psychological intervention at the individual level was inadequate to address individual suffering,

whereas the Conferees declared that “community psychology … is devoted to the study of general psychological processes that link social systems with individual behavior in complex relations (Bennett et. 1966, p. 6-7) and whereas community psychologists have not adequately developed that linkage thus far

Now, therefore

We, the undersigned participants of the Monterey Bay Conference on Critical Psychology do declare:

that preventable human suffering is the result not only of individual psychopathology, but also of individual, group, community and governmental acts, as well as social, cultural and institutional arrangements;

that much preventable human suffering is, therefore, intrinsically tied to social injustice;

that community psychologists must, therefore, work for social justice by engaging in both ameliorative and transformative acts at multiple levels; and

that the field of community psychology must adopt a critical theoretical stance and enact policies and practices in keeping with that stance if the Swampscott vision is to be realized.

Critical Theoretical Principles and Policy Guidelines for Community Psychologists

Article 1 - Ethical Obligation to Redress Social Injustice
Community psychologists have an ethical obligation to redress social injustice and to work actively to transform social, cultural and institutional arrangements that foster social injustice.

Article 2 - Vision of the Good Society
Community psychologists should employ a critical vision of the good society; i.e., we should evaluate policies and institutions on the basis of what could be, not on the basis of what is “normally” acceptable.

Article 3 - Understanding Human Behavior in Context
Community psychologists should understand human behavior in context; i.e., we should actively work to develop an understanding of the social institutions and forces in which individual humans are enmeshed, and we should adopt a social-ecological perspective in our work.

Article 4 - Consciousness Raising and Critical Thinking
Community psychologists should actively foster critical thinking among community members, students and colleagues, and facilitate conscientization whenever possible.

Policy 1 - Full Collaboration and Partnership Between Community and University
Community psychologists should collaborate with communities to design and evaluate projects in light of their potential to effect social change, and community psychology programs should place greater emphasis on community involvement in graduate practice.

Policy 2 - Methodological Diversity
Graduate programs in community psychology should reduce their emphasis on quantitative methods to the exclusion of other methodologies, and should expand the role of participatory research methods.

Policy 3 - Development of Theory
Community psychologists should develop theories that include in-depth analyses of human subjectivity, power asymmetries and social change.

Policy 4 - Broad Interdisciplinary Training
Graduate programs in community psychology should include interdisciplinary training in both theoretical and substantive areas of inquiry.

Policy 5 - Address Inequalities
Community psychologists should acknowledge the ill effects of ableism, ageism, bigotry, economic structures that exploit and impoverish, homoprejudice, misogyny, racism, sexism, speciesism and white supremacy, and work to undo them in our community interactions and in our scholarly activities.

Signatures, appearing in chronological order:

Holly Angelique, Community Psychology, Social Sciences and Community Psychology & Social Change, Penn State Capital College, USA

Ken Kyle, Sociology, Social Sciences and Community Psychology & Social Change, Penn State Capital College, USA

Jorie Henrickson, Vanderbilt University, USA

Ann V. Millard, Medical Anthropology Program, Department of Anthropology, Michigan State University, USA

Stephanie Austin, York University, Canada
By David S. Glenwick, Fordham University, and Leonard A. Jason, DePaul University

We read Stephen J. Fyson’s (2001) hostile and sarcasm-laden critique of behavioral community psychology with a mixture of dismay and irritation—dismay because of his resurrection of battles that we thought had long ago been settled, and irritation because of the half-truths, falsehoods, and distortions that fill his diatribe. We respond to some of these:

1. Behaviorism is a recent player (or would-be player) in community psychology. “Oh dear! The behaviorists have arrived within Community Psychology!” In actuality, behavioral approaches to community psychology have existed for over two decades, having been advanced in several volumes (e.g., Glenwick & Jason, 1980, 1993; Nietzel, Winett, MacDonald, & Davidson, 1977), at least one special issue of a major journal in the field (Glenwick & Jason, 1984), and numerous empirical articles. Because of mainstream community psychology’s relative lack of receptivity (due to a variety of historical factors, such as the founding generation and its offspring having their roots in psychodynamic and humanistic strands of psychology), many behaviorally oriented studies have appeared in noncommunity psychology outlets (either behavioral publications or publications having a suitable content focus, such as health, conservation, or safety).

2. Behaviorism is a no-win approach. “If this is true [that behaviorists “have enough knowledge about future social causation...to bring about change”] “then they have social power over their ‘subjects’... If it is not true..., the intervention becomes a process, which then becomes known for its intent or effort.” So, if behaviorists can produce change, it must be Mephistophelian; if they can’t, then behaviorism is impotent and without value. Yossarian in Catch-22 would understand this well.

3. Behaviorism is employed only when there is opposition to change. “If there was no opposition, he would not need a behavioural intervention.” This statement is similar to the one quoted in the previous paragraph in its view of behaviorism as requiring social control and top-down change. It ignores several thoughtful pieces (e.g., Bogat & Jason, 2000; Fawcett, 1990, 1991) regarding the importance of a collaborative partnership between behavioral researchers/program developers and community participants (not subjects).

4. Behavioral approaches ignore the larger context within which interventions occur. “Planning must rely on knowledge sources that go beyond what the empiricists can supply. Any intervention with a community must look more fully at the nature of the context into which it is being applied.” So, who disagrees with this? Few, if any, behavioral community psychologists would advocate exclusive reliance on empirical data in decision making. Indeed, with their focus on environmental factors, most behaviorists are acutely sensitive to the social, cultural, and political contexts that influence the usage of data, and affect the behavior of, the various stakeholders in a community.

5. Social planning is not an appropriate activity for behavioral community psychologists (or community psychologists in general). “Planning is not so much a subject for the social scientist, as for the theologian.” We would argue that while behaviorists (or any one else for that matter) should not be the sole designers of social change programs, they do have a contribution to make due to their attention to empirical data (as one source of knowledge) and the environments in which social change programs operate. Examination of various actions spearheaded by theologians or having a theological base (from the Middle Ages to 9/11/01) does not inspire one to place much confidence in decisions grounded exclusively in morality. Morality can, on a group level, rapidly devolve into narrow-minded ideology, with one person’s morality becoming another’s perfidy.

Fyson’s piece was especially disheartening because we had hoped that, by now, behavioral community psychology had achieved a place at the community psychology table. We believe that behavioral community psychology provides an orientation and a tool that, in concert with other perspectives and knowledge sources, can meaningfully inform our work with communities. Rigid adherence to an assumption that only behavioral or nonbehavioral community psychologists can only result in less effective and less humane social change efforts.

References
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...With visions of the Eco-conference dancing in their heads...

By Hillary Heinze & Nathaniel Israel, Co-Chairs, Eco 2001 Planning Committee

On a chilly Friday in October, Nathaniel and I pulled up to Camp Pretty Lake looking fearfully at a sky ridden with clouds. Will it rain, storm, snow...or, more importantly, will any one bother attending ECO this year? For us Wayne Staters, it was the first time we ever hosted, or even attended, the Midwest’s ECO conference. (For others of you who haven’t been exposed to ECO, it’s an annual conference held in the Midwest for community psychology students and their mentors from across the nation). We spoke amongst ourselves, tentatively yet hopefully, of how the following 36 hours would unfold.

The attendees trickled in. Students and faculty from the University of Illinois at Chicago, Penn State University, University of Missouri-Kansas City, and the University of Illinois-Urbana-Champaign arrived in time for cold pizza and a lively discussion of community programs, research projects and the events of the following day. We then retired to our state-of-the-art 20-(wo)man cabins, reviving the 60s fad of “co-sleeping”. Some of us, of course, did not sleep. Would everyone come? What will we do with all of that extra pizza? And how does one build a campfire in the rain?

Early Saturday morning, the troops arrived: More UIC folks, students and faculty from DePaul University, students from the University of Pennsylvania and the University of Missouri-Kansas City, and our keynote speaker, Steven Howe, from the University of Cincinnati. Various issues were discussed throughout the day, ranging from promoting connections with under-served groups to community responses to the World Trade Center tragedy. For Nathaniel and I, the day passed like a dream, and, whether it was due to elevated cortisol, caffeine, and/or nicotine levels, the specifics of the weekend remain vague. What we won’t forget, however, was the atmosphere of encouragement, camaraderie, interest and support created by all that attended.

In sum, people came, we ran out of bottled water, yes it did rain, a fire was built anyway, we met many interesting people, and we learned more about the state of community psychology. In addition to everyone that came to Pretty Lake, making ECO a successful and rewarding experience, we would like to thank Dr. Howe for his informative and thoughtful presentation, and Evelyn Yang and Wendy Siebold from Michigan State University for all of their suggestions and materials from ECOS of yore. Also, thank-you UIC for hosting ECO next year (see their announcement below)! Finally, we would like to thank the Community Research Team at Wayne State: Paul Toro, Mason Haber, Sawssoon Ahmed, and Carolyn Tompsett, and Sarah Chase (a community researcher at heart!) for all of the hard work and patience put forth in planning and running ECO 2001.

***SAVE THE DATE***

The graduate students at the University of Illinois at Chicago invite you to the: 2002 MIDWEST ECOLOGICAL-COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY CONFERENCE

OCTOBER 11-13, 2002

CAMP PRETTY LAKE

MATTAWAN, MI

For more information, contact Katie McDonald at kmcdonald.1@uiuc.edu or Rebecca Beyer at rbeyer.1@uiuc.edu

---

The Community Psychologist, Volume 35, Number 1, Winter 2002
Research in Social Psychological Aging Workshop

Nationally recognized experts in research methodology related to social psychological aging will lead a workshop specifically designed for social psychology faculty. The overarching goal of the workshop is to expand the pool of social psychologists engaged in conducting research on aging. The workshop will be held at the Essex Inn preceding the APA Convention in Chicago on August 19-21, 2002. Participants will also have the opportunity to maintain contact with the workshop faculty and with the NIA staff during the intervening year and attend a follow-up workshop prior to the 2003 APA Convention. Food, lodging, and travel support will be provided for twelve applicants selected to participate in the program. Please visit program Web site: [http://www.css.edu/socialPsyAging](http://www.css.edu/socialPsyAging) for additional information. For more details and application materials, please contact Chandra M. Mehrotra, Director, Social Psychological Aging Workshop, The College of St. Scholastica, 1200 Kenwood Avenue, Duluth, MN 55811 or via email: cmehrotr@css.edu. Application deadline is May 1, 2002.

8th Trans-Tasman Community Psychology Conference

This international conference will be hosted by Edith Cowan University and the Australian Psychological Society College of Community Psychologists, in Perth, Western Australia, from the 27th to the 29th June 2002. The conference is aimed at encouraging interdisciplinary collaboration, as well as participation from community members, advocates, practitioners, policy- makers and other stakeholders. The overall theme of the conference is Working Towards Inclusive Communities: From Rhetoric to Reality and will centre on the exploration of power and inequality in our communities. The conference is designed so that participants identify the issues of relevance and interest in their own communities to which the theme of inclusion applies. For further information regarding the conference or to view the venue and accommodation please see our website at [www.ecu.edu.au/ses/psych](http://www.ecu.edu.au/ses/psych). You can also contact Dawn Darlaston-Jones, School of Psychology, Edith Cowan University, Joondalup Campus, 100 Joondalup Drive, Joondalup WA 6027, AUSTRALIA; Tel: 61 8 9400 5543; E-mail: d.darlast@ecu.edu.au.

Community, ethics, and values: IV European Congress of Community Psychology

Barcelona 6-8 November 2002

INVITATION AND CALL FOR PAPERS

We invite you to participate in the IV European Congress of Community Psychology to take place 6 to 8 November 2002 in Barcelona. It is organized by the European Network of Community Psychologists (ENCP) in collaboration with the School (Facultad) of Psychology of the University of Barcelona and the Institute of Education of Barcelona. The Congress follows those held in Roma (1995), Lisboa (1998), and Bergen (2000). It is intended as a forum for meeting, exchanging, and discussing issues of common interest of community psychologists and educators from an European point of view. It will specifically focus on the following topics: Social values and their social dynamics, Ethics of community intervention and human development, Sense of community-theoretical and practical meaning, Community psychology-European perspective(s). Goals of the Congress are: presenting theoretical and practical advances on these topics, exchanging experiences and viewpoints about them, and reaching conclusions useful in the community and educational areas.

Contributions to the Congress will take two basic forms: participatory round tables focused on the referred topics; workshops on selected practical topics. Other possibilities (such as direct publication in the Congress proceedings) are also planned for contributions which, given their topics or formal characteristics, may not be included in any of the available round tables or workshops.

General Information

Site: School of Psychology Theater, University of Barcelona. The Facultad of Psychology is located in the university campus of Valle Hebrón, in the hillside of the Tibidabo mountain, in Barcelona. It is accessible by subway and bus lines.

Congress languages: Spanish and English; simultaneous translation will be provided for round tables.

Registration: Fill in registration form included on these web sites:
- [ENCP](http://www.europe-community-psych.org)
- [Social Psychology Department, University of Barcelona](http://www.ub.es/dppss/modelc.htm)

Upon receipt of the registration card participants will be sent information regarding payment procedures and accommodation arrangements. Given limited capacity of the hall seating the congress, registrations will be admitted by strict order of reception and payment of the registration fee.

Registration fee: General: 25.000 pesetas (150 euros) before May 31, 2002; 30.000 pt. (180 E) after June 1. Students: 15.000 pt. (90 E) before May 31; 20.000 pt. (120 E) after June 15, 2002. Besides Congress sessions and workshops, the fee includes beverages available during sessions.

Abstracts: Participants must send, by May 31, a 200 to 250 word abstract of the communication (round table or workshop) to be considered for presentation in the Congress and to be distributed to all participants. Abstracts must clearly and briefly describe contents of communication they wish to submit. They must include name of authors, institutional affiliation, and electronic and postal addresses. They will be sent in paper and diskette in language Word 6, font Times New Roman 12, single spaced and, if possible, in format RTF. Papers admitted for publication in the Congress proceedings should not exceed 12 pages with the same language and format; they must be delivered (in paper and diskette) during Congress celebration.

Call For Papers

Contributions are invited for the next issue of Network, the Journal of the Australian Psychological Society, College of Community Psychologists. The theme of the issue will be Psychology, Multiculturalism, and Racism. The issue will present a selection of papers to stimulate debate about the challenges of cultural diversity and showcase the ways community psychology can contribute the promotion of positive cultural diversity. To achieve this we are keen to receive a variety of contributions that address issues related to this theme, including theoretical, empirical and reflective pieces. We are also keen to include discussions and book reviews. All papers will be reviewed.

Please send your contribution to Network Special Issue Editors, Lynne Cohen and Christopher Sonn, Attn: Lynne Cohen, School of Psychology, Edith Cowan University, Joondalup Dr, JOONDALUP WA 6027 AUSTRALIA. Email contributions are also welcome at [lecoheng@cowan.edu.au](mailto:lecoheng@cowan.edu.au). The deadline for submissions is 31 May 2002.
CALL FOR PAPERS:
SPECIAL FEATURE ON TEACHING COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY

TO ALL TEACHERS OF COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY COURSES:

Have you developed innovative ways to engage students in learning about community or preventive psychology?

We are planning a TCP Special Feature on Innovations in Teaching Community Psychology, to appear in the Fall 2002 issue. We’re interested in both graduate and undergraduate courses, and especially in these topics:

- innovative exercises and activities in the classroom;
- projects in the community and/or community service learning;
- experiencing and learning about human diversity;
- reflective papers on paradoxes and issues for teaching;
- international perspectives on teaching.

DEADLINE FOR SUBMISSION OF PAPERS: June 15, 2002

For information on submitting manuscripts, contact: James H. Dalton, Ph.D., Phone: 570-389-4475, Email: jdalton@bloomu.edu

General Information

2003 APA SCIENTIFIC AWARDS PROGRAM: CALL FOR NOMINATIONS

The American Psychological Association (APA) invites nominations for its 2003 scientific awards program. The Distinguished Scientific Contribution Award honors psychologists who have made distinguished theoretical or empirical contributions to basic research in psychology. The Distinguished Scientific Award for the Applications of Psychology honors psychologists who have made distinguished theoretical or empirical advances in psychology leading to the understanding or amelioration of important practical problems.

To submit a nomination for the Distinguished Scientific Contribution Award and the Distinguished Scientific Contribution Award for the Applications of Psychology, you should provide a nomination form, a letter of nomination, the nominee’s current vita with list of publications, up to five representative reprints, and the names and addresses of several scientists who are familiar with the nominee’s work.

The Distinguished Scientific Award for Early Career Contribution to Psychology recognizes excellent young psychologists. For the 2003 program, nominations of persons who received doctoral degrees during and since 1993 are being sought in the areas of:

- social;
- behavioral and cognitive neuroscience;
- perception, motor performance;
- applied research (e.g., treatment and prevention research, industrial/organizational research, educational research);
- individual differences (e.g., personality, psychometrics, mental ability, behavioral genetics).

To submit a nomination for the Distinguished Scientific Award for Young Career Contribution to Psychology, you should provide a letter of nomination, the nominee’s current vita with list of publications, and up to five representative reprints.

To obtain nomination forms and more information, you can go to the Science Directorate web page (www.apa.org/science/sciaward.html) or you can contact Suzanne Wandersman, Science Directorate, American Psychological Association, 750 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20002-4242; by phone, (202) 336-6000; by fax, (202) 336-5953; or by E-mail, swandersman@apa.org.

The deadline for all award nominations is June 1, 2002.

ELIOT WERNER PUBLICATIONS

Introducing Eliot Werner Publications (EWP), a new publisher of academic and scientific books in psychology and related fields. Our mission is to publish high-quality books at prices that are affordable to individual scholars, researchers, practitioners, and students as well as libraries and other institutions. Our emphasis is on professional service, accessibility, personal responsibility, and developing long-term relationships with authors and customers.

Included within the EWP umbrella is Percheron Press, a division devoted to reprinting important books in the above fields (with new introductions) that are no longer available from the original publishers. We are pleased to announce that seven distinguished researchers have agreed to edit a reprint series for Percheron Press:

Eliot Werner, the founder and president of EWP, has twenty-five years experience in scholarly and scientific publishing. As social sciences editor at Academic and Plenum presses between 1978 and 2001, he oversaw the publication of approximately seven hundred books in a wide range of fields while initiating or acquiring nearly sixty journals, book series, serials, and treatises. For further information please contact:

Eliot Werner, President
ELIOT WERNER PUBLICATIONS, INC.
PO Box 268
Clinton Corners, NY 12514
Phone: (845) 266-4241
Fax: (845) 266-3317
E-mail: kochwerner@vh.net

THE PSYCHOLOGY OF TERRORISM: MIND GAMES AND MIND HEALING

Philip G. Zimbardo, President of the American Psychological Association

As the war in Afghanistan winds down and the relentless hunt for Osama bin Laden continues, our government is gearing up for what is promised to be a long battle against the shadowy, ubiquitous enemy of world wide Terrorism. Leaders from the corporate, scientific and technical sectors of our country are collaborating to develop strategies for combating almost every conceivable kind of terrorist attack - bio-terrorism, cyber-terrorism, nuclear terrorism, terrorism...
against our reservoirs, grain stores, food delivery systems, and of course airlines, tunnels and bridges. They are working on the assumption of international enemies with sophisticated technologies and ample resources to deliver lethal attacks that would cripple our nation’s functioning. Putting their big security plans into operation will cost billions of “better safe now than sorry later” taxpayers’ dollars. Given the current state of national angst over the devastating attacks on the World Trade Center and Pentagon, along with the anthrax mail contamination, most Americans are ready to pay almost any price for greater security.

But what is missing in this big view of the demonic, technologically savvy Enemy bent on mass destruction? Missing is the recognition of the less obvious psychological perspective on what terrorism is all about. Terrorism is the process of inducing fear in the general population by means of acts that undercut an established sense of trust, stability and confidence in one’s personal world. Unpredictable, dramatic acts of seemingly random violence are the terrorist’s signature. Our fear is a realistic emotional response to events that can harm us, and we react to fear by fleeing or fighting it, or freezing in its presence. Fear becomes anxiety when it generalizes beyond the specific danger situation to become a more pervasive feeling of personal vulnerability to things that are not intrinsically dangerous, but are linked symbolically or historically to danger. Anxiety may be triggered by current events that link to unresolved earlier conflicts, to feelings of loss of control, or to childhood states of inadequacy. The actual danger of most terrorist attacks is relatively small compared to on-going dangers in our everyday lives, such as accidents, stress-induced heart attacks, obesity-induced diabetes, or disability and death from smoking. It is the irrational anxiety that terrorists are able to spread wide and deep that amplifies their impact. Kill one president, make everyone feel threatened. Torture and rape a few and make many feel insecure. Destroy a building and have citizens worry that theirs will be next. The terrorists’ omnipresent weapon is exaggerated fear that spreads into action-crippling anxieties, especially when delivered repeatedly by television and print media. It is more likely that terrorists would suicide bomb some urban subways or time bomb a few rural school buses than poison our water or food supply. The key to combating terrorism is adopting their minimalist mind set of the rippling impact of singularly dramatic deeds, not using the lens of our grand vision of what major calamity we would inflict given our power — if we were terrorists.

In a profound sense, everything of terrorism is about psychology. Beyond their mind games is the way we cope with their threat. When national leaders repeatedly issue alerts for hyper-vigilance, they ignore all the psychological research about the negative effects of non-specific warnings without any action focus - only making us more paranoid and less mindfully alert. Many of the victims of the Sept. 11 attacks have turned to psychologists for counsel, therapy and aid to help with their overwhelming personal and family grief and stress, and we have continued to give them our services freely. Psychology is also at work in the remarkable transformation that has been taking place in communities throughout the United States. We have changed since our initial sense of feeling victimized, as the hated enemy of unknown forces, as being vulnerable in a way Americans have never felt on our homeland. We are developing a more thoughtful, mature outlook on life, sensitive to the preciousness and fragility of all life, and aware of the need to connect more deeply to family and friends. Research shows that reinforcing one’s social support network is the single most powerful act any of us can do to improve our health and longevity. There seems to be a shift away from our preoccupation with future goals and materialistic ambitions towards a better blending of our time frames to include present joys and indulgences as well as embracing past links to our roots and spiritual values. In volunteering money, blood and services, more Americans than ever before are reaching out to help our near and distant neighbors. We have all been the beneficiaries of learning of the sacrifices of so many ordinary men and women in police, fire and emergency forces at Ground Zero, who have become the nation’s new breed of hero, replacing celebrities and the idle rich and famous.

The losses of Sept. 11 still hurt and sadden us, but we are emerging as wiser, and are collectively discovering new sources of resiliency that are apparent only when our resolve and courage are put to extreme tests. We are going beyond simplistic patriotism, with its songs and slogans, to question how much of our basic freedoms we are willing to surrender for an illusion of security? We are becoming aware that there are not simple, immediate solutions for complex problems that have been in the making for decades. We can be proud of the ways in which most Americans have demonstrated tolerance for the ethnic and religious diversity that so enriches our national purpose. We can now better appreciate the depth of resiliency that has always been the hallmark of people of color and the poor in our nation, learning from them that a sense of community and kinship helps transcend suffering and victimization. Psychology is all about making the human connection, about understanding and contributing to enriching human nature. And it is about our enduring televised imprinted memory of September 11. Vibrant lives of thousands of people from New York City and its neighboring Global Village are now images held tenderly in the arms of our million memories. Psychology is about thinking, feeling and acting — sometimes to create a bit of hell and sometimes a bit of heaven on earth.

POST-DOCTORAL RESEARCH DIRECTOR, DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY, WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

Applications are invited for Research Director on an ongoing NIAAA-funded longitudinal research project on homeless and matched housed youth in the Detroit metro area. An initial 4-year grant allowed data collection for up to 3 years and a new 5-year grant just beginning will allow follow-up of the sample of 400 youth into young adulthood. The full-time, 12-month Project Director will serve as the general manager of the research project and can be appointed with the approval of the PI to oversee and manage the project, and can be appointed as a co-principal investigator. The project aims to contribute to our understanding of the development and manifestation of alcohol misuse and problems among young adults in the context of homelessness and matched housed youth. The PI holds a Ph.D. in psychology, with a background in substance abuse and mental health issues, and has a strong publication record. The PI is currently seeking an experienced and motivated individual to join the research team as a Research Director. Responsibilities include: (a) coordinating the day-to-day operations of the project; (b) overseeing the data collection, input, and computer analysis of data; (c) assisting the PI in preparing proposals to new funding agencies; and (d) planning and conducting data analyses and writing reports for publication. Familiarity with multivariate statistical procedures such as HLM and SEM are desirable. Salary is competitive. The WSU Department of Psychology offers training in Community Psychology as part of its doctoral programs in clinical (APA-approved), social, developmental, and industrial/organizational psychology. Teaching opportunities and involvement in related research projects are possible. Interested applicants should send a cover letter, CV, copies of recent publications or other reports, and 3 letters of reference to: Paul A.
The Department of Psychology seeks an Assistant Professor (tenure-track) for its APA accredited Ph.D. program in clinical psychology. Candidates with a commitment to scholarship, undergraduate and graduate education, and cultural diversity are strongly encouraged to apply. Excellence in teaching is expected, both in the classroom and in mentoring students outside the classroom. Duties include: teaching courses in psychological assessment and areas of specialization, supervising student research and clinical practica, and developing an active program of research.

Proficiency in one of the following areas is desirable: cultural diversity, child/developmental, and/or rural community psychology. Qualifications include: Ph.D. from APA accredited clinical psychology training program and completion of an APA accredited internship required (ABD near completion will be considered). Experience with ethnic minority/diverse populations preferred. Salary commensurate with qualifications and experience. Review of applications to begin April 1, 2002, and will continue until a suitable candidate is hired. A letter of application including a statement of research and teaching interests, curriculum vitae, graduate transcripts, three letters of recommendation and reprints/preprints should be sent to: Clinical Search and Screening Committee, Department of Psychology, The University of South Dakota, SDU 105, 414 East Clark Street, Vermillion, SD 57069-2390. (E-mail: msturzen@usd.edu and webpage: www.usd.edu/psyc/ctp) The University of South Dakota is an Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action employer committed to increasing the diversity of its faculty, staff, and students.

THE BRANTFORD CAMPUS OF WILFRID LAURIER UNIVERSITY

Invites applications for a full time position in its interdisciplinary program in Contemporary Studies (subject to budgetary approval). The campus is looking for someone with expertise in Community Psychology. The position will be a limited- term or tenure-stream appointment, depending on qualifications, and will begin July 1, 2002. The successful candidate will be responsible for teaching courses on contemporary issues and contemporary thought, and in Psychology, and will be expected to develop an active research program that reflects an interest in community psychology. The extended Brantford community offers particularly attractive research possibilities in the area of aging, but applicants with other interests are welcome to apply. The person hired will have the opportunity to develop links with the graduate programs in community psychology at Laurier’s Waterloo campus. A completed PhD and strength in both teaching and research are strongly recommended. Applications, including a full curriculum vitae, letters of reference, and a teaching dossier, should be sent to: Dr. Leo Groarke, Dean of the Brantford Campus, Wilfrid Laurier University, 73 George St., Brantford ON, N3T 2Y3. The deadline for applications is April 15. In accordance with Canadian Immigration requirements, Canadian citizens and permanent residents will be given first consideration. The University is committed to employment equity and welcomes applications from all qualified women and men, including persons in a visible minority, persons with disabilities, and aboriginal people. If you have questions, you can also contact Geoffrey Nelson, Professor of Psychology, Phone 519-884-0710, ext. 3314, Email nelson@wlu.ca

FACULTY POSITION IN COMMUNITY PSYCHOLOGY

The Psychology Department at Wilfrid Laurier University invites applications for a 12-month limited term or a tenure-track appointment in community psychology beginning July 1, 2002, subject to budgetary approval. Additional expertise in the psychology of women, or organizational behavior, or human diversity, and/or clinical/abnormal psychology is desired. Hiring decisions will be made on the basis of research excellence, teaching ability, leadership abilities, and fit with departmental needs. Applicants should have a Ph.D., evidence of commitment to, and superior ability in teaching, as well as an active program of research with strong potential for external funding. Applications should send a curriculum vitae, copies of recent publications, a statement of current and prospective research interests, a statement regarding teaching experience or potential, and at least three letters of reference to Dr. Angelo Santi, Chair, Department of Psychology, Wilfrid Laurier University, Waterloo, Ontario, Canada N2L 3C5 (email: asanti@wlu.ca). Applications will be accepted until April 1, 2002, or thereafter until the position is filled. Community Psychology has a thirty year history at Wilfrid Laurier University. The department offers three community psychology courses at the undergraduate level and has a well established free-standing M.A. program in community psychology. The department expects to launch a PhD program in the Fall term of
2003. The program has strong links with diverse sectors of the community. The successful applicant would be entering a very supportive academic environment with excellent opportunities for collaborative work activities with academic colleagues and in the community. The university would be prepared to hire a senior person. Applicants can learn more about the Department and current faculty interests at our website [http://www.wlu.ca/wwwpsych]. In accordance with Canadian Immigration requirements, Canadian citizens and permanent residents will be given first consideration. The University is committed to employment equity and welcomes applications from all qualified women and men, including persons in a visible minority, persons with disabilities, and aboriginal people. Should you have any questions, please feel free to contact Geoffrey Nelson, Ph.D., or [mailto:gnealson@wlu.ca] or Ed Bennett, CP area coordinator. [mailto:ebennett@wlu.ca]

POSTDOCTORAL TRAINING OPPORTUNITY

The Consultation Center of the Department of Psychiatry, Yale University School of Medicine is seeking a Postdoctoral Fellow to join our work in the areas of program and service system evaluation. The fellow will have two primary areas of responsibility: 1) joining a team conducting an evaluation of an emerging service delivery system with the goal of reducing the impact and incidence of exposure to violence in the home for children 0-6 and their families; and 2) taking a leadership role in community-based evaluations of programs serving at-risk populations. In this position, the fellow will gain skills in: evaluation consultation to community-based organizations; design and implementation of quantitative and qualitative program evaluations; data analysis; report generation; and, presentation of evaluation findings to various groups of stakeholders. In addition, the fellow will have the opportunity to work closely with a team of faculty members with extensive evaluation experience and to collaborate on the writing of papers for presentation and/or publication. Interested candidates should forward their CV and contact information for three references to Joy S. Kaufman, Ph.D., Director of Program and Service System Evaluation, The Consultation Center, Yale University School of Medicine, 389 Whitney Avenue, New Haven, CT 06511 or Email: joy.kaufman@yale.edu

FACULTY POSITION

The Department of Population and Family Health Sciences of the Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health is seeking an outstanding leader in adolescent health as a senior faculty member in the department and as the director of a Centers for Disease Control and Prevention-funded Prevention Research Center. Information about the Department of Population and Family Health Sciences and the Center for Adolescent Health Promotion and Disease Prevention can be found on the School’s website [www.jhsph.edu] under Academic Programs and Research Centers. Faculty appointment is expected to be at the rank of Associate/Full Professor. Individuals can come from any relevant discipline. Leadership characteristics sought include an established record of scholarly publications and funded research, prior university teaching experience, commitment to improving adolescent health through community-participatory research, ability to communicate effectively to university and community audiences, and a capacity to work collaboratively with faculty and staff from diverse disciplinary backgrounds. Send letter of interest, curriculum vitae, and the names of three references to: Bernard Guyer, MD, MPH, Zanvyl Krieger Professor of Children’s Health and Chair, Department of Population and Family Health Sciences, Johns Hopkins Bloomberg School of Public Health, 615 N. Wolfe Street, E4132, Baltimore, MD 21205.

FACULTY POSITION, COMMUNITY HEALTH

The Section on Social Sciences and Health Policy in the Department of Public Health Sciences at Wake Forest University School of Medicine invites applications for a tenure-track faculty position at the Assistant, Associate, or Full Professor level. We are seeking applicants with research interests in community interventions (e.g., community organizing, social marketing) and/or the analysis of community health issues (e.g., spatial analysis of health and illness, design and/or analysis of community trials). Candidates’ interests may cut across disease areas, behaviors, and populations; interest in health disparities is highly desirable. Applicants should have a Ph.D. or other terminal degree in a relevant field such as public health, health behavior, sociology, communications, or psychology. Experience in collaborative research in a multidisciplinary setting and excellent written and oral communication skills are required. The successful applicant should have a strong publication record. Experience in teaching at the graduate level and a history of extramural funding is highly desirable. The Department of Public Health Sciences has over 40 faculty and 200 staff in three sections: Social Sciences and Health Policy, Epidemiology, and Biostatistics. The Department is home to several nationally recognized research programs, including community trials and community epidemiologic studies in aging, diabetes, cardiovascular disease, genetics, cancer, substance abuse, violence, and women’s health. The Department, which obtained over $25 million in direct extramural research funding in 2001, ranks fourth in NIH funding among medical school departments of public health and preventive medicine. The Section on Social Sciences and Health Policy is comprised of 15 faculty with training in psychology, sociology, economics, public health, and law, and 50 staff. Current studies focus on a broad range of topics including quality of life, patient satisfaction, women’s health, health services research, medical decision making, insurance and managed care regulation, substance abuse, cardiovascular disease, cancer, and diabetes. Opportunities for collaboration exist with other clinical and basic science departments as well as the Comprehensive Cancer Center, the Women’s Health Center of Excellence, the Brenner Center for Child and Adolescent Health, the Center for Healthcare Research and Quality, and the Center for Community Research. For details about the section, please visit [http://www.phs.wfubmc.edu/Sections/sshp/sshp.htm]. Candidates should send a current CV and a letter indicating area(s) of expertise and interest and a list of possible references to: Mark Wolfson, Ph.D. (attn: Vicky Cranfill), Section on Social Sciences and Health Policy, Department of Public Health Sciences, Wake Forest University School of Medicine, Medical Center Boulevard, Winston-Salem, NC 27157-1063. Applications will be accepted until the position is filled. Wake Forest is committed to equal opportunity, affirmative action and the diversity of its faculty and staff. Women and minorities are strongly encouraged to apply.
SCRA Membership Application

The Society for Community Research and Action
Division 27 of the American Psychological Association

Tel. (405) 341-4960/E-mail, scra@telepath.com
on the web: http://www.apa.org/divisions/div27

Name: _______________________________________________________
Institution: _____________________________________________________________________________________________
Address: ______________________________________________________________________________________________
City: __________________________ State: ________
Zip/Postal code: __________________________ Country: _______________________________
Telephone: __________________________ FAX: __________________________
E-mail: _______________________________________________________

Do you want to be included in our membership directory? _______Sure _______No thanks

I will pay the following dues: _____ $45 (professional member)
_____ $35 (international, non-APA member)
_____ $20 (student member)

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

____ Women’s Committee     ____ Racial and Cultural Affairs Committee
____ Social Policy Committee ____ International Committee
____ Aging                      ____ Community Action
____ Children & Youth    ____ Community Health
____ Disabilities         ____ Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, & Transgender Concerns
____ Stress & Coping      ____ Prevention and promotion
____ Rural                   ____ Self-help & mutual support
____ School Intervention ___ Undergraduate Awareness

Are you a member of APA? _______yes _______no

If yes, are you? _______a fellow _______a member _______associate _______student

How did you find out about SCRA? Please tell us.

(These next two questions are optional.)

What is your gender? _______female _______male

What is your race/ethnicity? __________________________________________

Signature of Applicant ____________________________________________

Please enclose a check or money order in US funds payable to “SCRA”. Mail this page and your dues payment to:
Janet Singer, 1800 Canyon Park Circle, Bldg. 4, Suite 403, Edmond, OK 73013.
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The Community Psychologist is published four times a year to provide information to members of the Society for Community Research and Action (SCRA). A fifth “Membership Directory” issue is published approximately every two years. Opinions expressed in The Community Psychologist are those of the individual authors and do not necessarily reflect official positions taken by the Society. Materials that appear in The Community Psychologist may be reproduced for educational and training purposes. Citation of the source is appreciated.
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