

---

---

# Population and Environmental Psychology Bulletin

Vol. 28, No.2, Spring, 2002

---

---



---

---

## THE FUTURE OF THE DIVISION

---

---

### IN THIS ISSUE

#### Feature Articles

Is the Marriage Over?.....Severy	1
Responses to Severy Statement.....Multiple	2
Letter from APA President.....Zimbardo	11

#### APA Convention

<i>Symposia Abstracts</i>	
Conservation Psychology.....Brook	13
Open-Plan Offices.....Veitch	15
<i>Collaborative Program</i>	
Social Justice.....Solarz	16
Division 34 Program Overview.....	16

APA Business.....Walsh	17
------------------------	----

#### Book Reviews

Stress at Work.....Masters	18
Two Out of Three Ain't Bad.....Tassinary	19

Announcements.....	19
--------------------	----

#### Future of the WTC Site

Six Concept Plans...Lower Manhattan Development Corp	13
--	----

### FEATURE ARTICLES

#### Is the Marriage Over, or is Division 34 Salvageable?

Larry Severy,  
University of Florida

There have been troubling trends in the last several years for Division 34 of the American Psychological Association. At one time or another, I, along with recent division presidents Bob Sommer and Marie Harvey, have told myself that as the incoming president "something has to be done" to preserve a scholarly home base for our interests within the APA. The fact of the matter is that perhaps the problems are not with the division per se, but with the American Psychological Association itself. The three of us, along with others such as Henry David, view the current situation as absolutely critical and in need of immediate action. So, I agreed to write this open invitation to the membership. I shall detail some of the problems, list a few alternative courses of action, and request feedback as the division leadership tries to make important decisions about the continuation of the marriage, the potential death of the division, or plans for restructuring. Please know that this argument is mine. That said, Bob and Marie have had input into this statement and agree with most of the issues, although perhaps they have different solutions to suggest.

Each of us, and others as well, have experienced the real pain of constructing APA convention programs. Very few people submit proposals to be placed on the program. As a consequence, program chairs typically need to "beat the bushes" to put together attractive programs. The result is often embarrassment when invited participants are scheduled to perform and find fewer than ten people in the audience. The simple fact of the matter is that most of us do not save our best papers for the APA meetings, we do not look forward to the meetings as either the place to advertise and promote our best students, or to recruit. Instead, focused and topical meetings have experienced a great growth in contradistinction to APA.

This fall I was fortunate enough to attend an APA workshop for incoming division leaders. The statistics presented were staggering. About 25-30 years ago the APA

### NEWSLETTER NEWS

PEPB is an unrefereed forum for sharing news, ideas and opinions in population and environmental psychology. Opinions are those of the authors and do not reflect the official policy of Division 34 unless explicitly stated.

#### Call for Submissions

Autumn 2002

*Continued Dialogue on the Future of the Division*

October 15<sup>th</sup>, 2002

#### Sad News

Erv Zube, whom many in the landscape architecture world consider to be the father of landscape architecture research, died in February. Because Erv and his work were well-known to many in Division 34, we will publish a remembrance in the fall issue, written by Paul Gobster, James Palmer and Joseph Crystal. Gobster et al. are also preparing a paper on the significance of Erv's work to Environment-Behavior studies, which will appear in *Environment and Behavior*.

meetings were the place to be – and the elite were present. One went to network with the best in the profession. About 25 to 30 percent of all APA members attended. Now, even though the association has tripled (or more) in size, only less than 5% attend the national meetings. Further, even though membership in one division can be free, less than one half of all APA members belong to any division! Why are people joining APA? The cynical answer, perhaps, is for licensure, certification, insurance, etc.- concerns not relevant to most Division 34 members. How about our division? After building to a membership of around 600 individuals, we are now the second smallest division at less than 300.

So, where did we come from, what's wrong now, and is it worth the effort to sustain the marriage? There are actually two marriages here – the first is between population and environment and the second is between the division and the APA. Let me concentrate on the first. In the early 1970's, an APA task force focusing upon population and fertility issues came to the conclusion that, in and of itself, the topic generated insufficient attention to warrant its own division. A similar conclusion was becoming apparent to those with interests in environmental issues. Consequently, a marriage of convenience was suggested, and APA agreed to create Division 34. There are those who argue that all arranged marriages of such ilk are ill-conceived (bad pun) and doomed to failure. However, for those involved, and for the important topics of study at the time, the marriage made conceptual and theoretical sense as well. For example, many individuals were studying crowding behavior – and the intersection of interests fit the division very well. Statements in the division newsletter 25 years ago by writers such as Dan Stokols and yours truly buttressed the belief that the integration made sense.

Well, what has happened? To start, let us acknowledge that both fields have experienced change. Population is a little used term. More likely one finds “reproductive health” or “fertility and fertility regulating behavior” or “HIV/STI prevention”, etc. Even the long popular Alan Guttmacher publication “Family Planning Perspectives” just became “Perspectives on Sexual and Reproductive Health” after 30 years with the former title. The case is probably well made that there are more members of Division 38 studying such issues than there are members in Division 34. On the other side of the coin, the environmental group also displays fewer psychologists by training and more people interested in architecture, engineering, community design, and environmental degradation, than when the division was formed. Some of this is just natural. As Bob Sommer would say, it is natural because we have all followed the money trail and that is where we have been led. I would tend to agree. However, the point is that once we were close together, and now we have grown apart.

For me the larger problem is the marriage with the APA. It would be very hard for me to admit that what we as psychologists have to offer is not relevant. Members of Division 34 study some of the most important and vital issues of life on this planet! As Bob would say, we simply can not get lost in a forest of individual trees! We must continue to challenge ourselves and those in APA to focus on the big picture! That said, how do we proceed?

I am not sure how to proceed, either with the population and environment marriage, or with the division and APA marriage. However, it is certainly logical to point out that without serious attention, this organism, or this ecosystem, is not sustainable! One can quickly suggest that there are at least three traditional options:

- Let it die – simply “give back” the division – dissolve the marriage and move on. This has been done only a few times in APA history – and I can not believe that APA would like to see this happen. In this case, both population and environmental psychologists would need to find new homes.
- Divorce, but let one of the “sides” keep the house (the home division), and let the other “move out.” In this case, by focusing on only one issue, the division can be renamed to more adequately describe current interests - for example, “reproductive health, fertility and fertility regulating behavior”. In this case one only group needs to find a new home.
- Recommit to the current marriage – but with new vows. Perhaps someone knows how to restructure and rename the division to more adequately describe the two rather distinct interest groups. Accordingly, our division would need to take steps to increase the visibility of our respective fields.

The goal of this paper is to bring these matters to the attention of the membership. We do not have very good solutions. We invite serious thought and suggestions.

Our intention was to quickly disseminate these ideas via the internet, to receive responses, and to then publish some version of this piece, along with good responses, in the current division newsletter. Russ Parsons is ready to give the dialogue plenty of space in the next issue as well. With luck, the initial phase of this discussion will appear prior to the next APA convention in Chicago (if anyone plans on attending). At that time, I will devote the time allocated to a “roundtable discussion” on Friday to a discussion of ideas. In turn, the division business meeting follows later in the day, and we can begin to act in concert with the will of the division membership.

Please help. The division was a good idea when established. A dramatic re-crafting is essential if it is to survive, if you want it to survive.

---

## Representations and Understandings of Environmental Psychology

Joseph P. Reser

Applied Psychology, University of Durham, UK

Larry Severy's thoughts and concerns with respect to the current crossroads for Division 34 require considered reflection and a clear response and direction on the part of our membership.

I would hope that a variety of considerations will be canvassed in this and subsequent issues of *PEPB*. I would like to focus my own comments on the issue of *representation*, both in a social representation, shared societal understanding sense,

and in a subdiscipline presentation and identification sense (e.g., Flick, 1999; Sommer, 2000). I think this is a critical matter, and particularly germane to the matters Severy and previous commentators have raised. The most immediate and obvious consideration is that the name 'Population and Environmental Psychology' has been confusing from its inception, and has not served us well in communicating or representing the nature of either 'environmental psychology' or 'population psychology' to psychologists or nonpsychology professionals or laypersons. There is also a curious imbalance in the title as the nonalphabetical sequence tends to privilege 'population psychology' which is in reality a far more focused and very different research and policy enterprise. What is perhaps far more important, however, is the fact that the history, nature and scope of 'environmental psychology' continue to be poorly understood by psychologists, environmental professionals, and the public. To some extent such an encompassing, portmanteau character and profile is inherent to any diverse and applied research and practice domain of psychology, particularly one with such interdisciplinary synergies and crossdisciplinary overlaps. Such understandable confusion on the part of nonpsychologists, however, has been exacerbated by considerable representational and language chaos in which environmental psychology is regularly and ubiquitously confused with 'ecopsychology' (e.g., Roszak, 1992; Roszak et al., 1995), 'ecological psychology' (e.g., Howard, 1997; Winter, 1996) and other nondisciplinary-based cultural perspectives and movements. There is also the confounding of the work and scope of environmental psychology with a wider professional responsibility and public expectation for psychology to address the human behaviour and experience side - and causes and consequences - of myriad 'environmental' problems and challenges, ranging from post-disaster trauma, to housing and urban planning failures, to failing planetary life support systems.

My own view, previously argued, is that an important and neglected avenue for achieving greater professional transparency and credibility, and making a difference with respect to salient policies and problems is to foster and profile a more coherent, identifiable, and discipline-linked public face for 'environmental psychology' (e.g., Reser, 2001, 2002; Reser & Bentruperbäumer, 2001).

The problem of representation was very evident in the coverage of 'environmental' psychology initiatives with respect to environmental sustainability, in the May 2000 issue of the *American Psychologist* (e.g., Oskamp, 2000). These articles, excellent in their own way and written by environmental psychologists, rarely employed the term 'environmental psychology', and, collectively, provided a reasonably opaque and misleading picture of what 'environmental psychologists' are doing for a naïve reader. Rather, the articles, perhaps understandably for an *American Psychologist* issue focused on 'sustainability', took much for granted on the part of the audience, and addressed a particular set of behaviour change problems and issues, causal attributions, and suggested ways forward, rather than offering an overview or perspective on 'sustainability' from environmental psychology. This was a genuine missed opportunity. It is noteworthy that the response from other disciplines to this *American Psychologist* material reflected both dismay and some not unreasonable criticism

(e.g., Anderson, 2001; Schonborg, 2001). The subsequent coverage of the greening of psychology in the April 2001 *Monitor* issue provided a markedly contrasting strategy. Here, a science writer, Rebecca Clay, attempted to clearly communicate, explain and situate what environmental psychologists and (environmental psychology) are doing with respect to a spectrum of broad environmental psychology research fronts - all related to sustainability issues.

What the public and policy makers require, and what we need to be able to communicate and deliver is an environmentally and societally relevant, problem-focused, cross-disciplinary-informed, widely recognised and credible, domain of expertise, research and application. A concerted and genuine effort here would bring together committed environmentalists and environmental psychologists, recognising that many individuals have indeed been both for many years. A clearer communication of what psychology brings to the environmental arena would inform and correct the confusions and misperceptions of other professional players. A conscious and strategic reframing and refocusing of what environmental psychology is about would go a long way towards situating and clarifying public understandings, and would allow practising environmental psychologists to think through how their own work aligns with and complements the collective enterprise on which all of us are working. This will not happen by itself, at least not in a time frame which is acceptable. Such an articulation and identification needs to be guided and driven by accessible and strategic articles and media coverage, by textbooks and recognised training programs, by a clear and effective representation of what this diverse area of psychology is about.

With respect to the decision crossroads raised by Larry Severy, it is preferable, reasonable, strategically advantageous and ultimately inevitable that 'population' not be included in the Division title representing environmental psychology. As an environmental psychologist who initiated his career working on the 'population' front, researching the dynamics and consequences of human crowding, I have no problem with 'population' research taking a very secure seat in an arena filled with many other, often-related, research and application perspectives, problems, and myriad other people-setting considerations. It would be clearer, more appropriate - given the centrality of the population focus in the history of Division 34 (e.g., Altman, 1999; David, 1999) - and less contentious, to simply establish a new and separate Division for Environmental Psychology.

This argument about representation has particular resonance with Robert Gifford's argument in the Fall 1999 *IAAPS Newsletter* and in the corresponding *PEPB* issue. He notes that, in his experience, the general public, as contrasted with other social scientists, seems to "instantly understand the importance and value of environmental psychology". He goes on to say that "we need to do more to demonstrate to our professional colleagues the field's crucial importance ... we need to engage in more public advocacy of the field." The irony is that notwithstanding the public's intuitive appreciation of what we as 'environmental' psychologists are or should be on about, they are understandably confused, dismayed, and alienated by the often conflicting and incongruent public representations of ecopsychology, ecological psychology, and

environmental advocacy, to say nothing of the semantic challenge of virtually all contemporary environmental discourse (e.g., Harre et al., 1999). It is critically important to appreciate that the problem of representation and language is both broader and deeper than names and numbers: it is essential that we more effectively and clearly communicate our frameworks and findings –and disciplinary and interdisciplinary foundations - to other social and natural scientists and the public at large. We need to better appreciate public understanding of and expectations for science and research, and their particular understandings of psychology and ‘psychology and environment’ (e.g., Field & Powell, 2001). We also need to understand that placing the adjective ‘environmental’ before psychology, while necessary and appropriate, carries its own multivalenced ambiguities, and communication as well as credibility problems.

Others have, of course, addressed the representational issues I raise here (e.g., Sommer, 2000; Stokols, 1995; Craik, 1996). Indeed this discussion about who and what we are, where we sit, and how we might be more effective has been a recurrent debate and very natural point of reference over the past three decades of promising growth and at times surprising stasis for a burgeoning and hugely relevant subdiscipline of psychology. But, as Klein (1996) and Sommer (2000) remind us, an area of knowledge and practice must be identified as such and institutionalised if it is to attain influence. These prerequisites directly implicate and wholly encompass the matter of adequate representation. Happily, the representation of environmental psychology is to a large extent under our collective influence and control. The current decision quandry with respect to a separate Division status and name for Environmental Psychology provides a welcome and apposite opportunity for representing and re-presenting environmental psychology that must be taken.

## References

- Altman, I. (1999) On the marriage of population and environmental psychology. *Population and Environmental Psychology Bulletin*, 25, 3-4.
- Anderson, E.N. (2001) Psychology and a sustainable future. *American Psychologist*, 56, 457-458.
- Craik, K.H. (1996) Environmental psychology: A core field within psychological science. *American Psychologist*, November, 1186-1187.
- David, H.P. (1999) Retrospectives: From APA Taskforce to Division 34. *Population and Environmental Psychology Bulletin*, 25, 2-3.
- Field, H. & Powell, P. (2001) Public understanding of science versus public understanding of research. *Public Understanding of Science*, 10, 421-426.
- Flick, U. (1998) (Ed) *The psychology of the social*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Gifford, R. (1999) Environmental numbness and the secret science. *Population and Environmental Psychology Bulletin*, 25, 7-10.
- Harre, R., Brockmeier, J. & Mulhausler, P. (1999) *Greenspeak: A study of environmental discourse*. Thousand Oaks, Ca: Sage.
- Howard, G. (1997) *Ecological psychology: Creating a more earth-friendly human nature*. Indiana: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Klein, J.T. (1996) *Crossing boundaries*. Charlottesville, Va.:University Press of Virginia.
- Oskamp, S. (2000) A sustainable future for humanity: How can psychology help? *American Psychologist*, 55, 496-508.
- Reser, J.P. (2002) Environmental psychology in Australia: A critical and sustainable ecological niche. *Australian Psychologist*, in press.
- Reser, J.P. & Bentrupperbäumer, J.M. (2001) Social science in the environmental studies and natural science arena: Misconceptions, misrepresentations and missed opportunities. In V. Higgins, G. Lawrence & S. Lockie (Eds) *Social sciences in natural resource management: Theoretical perspectives* (pp 35-49). London: Edward Elgar.
- Reser, J.P. (2001) Situating and representing psychology, environmental psychology, and conservation vis-a-vis the natural environment and other perspectives and disciplines. *Population and Environmental Psychology Bulletin*, 27, 4-7.
- Roszak, T. (1992) *The voice of the earth: An exploration of ecopsychology*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Roszak, T., Gomes, M.E. & Kanner, A.D. (Eds) (1995) *Ecopsychology: Restoring the earth, healing the mind*. San Francisco: Sierra Club Books.
- Schonborg, G. (2001) Big brother's ecological psychology. *American Psychologist*, 56, 458-459.
- Sommer, R. (2000) Discipline and field of study: A search for clarification. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 20, 1-4.
- Stokols, D. (1995) The paradox of environmental psychology. *American Psychologist*, 50, 821-837.
- Winter, D.D. (1996) *Ecological psychology: Healing the split between planet and self*. New York: Harper Collins.

---

## Reflections on the Future of APA Division 34

Henry P. David

Transnational Family Research Institute, Bethesda, MD

In response to the editor's invitation, I am pleased to comment on Larry Severy's timely and thoughtful statement regarding the future of Division 34. My reflections are based on an unpublished paper I presented at the Division 34 Symposium on "Critical Issues Facing Population Psychology" at the August 1987 APA Convention in New York City (David, 1987), my published recollections (David, 1998), and Jim Richards' excellent history of the Division (Richards, 2000).

Population psychology emerged in response to the interest of a handful of individual psychologists and the availability of grant support - not in response to academic interests. It developed within APA when APA Council in 1969 endorsed abortion as a woman's civil right and simultaneously established a Task Force on Psychology, Family Planning, and Population Policy. It was my privilege to serve as Task Force chair, joined by Jim Fawcett, Deborah Matory, Sid Newman,

Ted Pohlman, and Vaida Thompson, and subsequently by Miriam Kelty and Nancy Russo. In its Final Report, presented to APA Council in 1972, the Task Force recommended organizing a Division on Population Psychology. Following approval by APA Council in 1973, the Division was formally established in 1974. Three years later, when environmental psychologists sought a home in APA, we invited them to join with us. Division 34 was renamed the Division of Population and Environmental Psychology.

At about the same time, colleagues from diverse scientific backgrounds thought about the interdisciplinary nature of population studies and the need for discussion beyond their own disciplinary bases. From those deliberations evolved what is now known as the Psychosocial Workshop. Beginning in 1973, we have met each year for two days before the annual convention of the Population Association of America (PAA). Although cited in the PAA Convention Program, the Workshop is not officially associated with PAA or any other organization. It is the only group I know which has functioned for nearly 30 years without dues, by-laws, or elected officers. Organized each year by two volunteer program chairs, registration covers two breakfasts, morning and afternoon coffee breaks, and a dinner at a highly regarded local restaurant that meets our needs for collegiality. The objective has been and still is to exchange information, facilitate communication, and explore innovative ideas for research and services. Most presentations are limited to five minutes - long enough to stimulate discussion. Attendance seldom reaches 100 persons. We worry when it does, lest size interferes with spontaneity and opportunities for more exchanges.

Larry Severy has well delineated the problems confronting the Division's future. Currently, Division 34 is the second smallest in APA with 292 members. Our membership is just about the same as it was at its founding. According to Sarah Jordan, Director of the APA Division Services Office, several divisions are around the 300 number. One reason for our small number within APA, recognized by Vaida Thompson (1986), the first Division 34 President, is that for many population psychologists their interest in population is a secondary interest. They are seldom mainstream psychologists. Others, as noted by Larry Severy, have progressed from an initial demographic orientation to one more focused on reproductive behavior and/or sexual and reproductive health. In addition, many of us have become disenchanted by APA - we feel lost among divergent and at times conflicting interests at meetings, and are troubled by high convention costs. The declining membership in divisions overall suggests that psychologists are becoming more selective in deciding on where and how they want to spend their shrinking support for convention participation and dues. A good many Division 34 members are active in the Psychosocial Workshop, whose interdisciplinary atmosphere may be more to their liking.

In my 1987 paper I observed that our field is driven by the availability of funds and pragmatic research interests. This nearly always involves interdisciplinary collaboration, whether focused on HIV/AIDS, adolescent pregnancy prevention, or motivation for having children. I concluded then as I believe now that psychology has unique strengths for studying the reproductive behavior and wellbeing of people in diverse cultures, for research demonstrating differences between public

policy and private behavior, and for asking "why" something is so rather than only "how many." It is less a question of the shrinking size of Division 34 or of fewer shared interests with environmentalists but rather one of viability. Are we attracting students and financial support? Are we communicating our research findings in a way that will influence public health decision-making? Do we have an obligation to do so? The excellent PEPB widens our horizons. Media people contact us, often referred by APA. Some of our findings do influence public policy in the US and abroad. NIH funding is available for well-crafted proposals focused on priority concerns.

What to do? We need to re-energize, become more visible within mainstream psychology, encourage graduate students to join with us, find a more attractive niche within the revitalized APA Convention Program (now a work in progress), and seek relationships with other divisions (such as Health Psychology). Hopefully, a Special Section of the American Psychologist on population (now in preparation) will help to advance the cause. Perhaps we could build on the experience of the Psychosocial Workshop and reorganize Division 34 as a Society of Population and Environmental Psychology, affiliated with APA. I applaud the efforts of our leadership to maintain the relationship with the environmental folks. Let us continue to explore fresh approaches.

## References

David, H.P. (1987). Thoughts on future directions of population psychology. Unpublished paper presented at the Division 34 Symposium on "Critical Issues Facing Population Psychology," 1987 APA Convention in New York City.

David, H.P. (1998). Foreword. In L.J. Beckman & S.M. Harvey (Eds.). *The new civil war: The psychology, culture, and politics of abortion*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Richards, J.M. Jr (2000). A history of Division 34 (Population and Environmental Psychology). In Dewsbury, D.A. (Ed.), *Unification through division; Histories of the divisions of the American Psychological Association, Volume 5*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association, 113-135.

Thompson, V. (1986). Where is population psychology? *Population and Environmental Newsletter*, 13 (2), 12-15.

---

## Maybe the Time is Right to Let Division 34 Go

Gary Moore, *FAPA* ('83)

Professor and Dean, Faculty of Architecture  
University of Sydney, Australia

I have read Larry Severy's interesting thought piece on the future of Division 34. I am sorry that the division is in strife, but I, among many others, am likely part of the problem rather than the solution. I am a PhD psychologist and fellow of the association. I have however long let my membership lapse, though I appreciate being on the e-mail listserv. Why? Because I have found over time that my interests have ceased to intersect in critical ways with the interests of the association,

though they have somewhat with the division. I found the last APA conventions I attended to be zoos, with too little going on of real substance for me in a sea of too many other things. I thus have joined the exodus to more focused, topical meetings where real in-depth attention can be given to issues of concern. Though now far away geographically, I do still attend EDRA and IAPS meetings, but have not attended an APA meeting, even on invitation, for many years. Like many others educated as environmental psychologists, I now identify more closely with the multidisciplinary environment and behavior field rather than with psychology. I thus spend my international travel allocations on meetings of that field, and on journals of that field, rather than on psychology meetings or journals which have only the occasional study of interest. Please note that the membership of EDRA and IAPS are each larger than the combined population/enviropsych membership of APA Division 34.

While I cannot weigh in on the three alternatives Larry Severy has offered, for surely one of them is to be preferred for those who remain wed to the APA, I personally find it most productive and am quite happy to continue to be a member of the E&B associations and to subscribe to the EB-type journals. I am quite sure there are many more like me out there, most of whom I would suspect are not even on this listserv and thus have not heard of any problems in Division 34. Maybe the time is right to let Division 34 go and to help enliven the debates on the broader environment, behavior and society issues researched and discussed at EDRA and IAPS?

---

### Whither Division 34?

Jennifer A. Veitch\*

National Research Council of Canada  
Institute for Research in Construction, Ottawa, ON

Three problems have been around as long as I have been active in Division 34 (10 years):

- Not enough good, exciting submissions to the convention
- Not enough candidates for Executive Committee positions
- Not enough members at the convention for a good social hour

I'm only slightly facetious in the last point. The underlying problem is a lack of involvement in Division activities on the part of members, which extends to a lack of missionary zeal in attracting new members. The only exception at present seems to be the newsletter, *PEPB* – which I know from personal experience requires regular effort on the part of the editor to encourage, cajole, persuade, remind, and arm-twist members (and some non-members) into contributing content. Such effort on the part of the Convention Program Chairs is more challenging because the entry cost is higher; the commitment to travel to the convention and present an entire paper is bigger than writing 500 words for a newsletter. It seems that, under some duress, members will make the commitment provided the cost is low.

Why is this? I don't think that the problem is between APA and Division 34 in particular; rather it seems that our situation is symptomatic of the APA's situation. APA is

suffering lower convention attendance partly because parts have splintered off into more tightly-focused interest groups, some of which run their own annual or biannual conferences. Our lowered activity parallels this: Our members are attracted to groups that have more direct connection to their research or applied interests – even when these are other APA divisions.

This might be considered a natural progression, particularly as some of the social and environmental issues that drove the initial creation of Division 34 have become more widely accepted as problems (although not, to my mind, any closer to solution). Those concerns no longer hold the group together uniquely in this Division. One can find research and activism on such issues in many Divisions, in some cases together with a tighter focus on one issue that offers deeper, more intense, more lively intellectual exchanges to those with that interest than Division 34 in its diversity ever could. It's important to recognize that for the most part, the topics we study are of greater interest than ever, to more psychologists – the problem is that many of them don't identify with Division 34.

That being said, there is also a role for the diverse. The discerning psychologist recognizes that creativity comes from the novel application of ideas. The cross-fertilization that comes from interacting widely is the genetic mixing that can breed new directions in theory and research. Coming out of our silos to encounter the mix in Division 34 can have unforeseen consequences. Consider, the decreasing fertility rate, particularly in Western countries, and the increasing number of smaller households. On the one hand these related phenomena seem to be Population Psych topics; and yet, there is an Environmental side also, one example being at the level of urban planning and the prevention of sprawl as housing developments expand to hold the new households. Another pairing might be population mobility and consequent resource-use pressures (e.g., water availability in the Southwest). A complete understanding of many phenomena encompasses both Population and Environment.

Thus, I would argue that we all need Division 34, although for many it might not be the primary affiliation within APA or among several professional associations or networks. If people will commit to Division 34, but at a low level, perhaps we should harness that without expecting more. This would make the edited forum for information exchange, in the form of *PEPB*, the primary Division 34 activity. For most members it has for some time been the principal membership benefit.

The changed emphasis would be reflected in giving up attempts at a uniquely Division 34 presence at the convention, instead combining all our efforts with allied divisions (population or environmental tracks, or better yet a blend with a focus on some current issue), to develop programs of interest to a wide body of psychologists. This would have the benefit of being in keeping with the changes to APA's convention programming.

\* *This statement is the author's personal opinion. Correspondence may be sent to her at: [jennifer.veitch@nrc.ca](mailto:jennifer.veitch@nrc.ca)*

---

## Perhaps it is Time to Leave Our Parental Home

Claudia Mausner, Doctoral Candidate

Environmental Psychology Program at CUNY Graduate Center

Larry Severy asks if the "marriage" is over between environmental psychology and population psychology, or between Division 34 and the American Psychological Association. I agree with his assessment that "the larger problem is the marriage with the APA". For environmental psychologists, this is the question that demands a soul-searching answer. In addition to "moving out" from our divisional home, perhaps it is time to leave our parental home, or to at least acknowledge that a de facto separation has already occurred.

Much has been written about the future of environmental psychology and the dearth of new theory and methods emanating from the research. More than a decade ago Hal Proshansky wondered whether this field would succeed in maintaining "its unique conceptual point of view and the epistemological integrity that first spawned its development" (Proshansky, 1987, p. 1467). His concern remains as relevant today as it was over ten years ago.

Unable to gain widespread institutional acceptance, environmental psychology has grown away from its early roots in psychology. It has become increasingly multi-disciplinary both in approach to subject matter and in the training of persons who identify themselves as or with environmental psychologists. As reported by Severy, "fewer psychologists by training and more people interested in architecture, engineering, community design, and environmental degradation" have been joining Division 34 in recent years. At times the term "environmental psychology" even seems like an anachronism, given the legal restrictions on its use by non-licensed professionals (in New York and, I presume, in other states); for this and other reasons, it is not surprising that alternative names such as "environmental social scientists" have emerged in recent years.

I would support withdrawal of environmental psychology from Division 34, and would encourage serious evaluation of our relationship with the American Psychological Association. Has this fledgling field been encouraged to pursue new paradigms developed by our founders -- Lewin, Gibson, Brunswik, and others -- which challenge traditional psychological methods and theory? Have there been sufficient opportunities to publish in APA journals, thereby exposing our work to wider audiences? Or is there inherent conflict between the "unique" approach taken by environmental psychology and the type of research published in APA journals? Has APA offered funding opportunities that support a non-traditional approach to human-environment studies?

Perhaps, as Veitch (2002) suggests, environmental psychologists can be most effective by "infiltrating established areas" (p. 12) both within APA and across a variety of disciplines. I expect that person-environment issues are equally relevant to APA divisions such as Community Psychology, the Society for Psychological Study of Social Issues and Peace Psychology. I would hope that Division 34 members retaining their association with APA would find a supportive home in these divisions.

Outside APA, it may be more effective to strengthen our commitment to organizations that focus exclusively on environmental issues. Perhaps environmental psychologists can make their greatest contribution by heightening their visibility within organizations such as EDRA, and creating working groups such as a "Psychology Network". While building a dedicated community of colleagues, such a network would also provide a valuable resource for non-psychologists within these organizations. Moreover, institutional interaction with both practitioners and academicians could benefit the field of environmental psychology by offering feedback and inspiration from a wide variety of perspectives.

By mobilizing our resources to move out from the familiar APA "home", perhaps environmental psychology can receive the jumpstart it needs to persevere in fulfilling the promise of its early pioneers.

### References

- Proshansky, H. (1987). The field of Environmental Psychology: Securing its future. In D. Stokols & I. Altman (Eds.), *Handbook of Environmental Psychology: Vol. 2* (pp. 1467-1488). NY: John Wiley.
- Veitch, J. A. (Winter 2002). Festschrift for Man-Environment relations. *Population and Environmental Psychology Bulletin*, 28 (1), p. 12.

---

## A Marriage of Convenience

Toni Falbo, Ph.D.

Professor of Educational Psychology & Sociology  
University of Texas at Austin

Dear Larry Severy and the Rest of the Division 34 Global Village-

As a former newsletter editor for this division, let me say that Larry's comments about our need for a rededication to the marriage between environmental and population psychology is a repetition of issues we have faced several times before. The need for continuous tending of the marriage between environmental and population psychologists has been the topic of discussion for at least 30 years. Ours has been primarily a marriage of convenience. No passion, no lovemaking, but so what? So what if environmental psychologists have more in common with architects or engineers! ? And population psychologists affiliate with demographers and public health researchers! ?

We are a union that makes a lot of sense from a global perspective. This marriage has worked for us by giving us an institutional base. The problem is that APA as an organization has drifted away from science. It is no longer an association of scientists, but of practitioners. Even though I accept this state of affairs, I still have a hard time dealing with it during conventions. I confess I was stunned by the Opening Ceremonies of the last APA convention. I was sitting with a group of strangers, who were all grad students from various universities in North America. By the end of the program, we were all snickering, SNICKERING!

As a former president of the division, and as a co-organizer of the division's APA program, I know that our participation in APA affairs has been far from active, but the problem is really with APA and not us. I know it is hard to put together a convention program, but it can be done. There are plenty of other divisions that have more submissions than they know what to do with, and all we need to do is co-sponsor-I even gave away hours of our program to overflow submissions to other divisions-- for selected, relevant, high quality sessions. In fact, last convention, the division 34 session I organized had a strong attendance--well over 10 people. The other sessions I attended (not division 34 events) were much less well attended. Low attendance at sessions is a result of the low interest in science that is currently epidemic among APA members.

What would happen if we just disbanded? It would reduce the legitimacy of what most of us have been doing for the last 30 years. As long as we can point to a division within the APA, we can at least say that we are a recognized special interest group within psychology. Our small numbers and tendency to fraternize with researchers from other disciplines is really a strength, even if this does keep us on the endangered species list.

---

### Let's Stick Together

Carol Werner

Psychology Department, University of Utah

I read the article about our two marriages. I don't have a solution, but I can provide a little history. When I left APA to join APS, I urged Div. 34 to come, too. There was a great deal of resistance within the Executive Committee for a variety of reasons (those I recall are: if the population people would leave APA, they'd prefer to go to a population organization, not a psychological or environmental one; some concern that we would lose autonomy with respect to scheduling our own conference; I believe that several people belonged to other APA divisions, and did not want to lose access to those conference presentations).

I happen to like the marriage between population and environmental researchers. As the population explodes and many cities experience rapid growth and sprawl development, there are more and more opportunities for both environmental and population scholars to address issues of pronatalism, migration, growth patterns, environmental losses, and so on. Frankly, I hear more sociologists addressing these issues than psychologists.

I am not a member of APA and my perception still is that APA cares little about scholarship and publishing (except for the money that the journals bring in). I have not attended APA in ages, and have only attended APS once. I do attend a wonderful conference that has no "divisions" but would welcome new members: International Symposium on Society and Resource Management. We could also shift our affiliation to edra -- environmental design research association. Both are small associations with "open" policies re: accepting papers for conferences (though edra is more open minded than ISSRM -- I just had to revise an abstract so it fit with ISSRM's theme --

very unusual). Another possibility is that we merge with SPSSI or Div. 8. I think SPSSI shares more of our concerns. They are large and vital, and many Div. 34 members also belong to SPSSI (Div. 9)

I like the idea of the population and environmental researchers staying together. We are psychologists. I love seeing everybody on the rare occasions we all attend the same conference. So I guess my hope and bottom line is: let's stick together. Let's find a conference we can attend that meets our identity and scholarly needs. Let's poll the Division and ask what meetings they attend regularly (at least every 2 years). Maybe we'll attend two different meetings -- on alternate years - - so that we do have opportunities to get together and share our work and maintain our viability as a discipline.

Just some stray thoughts,

[CAROL.WERNER@m.cc.utah.edu](mailto:CAROL.WERNER@m.cc.utah.edu)

---

### Divorce, and Remarry

Warren B. Miller, M.D., Director  
Transnational Family Research Institute  
[tfriaptos@earthlink.net](mailto:tfriaptos@earthlink.net)

I think Larry has laid out pretty well what the issues are. I would favor divorce, followed by a new marriage. Let Division 34 split into an environmental group and a group that might be called "Fertility Behavior and Reproductive Health" or some such. The latter might then merge in some formal way with the Fertility Workshop. The new group formed by this marriage could then both determine the annual place and time for a meeting (traditionally, during the two days immediately preceding the PAA annual meeting) and be an official or quasi-official liaison between the APA and the PAA. Meetings at the APA itself might then disappear or simply vary from year to year, depending on interest as indicated by submitted papers. I think this arrangement, if it can get past the procedural quagmires of both the APA and the PAA, would represent a tentative but much needed first step into the interdisciplinary partial restructuring of our professional organizations.

---

### Psychology of Sustainable Communities

William A. McConochie, Ph.D.  
[tstmastr@rio.com](mailto:tstmastr@rio.com)

Dear Division Leaders:

I suggest we consider redefining the division as the Division of "The Psychology of Sustainable Communities". This broader title subsumes many relevant fields but puts a focus on the overall importance of recognizing that the human race in many ways is jeopardizing important traditions, social structures and overall ecosystems and that there is much room for scientific investigation and related prompt political and community action to understand how people can be helped to control selfish, short-term, nationalistic, economic and pleasure

goals for the sake of preserving our planet for an indefinite number of future generations.

To this end, I think we could do two things:

1. Lobby for federal government money to support and encourage such research and action, perhaps via a newly formed Department of Sustainable Policies, Practices and Communities.
2. Write a text book via our collective contributions for college student use, e.g. "Introduction to the Psychology of Sustainable Communities, where we've been, where we need to go and how to assure that future generations will have a chance to get there." The text book would include discussions of research to date and many ideas and suggestions for research projects that interested students and scientists could do. It could also include interviews with state, national and United Nations political representatives to help define the most focal problems and clarify central issues that complicate defining and realizing sustainable communities (agricultural practices, fishing practices, mining, pollution, greenhouse gases, overpopulation, disease epidemics, etc.).

I have dreamed of creating this text book for some years, but, without funding or the sophistication to know how to get it, or the credentials to convince anyone that I deserve the support to realize this dream. I am near retirement, but am still a bit reluctant to try this project without funding and the energetic support of fellow professionals who share my optimism and concern for the problem. I'd love to work on this. I have many specific research projects in mind that would help flesh it out. If successful, such a text might spark the birth of a very interesting new field that would capture the interest of many students. Such students might then help swell the ranks of Division 34.

---

## Environmental Problems Are Not Going Away

Richard Osbaldiston

Environmental Psychology, University of Missouri  
[rjo42c@mizzou.edu](mailto:rjo42c@mizzou.edu)

I feel very strongly that psychologists have an important role to play in helping protect and preserve the environment. (In fact, the reason that I chose to go into this field is because I see psychologists as being uniquely positioned to make the most beneficial and long-lasting impact on the environment.) Larry Severy's letter posted on the internet suggests that Division 34 was not formed as a division that intended to look into solutions to environmental problems.

Environmental problems are not going away. Although there is currently little financial, political, and professional support for what we do in terms of "conservation psychology," "sustainable development," or whatever you choose to call the collective research that aims to alleviate these problems, I feel that this support will continue to grow as the magnitude and consequences of the problems that we work on intensifies. In order to help promote a change such that more support is available, we need to be "in on the ground floor." If

we have a home in APA, that helps lend visibility and credibility to what we do. (There are other things that we have to do at the ground floor, too, and I am encouraged by many of the things that are happening: textbooks, academic books, articles in specialty journals, symposiums at conferences, email list-serves, college programs in environmental studies, etc.) As Severy has implied, perhaps it is time to transform Div. 34 from a "catch-all" division to one that is truly devoted to the study of alleviating environmental problems. I am in favor of this transformation.

Such a transformation and the ensuing work will not be easy, and we will need everyone's cooperation to continue to bring this work to the attention of funding agencies, tenure and promotion committees, and the general public. But I feel that our efforts will be rewarded in the long run.

---

## More Than a Marriage of Convenience

Johanna Tabin  
[jktabin@juno.com](mailto:jktabin@juno.com)

Firstly, APA used to be completely an association of academicians. Slowly and then rapidly it transformed into a heavily weighted society of clinicians. Even the long-standing tradition of meeting at the end of August was established because of academic schedules. The value of APA is no longer chiefly in cross-fertilization of knowledge. And one is not any longer likely to belong to an academic department that subsidizes one's appearance at and contribution to APA.

Second, the marriage is to me one of more than convenience. I am persuaded that the combined interests are great enough not to require two separate Divisions. On the other hand, just checking the produce department of any supermarket shows how much interest there is in environmental/population concerns among the general public. It used to be that one could find--at best-- a few scraggly leaves of wilted lettuce as organically grown. Now the organically grown food gets a noticeable amount of shelf space. Some of the consumers must be psychologists.

As a member of Boards of three sections of Div. 39, I have learned something of what it takes to increase membership. I would suggest three things for Div. 34: 1. At this stage, one powerful and significant program at APA, publicized, if possible, even in the Monitor (which tends to be very cooperative). 2. A project that might entice the activity of some of the members and the public spirit of more. 3. A service angle to the use of our web site--CEU's, hotline updates, etc.--not all at once but something in the direction of golden carrots for belonging.

I joined 34, even though I am stupidly overextended, because I feel the importance of its mission to be very great. As you say, psychologists are little represented among the environmental crowd. Div. 34 should be aimed at redressing this. There should be a potential for satisfaction from the exercise of psychological insight in environmental causes.

## No Great Divide Between Environmental and Population Psychology

David Barry  
david\_barry@adtcniagara.ca

Larry Severy raises a number of excellent points in his statement regarding the future of Division 34. I am in favour of keeping the marriage together if only for the sake of the children—ourselves. I personally do not see a great divide between environmental and population psychology—I for example am a recent PhD grad in environment and behavior studies via a department of environmental design—and one of my major areas of interest is environmental factors in safer sex behaviour practices. So we may overlap more than we think.

I will say I am concerned about the lack of discussion within the Div 34 listserv. When I first joined I felt it would be an active and vivacious forum; clearly it is not. Perhaps the members are joining merely for membership in APA and are not really interested collegiality. I find that hard to believe in a Division where very few people would need the credential of being an APA member—it doesn't devolve any benefit to me professionally, anyway.

---

### Nothing Wrong With Letting It Die

Sara Kiesler  
kiesler@cs.cmu.edu

Thanks to Larry Severy for this. As a long time member, I do feel that the fields have diverged and changed, and that the division does not have sufficient authority and interest as it stands. There is nothing wrong with letting it die, if members with a common interest have a place to go.

The APA convention is another matter. As one of the people who gave an invited talk to only 10 people (at most), I share that pain. The current trend is towards smaller meetings in which people can have more discussion as compared with formal presentations. Participants at the recent SPSP were very happy. A preconference at the annual SPSP for those interested in environment/ecology would seem to be a good idea, for example.

---

### Psychologists Part of the Solution

Linda Riebel  
Lriebel@aol.com

We face the biggest crisis in human history. The degradation of the planet proceeds rapidly, with air, soil, rivers, oceans, water tables, food supply, biodiversity, and the climate itself being threatened by human activities. The future of APA's Division 34 is, compared to these incalculably tragic losses, a minor drama. Yet it is relevant, since psychologists can and should be part of the solution. The environmental crisis is human-made, and the response must address human players – their motivations, attitudes, resistances, defense mechanisms,

self-images, and group dynamics. Psychologists in every specialty and setting can contribute to this work. A revitalized and redefined division could attract people whose interests include social marketing of the environment, cultural criticism and re-visioning society, applying developmental concepts to the task of creating sustainable systems, organizational and systems thinking, the psychopathology of ecocide, human/animal relationships, population dynamics, ethics, and many more topics.

Which division is better placed to mobilize psychologists for this than Division 34? Its traditional interests in population and the human response to the built environment are consistent with *the emerging paradigm emphasizing humans in context, not in isolation*. Some active environmental psychologists are not APA members because they perceive APA as irrelevant to their goals. A change in Division 34 – a forthright announcement that it will be a home for those concerned about the planet – could attract these talented and active psychologists. Several non-APA colleagues have told me as much.

I had no interest in the architectural, engineering, planning, or perceptual aspects of what was then environmental psychology. I joined Division 34 because it seemed the closest option, hoping to find a home for what I perceive as more pressing issues: environmental destruction and psychologists' potential role in stemming it. With no disrespect intended towards the traditional focus of Division 34, I think events have shown that it no longer attracts a critical mass of interest and participation. The current debate is an acknowledgement of that fact.

The division should not be allowed to die. Creating a division involves such bureaucratic labors that, given the opportunity it offers to provide a platform for the most important mission of our time, the refashioning of Division 34 is worthwhile.

The solution is to redefine it afresh. It could be called Environmental Psychology and Sustainability, or some such name that announces the breadth of goals and interests it would embrace. Population is part of the environmental crisis, so that area would be included, with emphasis on finding strategies to curb overpopulation.

There is already an active, diverse, and productive group of psychologists to be enrolled. Environmental psychologists (who may call themselves eco-psychologists, green psychologists, or ecological psychologists) are engaging in the following activities, among others:

- Publishing books and articles (Deborah Winter's book *Ecological Psychology*)
- Advocacy (Allen Kanner's campaign to disavow psychologists' participation in the manipulation of children for corporate profit)
- Teaching, either within the profession or to the general public
- Popularization (my new book *Eating to Save the Earth: Food Choices for a Healthy Planet*)
- Conservation (Carol Saunders's conference on conservation psychology)

- Journals (a new one, *Environmental Communication Yearbook*, is soliciting submissions for its inaugural issue)
- Education (some schools are already offering relevant programs; others, such as Saybrook Graduate School, are preparing them)

We are scholar-citizens with a stake in sustainability. We are an active group of people who sometimes feel more isolated than we would like to be – especially since our goal is to influence large groups and society at large. I believe many of us would welcome an organizational home. I would be willing to join in its governance.

The field of environmental psychology is relatively new, and, not surprisingly, involves some debates about definitions and domains. For instance, should the field be called environmental psychology, or eco-psychology, or what? Should we stake out a sub-field called conservation psychology, akin to conservation biology? The field is not hardened into turf wars and defended paradigms. That is one of its appeals. By participating, one can help create a valuable intellectual and practical discipline to mobilize our understanding of human nature to change human worldviews and activities toward sustainability.

I believe Division 34 can grow, cultivating leadership in vital work that challenges humans to use their creativity in building a sustainable future.

---

## LETTER FROM APA PRESIDENT

### Why Should You Belong to APA?

Philip G. Zimbardo, Ph.D.  
President of APA

One of the first things that newly-elected APA Presidents do is get briefed by staff on the structure, function and activities of APA's organization and its members. When I first became President I knew about as much about APA as the typical member -- I subscribed to the journals, I read parts of the Monitor, gave talks at conventions, and I knew that there was a large organization "somewhere" doing things in support of Psychology. Unlike most APA presidents, I was a total outsider to APA governance, never having had anything to do with its Council of Representatives, task forces or many committees. I paid my dues, used APA when I needed to, but never worked in its trenches. I won the election based on solely on the credits I had earned as an academic-scientist.

Now that I am well into my Presidency, I can say it has been an eye opener for me to discover the range, number and extent of projects, task forces, actions and initiatives meant to further our discipline, advocate for psychological science, and apply psychological knowledge in the service of society. I also had no idea of the large staff infrastructure at APA that serves as our eyes, ears, hands and feet in making sure that psychology gets funded and represented at federal and local levels, in making sure that the very best of science, application and practice come to the attention of policy makers and

implementers, and in fostering psychology's collaborations with other scientific disciplines.

I realize I may sound like a cult convert, but I want to share with my colleagues in Division 34 a few of the things that I've learned that APA does for its scientists and scientist-practitioners. I hope it will help dispel the myth that "APA does nothing for scientists or academics," or "my dues go only to support Practice." The more I have learned, the more I have been motivated to contribute time, energy and talents to further these important efforts (as I will outline at the end of this note). If you want to know the whole gamut of things the Science Directorate does, please check out its web page -- [www.apa.org/science](http://www.apa.org/science).

Here are a few highlights in just three areas -- advocacy, training, and what I will call "burning issues." These activities underscore what APA does "behind the scenes" in service to us all.

### Advocacy

You probably all know that APA has a large presence on Capitol Hill through its activism for mental health parity and prescription privileges. But did you know that APA has an equally vocal presence for science matters? APA staffers monitor what is happening on the Hill and in Federal Agencies relevant to researchers (NSF and NIH -- including institutes NIMH, NICHD, NCI, NINDS, NIDA, NIAAA, NIA; and VA, NASA, DOE, DoD, and FDA to name a few -- a lot of alphabet soup, but rich in funds that we want to tap into). They work in many ways to advocate for behavioral science funding, and for report language in federal bills in support of behavioral science research – by proposing legislative language, by testifying before congressional committees, and by visiting with congressional members and their staff. Much of this work is done in coalitions, and APA's staffers take leading roles. Just for starters, PPO-Science's Karen Studwell chairs the Friends of The NICHD (a coalition that advocates for the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development), PPO-Science's Director Geoff Mumford is the treasurer of the Coalition for National Science Funding, PPO-Science's Heather Kelly is the treasurer of the Defense Research Coalition, and PPO-Science's Pat Kobor is co-chair for the Coalition for the Advancement of Health through Behavioral and Social Sciences Research. In addition to "lobbying" efforts, APA staff continually monitor and respond to doings in the federal research and regulation arena. Whenever there are requests for comment on proposed regulations or changes to the research landscape, staff request input from relevant experts and draft a comment or letter from APA. In the last year APA has made comments on a wide variety of proposed legislative and regulative issues from education, animal research, medical records privacy, data sharing, to standards for IRB accreditation. For each of these issues, members have been asked for their input – to make comments on written documents, to come to Washington to help put on congressional events, such as briefings or research exhibits, or to let APA take them to talk directly to their congressional representatives on the Hill about specific legislative issues. You can find out about these by subscribing to a monthly e-newsletter that will keep you up to date – its called SPIN. Look at it via

<http://www.apa.org/ppo/issues/spinhome.html> or sign up by sending an email to [ppo@apa.org](mailto:ppo@apa.org).

APA also advocates in a different way -- there is regular APA representation at major meetings of other societies and organizations (e.g., Society for Neuroscience, American Association for the Advancement of Science, National Academies of Science, etc.), where larger science initiatives and issues are discussed. In these venues APA presents information on such issues as ethics, research regulation and IRBs, or gives comments to National Research Council committees on their scope and work plans. APA has an important place at the science table -- I attend a bi-annual conference of the presidents of over 60 scientific societies, where psychology is the only social/ behavioral science represented, and have been able to show these physicists, biologists and others of the many ways in which psychology is relevant to issues of national defense, terrorism, and more. APA staff also attend regular meetings with other science groups and with policy makers (for example the Office of Science and Technology Policy -- the white house's advisory arm) to discuss current science opportunities and issues, and consult with federal agencies on applications of behavioral research to their concerns.

### Training

APA's most visible student activities occur through its graduate student association, APAGS -- but did you know that the Science Directorate sponsors the "Science Student Council" -- a group of 10 students who engage other science graduate students in convention programming, an extensive web presence, an email network, a grant program and more? The Science Directorate is also involved in some direct training activities. One activity is for more established researchers -- the Science Directorate's "Advanced Training Institutes," first held in 1999, offer week-long, hands-on courses on cutting-edge methodologies such as fMRI techniques or longitudinal modeling. Another activity is directed toward advanced graduate students and young faculty, the Academic Career Workshop. This workshop, which delves into the nitty gritty of finding, getting and keeping an academic research position, has been offered for several years at convention and at smaller scientific meetings. APA offers many more opportunities for learning -- from teaching tips for faculty, to a week course on psychology in general for outstanding science undergraduates, to the Exploring Behavior Week outreach to high school students. I will add that each of these activities is something in which you or your students could participate. I am planning to have APA develop the standard text for H.S. psychology courses, to collaborate with APS in promoting psychology science at H.S. science fairs, and to develop new web sites for training H.S. and College teachers in being more effective in their teaching.

### "Burning Issues" Activities

You may know about APA's standard governance groups -- the Board of Scientific Affairs (BSA) consists of 9 outstanding scientists (current Chair is Harry Reis, Div 8 Executive Officer), and its three standing Committees, CPTA (Committee on Psychological Tests and Assessments), CARE (Committee on Animal Research & Ethics) and COSA (Committee on Scientific Awards). But you may not know that

BSA regularly supports the establishment of working groups or task forces that address timely issues. Recent ones are a working group on Internet research, a task force on testing on the Internet, and a working group on the implications of the genetic revolution for psychological research and knowledge, and an ad hoc group to address current issues in research regulation, especially IRB activities. Each of these groups, comprised of experts in the topics, has been called together to survey the issues and make recommendations about what to do next. For example, the research on the Internet group (chaired by Robert Kraut) is looking at technical, ethical, and other implications of using the internet as a tool for collecting data, as a means of assistance to researchers who are or intend to use this tool. The IRB group is planning to develop informational materials to facilitate IRB-researcher-administration interaction.

I could continue this list of things the science directorate and APA do for social psychologists and social psychology -- I have not even mentioned their regular activities that support the field such as research based awards, student grants, conference awards, and more, that demonstrate that APA respects and supports its scientific foundation. But there is a more important point that I would like to address. This is the *perception* that APA does nothing and what you can do about it. When I mentioned this perception to Science Directorate staff (headed by Dr. Kurt Salzinger), they said it was something they constantly worry about -- and wondered how much their regular efforts -- substantial communications such as, *Psychological Science Agenda*, the bi-monthly newsletter; listserv notes; and the Science sections in the monthly *Monitor* -- get read or noticed by colleagues. Only you can answer that one -- but I want to remind you that the marvelous activities APA does in support of science are only possible when members (that is YOU!) are generous with their time, effort and attention. In each of their activities, the Science Directorate draws on member expertise, ideas and enthusiasm. So when you read a call for comments on your Division listserv, or read about a new important issue for which APA might be active, know that your input, your response and your opinion are not only important, they are the heart of what APA is all about. I want to assure you that there are eager ears waiting to hear from you -- mine, Bob Sternberg's (APA's president elect who will carry on the scientific tradition), and the staff of the Science Directorate.

Finally, let me mention a few things that I will be focusing on during my presidential tenure, in addition to helping develop a H.S. text and Psychology Science Fairs. I am working with the heads of APS to find areas in which our organizations can meaningfully collaborate for the benefit of psychological science. I am advancing an initiative to develop a compendium of all research psychologists have done that demonstrates a significant difference in improving some aspect of our lives, individually or collectively. Data are coming in from this survey (to which I would like each of you to contribute, see <http://research.apa.org/survey/compendium/>). When collated and organized by a task force of our experts, this compendium will be invaluable for creating a more positive image of psychology to Congress, the media and to the public.

I hope this quick overview has been of some value to you and encourages you to continue your APA membership, join if you are not, and promote APA to your students. One last word, the Chicago Convention (Aug 22-25) will be the best

ever, in part because I am working closely with the Board of Convention Affairs to have many new, amazing features, fabulous events, special guests with fun and good times and rock and roll for all.

## APA CONVENTION

### SYMPOSIUM

#### Conservation Psychology: Meanings, Emotions, and Identity in the Natural World

Amara T. Brook, Moderator  
Psychology, University of Michigan

As was evidenced last year in issues of *American Psychologist* and *Journal of Social Issues* which focused on psychology's role in promoting environmental sustainability, a growing number of psychologists are studying the connections between psychology and conservation issues. Conservation Psychology seeks to understand the human relationship with the rest of nature and to examine influences on human behavior toward the environment.

Human behavior in the environment is mediated by important social-psychological variables such as identity, emotion, group interaction, and the creation of meaning. This symposium will examine the roles of these inter-related psychological aspects of our relationship to the natural environment. What meanings do people find and what emotions do people experience in nature? How does our sense of identity interact with our attitudes and behaviors toward the natural environment in the context of environmental conflict? Empirical and conceptual contributions on these questions will provide material for a discussion on these themes in the emerging field of conservation psychology.

#### Meanings in Nature: Thematic Differences in Natural and Built Environments

Donna K. McMillan & Jaclyn A. Roverud  
Psychology  
St. Olaf College

What does nature mean to us today in our modern, technological society? To an unprecedented extent, modern Westerners are immersed in human artifacts; we have more contact with computer graphics than with the night sky, more time spent shopping at the mall than walking in the woods. Nevertheless, a variety of evidence indicates that the natural environment remains psychologically important. Studies have found that contact with nature can be associated with stress reduction, relaxation, emotional solace, enjoyment, increased self-esteem, physical well-being, and even increased sense of coherence (e.g., see Kahn, 1997; Kaplan and Talbot, 1983).

This paper further explores meanings which nature holds. Participants were asked to write stories in response to photographs of natural and built scenes. This task was

intentionally open-ended so that participants could freely project into their stories any elements or themes which came to mind in response to the different stimuli. Content analysis of responses from samples of 7th grade children and college students suggests interesting thematic differences in response to the different stimuli. For example, stories of peace, calm, quiet, and contentment were frequent in response to the natural scenes but less prevalent in responses to built scenes. Although none of the photographs actually included people or animals, participants much more frequently created stories of affiliation and connection in response to the natural scenes than the built scenes. In contrast, themes of social recognition, status, and prestige were more prevalent in response to the built scenes, as were stories in which the characters were busy and excited. Implications of these and other thematic patterns are discussed in a consideration of what nature evokes in us, what symbolic meanings nature holds, and what roles nature can (or does) have in modern life.

#### Emotional Dimensions of Animal Observation: An Experiential Sampling Study

Gene Myers  
Environmental Studies, Huxley College  
Western Washington University

Carol D. Saunders  
Communications & Conservation Psychology, Brookfield Zoo,  
Chicago Zoological Society

Emotions are important in understanding conservation behaviors because of their motivational force. However, our understanding of emotional experience of the non-human world is rudimentary. We will share some findings about what emotions are felt when watching animals in a zoo. The experience of watching living animals probably provides a main motivation for zoo attendance. Animal preferences, knowledge of animals, and attitudes toward zoo animals have been probed in previous studies, but the emotional aspects of this experience have not. This may be because such emotions are difficult to study, because they are context dependent, ephemeral, individually variable, and may not fit models that describe paradigmatic interpersonal emotional events. In this study, an experiential sampling method (employing electronic pager technology plus a response booklet) was used to obtain subjects' self-reports on 24 affective dimensions as they watched specific animals. In addition they answered questions tapping attitudes toward animals, typical emotionality, and background variables. Three hundred adults participated, while viewing one of three animal exhibits (okapi, gorilla, or snake). Analysis included comparison across emotions and across animals, and correlations of emotional experience across attitude and background variables. Subjects reported high levels of feeling happy, excited, involved, relaxed, positive, satisfied and focused across animals. High levels of attentiveness, peacefulness, attraction, sense of beauty, privilege, wonder, caring and respect were recorded, and low levels of surprise, concern, fear, embarrassment, disgust and anger. Medium levels of amusement, feeling connected, sympathy and love were reported, although on the latter three feelings, snakes received

much less of these feelings than the other two animals. We will discuss the implications for mapping the emotional landscape of the experience of non-human animals and nature, and for the role of emotion in models of conservation behavior.

## How We See Nature: Describing an Ideal Environment

Susan Clayton  
The College of Wooster

There are clearly many people for whom an important aspect of their identity is located in ties to the natural world. This is not limited to those who are labeled "environmentalists" by virtue of a political position; many who are associated with positions that are labeled anti-environmental nevertheless demonstrate, through words or behavior, their love of some aspect of the natural world. I propose that environmental identity (EID) can be part of the way in which people form their self-concept: a sense of connection to some part of the non-human natural environment based on history, emotional attachment, and/or similarity; a belief that the environment is important to us and an important part of who we are. The idea of environmental identity enables us to see the relevance of the self to interactions over environmental issues. Environmental attitudes are espoused not, in many cases, because of a belief that they will be listened to but in order to define oneself by expressing one's fundamental values and ethical standards. Donations to environmental organizations are made not to increase perceived personal utility but to obtain moral satisfaction. Environmental behaviors are engaged in, or not, in part because of the way in which these behaviors convey information about the self and group affiliations. Research on the Environmental Identity Scale (Clayton, 2001) has shown that it predicts environmental behavior and preferred resolution to environmental conflicts. In the present paper, I explore the relationship between EID and ideas about nature, through an analysis of undergraduate students' descriptions of an ideal environment. I discuss how these constructions of nature may relate to behaviors that are protective of the natural environment.

## Identity and Moral Exclusion in Environmental Conflict

Amara T. Brook  
Psychology  
University of Michigan

Susan Opotow  
Graduate Program in Dispute Resolution,  
University of Massachusetts, Boston

Environmental conflicts are often depicted as rational struggles to achieve concrete goals. However, this 'rational actor' explanation neglects some important psychological factors, such as identity and moral exclusion, which contribute to environmental conflict. Social identity is the part of a person's identity or self-concept that is derived from membership in groups. Social identities both contribute to and are affected by environmental conflict. Because self-esteem is partially rooted

in social identities, people are motivated to evaluate their own group more favorably than others and to discriminate against other groups. This can escalate inter-group conflict, which in turn makes group membership more salient. In addition, parties to environmental disputes often have different environmental identities, or ways that they see themselves in relation to nature. For example, one group may feel that humans are part of nature and see using nature as appropriate, while another group may feel that humans are separate from nature and thus feel that humans should not use it. These differences in environmental and social identities lead to moral exclusion, which helps perpetuate environmental conflict. Moral exclusion occurs when some people are not willing to treat other people or animals fairly, allocate resources to them, or make sacrifices to help them. The roles of identity and moral exclusion in environmental conflict are illustrated by a case study of conflict over rangeland management in the American West. Conflicts over protection of rare species have polarized ranchers and environmentalists, and this is seen in the specific case of the threatened Preble's meadow jumping mouse (*Zapus hudsonius preblei*). Qualitative and quantitative data illustrate the roles that identity and moral exclusion play in this conflict. Drawing from the present data and the psychological literature on inter-group conflict, identity-based strategies for reducing environmental conflict are suggested.

## Healing Gardens: A Step Towards Human and Ecosystem Health

Katherine N. Irvine  
School of Natural Resources & Environment  
University of Michigan

Sara L. Warber, M.D.  
Complementary & Alternative Medicine Research Center  
University of Michigan

Efforts within the health fields to change the way we think about health mirror efforts within the environmental fields to change the way we think about natural resource management. Both fields are recognizing the limitations of current practices; both fields are exploring and developing more comprehensive approaches to promoting healthy people and healthy ecosystems, respectively. A point of overlap is the emerging movement to bring nature, in the form of gardens, into healthcare settings.

Drawing on an initiative to incorporate a healing garden into the University of Michigan Medical Center, this presentation provides a conceptual framework for understanding the potential of healing gardens for environmental conservation. Healing gardens are a recognition that the environment of a health care facility is as much a part of the therapeutic effect as the expertise, contents, and procedures encountered within the building. The natural world's ability to heal is an important and vital part of the argument for conservation, protection, and restoration of natural areas.

## SYMPOSIUM

## Origins and Consequences of Environmental Satisfaction in Open-Plan Offices

Jennifer A. Veitch, Moderator  
National Research Council of Canada, Ottawa, ON

This symposium consists of three papers from an ongoing multidisciplinary project examining open-plan environments. The overall project includes experimental and computer simulation studies of the effects of open-plan office designs on lighting, acoustic, and ventilation conditions, and laboratory and field studies of occupant satisfaction with those conditions. The first two papers here are analyses of data from a field study. In the first, the authors report the validation of measures of satisfaction with aspects of the physical environment, and their relationships to measures of overall environmental satisfaction and job satisfaction. The second paper reports analyses of the effects of workstation size, partition height, and presence of a window on the environmental satisfaction measures. The third paper reports results from two laboratory experiments on the effects of simulated ventilation noise used to mask speech sounds, one examining the effects of varying noise spectra on satisfaction with acoustic conditions and the other varying both spectrum and noise level. Finally, our discussant will provide commentary on the papers and their implications from an industrial-organisational psychology perspective.

### Environmental Satisfaction in Open-Plan Offices: 1. Scale Validation

Kelly M. J. Farley  
Carleton University

Jennifer A. Veitch  
National Research Council of Canada, Ottawa, ON

As part of a larger project concerning the design and operation of open plan offices, a field study was conducted to determine the effects of open-plan office design (particularly workstation size and partition height) on the indoor environment and on occupant satisfaction with that environment. Data collected thus far represents the first portion of a pre-post renovation study of three government buildings. A 27-item questionnaire was administered to 419 government workers; it included 18 individual ratings of satisfaction with environmental features, a 2-item index of overall environmental satisfaction, and a 2-item index of job satisfaction. This paper reports analyses of the underlying factor structure of the 18 individual environmental features ratings, and of a model incorporating environmental and job satisfaction in relation to these ratings. Exploratory and confirmatory factor analysis revealed the existence of three latent variables: Satisfaction with Privacy, Satisfaction with Lighting and Satisfaction with Ventilation. Subsequent structural equation modelling analyses provided modest support for a model in which the latent variables relate directly to overall environmental satisfaction, and in which environmental satisfaction directly relates to job satisfaction.

### Environmental Satisfaction in Open-Plan Offices: 2. Workstation Characteristics as Predictors

Kate E. Charles & Jennifer A. Veitch  
National Research Council of Canada, Institute for Research in  
Construction, Ottawa, ON

Open-plan offices appear to be a flexible and cost-effective approach to office design. However, surveys reports consistently find that open-plan office occupants experience a lack of privacy, increased interruptions, and unfavourable ambient conditions. Understanding the influence of open-plan workstations on occupant satisfaction might lead to improvements in their design, to mitigate such problems. This paper is the second in a series of reports of a field survey of physical conditions and environmental satisfaction in three public sector office buildings. The data are from time 1 in the pre-post renovation study. This paper reports analyses of workstation characteristics (workstation area, minimum partition height and windows) as predictors on four environmental satisfaction measures (satisfaction with privacy, ventilation and lighting, and overall environmental satisfaction). Hierarchical regression analyses revealed that workstation area was positively related to satisfaction with privacy; windows were positively related to satisfaction with lighting and negatively related to satisfaction with ventilation; and minimum partition height was negatively related to overall environmental satisfaction. Results are discussed in relation to the favourable workstation characteristics observed in the current sample, the effects of alternative workstation characteristics and personal and organisational factors, and the potential mediating role of physical ambient conditions.

### Masking Speech in Open-Plan Offices: Noise Level and Spectral Composition Effects on Acoustic Satisfaction

Jennifer A. Veitch, John S. Bradley & Louise M. Legault  
National Research Council of Canada, Ottawa

A lack of privacy and distractions from others' conversations are among the most common complaints about open-plan offices. Ventilation-type sounds, depending on their spectrum and level, can mask speech sounds, but little is known about relationships between the acoustic conditions created by such sounds and occupant satisfaction with those conditions. Two within-subjects experiments were designed to meet this need. Participants experienced 15 different simulated ventilation noises in combination with simulated telephone conversations, and provided ratings of their satisfaction with each noise condition. Experiment 1 examined the effects of 15 different simulated noise spectra. Experiment 2 was a 3 x 5 factorial within-subjects design having three noise spectra at each of five A-weighted noise levels, for a total of 15 different noise conditions. Experiment 1 revealed that acoustic conditions with relatively more high-frequency sound are less satisfactory, despite their good speech masking qualities. Experiment 2 revealed that although increasing the loudness of the sound can improve speech masking, the improvement is less for noise

spectra that are poor at speech masking. Furthermore, sound levels above approximately 45 dB(A) are too loud. The results of the two experiments provided guidance for identifying acoustical conditions likely to prove satisfactory to occupants.

## COLLABORATIVE PROGRAM

### Social Justice in an Age of Globalization

Andrea L. Solarz, Chair  
Independent Consultant, Arlington, VA

What are the obligations, responsibilities, and opportunities for psychology to deal with social justice issues such as poverty and racism? Where does psychology need to go from here given the "new" domestic and global context after the horrific events of September 11th? What roles can psychologists play in overcoming social injustice? These are some of the provocative questions that will be explored during the program track on *Social Justice in an Age of Globalization*, which will be featured at the 2002 American Psychological Association annual meeting.

As most of you know by now, APA is experimenting this year with new formats in an effort to make the convention more attractive and interesting to attendees. In addition to the regular programming coordinated by the APA Divisions, a dozen tracks of thematic programs (scheduled so they do not conflict with substantive Division sessions) have been developed by clusters of Divisions. The *Social Justice* track was developed through a collaboration of Divisions: 9 (Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues), 27 (Community), 34 (Population and Environmental Division), 48 (Society for the Study of Peace, Conflict and Violence: Peace Psychology Division), and 52 (International Division).

We are especially excited that Congressman Jesse Jackson, Jr., has agreed to be the opening speaker for the *Social Justice* track on Thursday afternoon. Ruth Behar, an anthropologist, writer, and recipient of a MacArthur genius grant, will then talk about her experiences exploring culture and identity and show excerpts from her new documentary film, *Adio Kerida*. In the session on *The Psychology of Rhetoric and vice versa: Examining the Language of Terrorism*, Ted Sarbin and Joe Juhasz will explore how words that are descriptive in nature, such as "terrorist" or "terrorism" acquire meanings that arouse feelings and incite to action. The first day of programming will conclude with a moderated poster session. Attendees will have an opportunity to view a series of posters on *Global Perspectives in Social Justice and Terrorism*, and then participate in a discussion led by Anie Kalayjian, Brinton Lykes, and Rod Watts.

The program on Saturday will begin with an advocacy workshop on *Connecting Research and Action for Social Justice and Human Rights* featuring several psychologists who have integrated social action into their professional lives in creative and even courageous ways. Continuing Professional Education credits may be earned by those attending the session. A moderated debate on *Psychology at the Front Lines: Is it Time for Action?* will present different perspectives about when

psychology should—or must—take action to address social issues. How much of a science base must be in place? Is there ever a moral imperative to act? These are the kinds of questions that the panelists might be asked to address. The track on *Social Justice in an Age of Globalization* will conclude with a Town Hall meeting on *Terrorism, Poverty, Racism: Enemies for a Country at War?* Incoming APA President Robert Sternberg will lead a panel of distinguished psychologists in a forward thinking discussion exploring where psychology needs to go from here given a "new" domestic and global context.

We invite you to join us at these exciting sessions. Be sure to check the APA program for final program information.

## OVERVIEW OF DIV. 34 PROGRAMS

### Symposium

Empowering Women Living with HIV/AIDS:  
First and Third World Experiences

Thursday, 9:00

### Symposium

Conservation Psychology: Meanings, Emotions, and Identity in  
the Natural World.

Friday, 9:00

### Invited Address

Whispers and Shouts:  
The Making Public of Private Expressions

Friday, 11:00

### Workshop

Intimate Rooms:  
Testimony and Aurality [a writing workshop]

Friday, 12:00

### Roundtable Discussion

Recent Research on Reproductive Health, Fertility  
and Fertility Regulation

Friday, 1:00

### Executive Committee Meeting

Division 34 Executive Committee Meeting

Friday, 3:00

### Business Meeting

Division 34 Business Meeting

Friday, 4:00

### Division 34 Presidential Address

Blood and Soil: The Psychohistory of the American Home

Chair: Lawrence J. Severy, U. of Florida, Gainesville  
Participant: Joseph B. Juhasz, U. of Colorado at Boulder  
Friday, 5:00

### Discussion

The Architecture of Chicago: Sweet Shore Plays

Saturday, 1:00

*Paper Session*

Ethics and Accountability in Environmental  
and Population Psychology  
Sunday 9:00

*Invited Address*

Chicano/a Land Ethics:  
Sense of Place and the Environment  
Sunday, 10:00

*Paper Session*

The Greening of Psychology  
Sunday, 11:00

*Paper Session*

The Place of Memory in Psychology  
Sunday, 12:00

◆—————◆  
**APA BUSINESS**

### **American Psychological Association Council of Representatives Winter Meeting, 2002**

President Philip Zimbardo discussed his initiatives for the coming year emphasizing the need to demonstrate how psychology makes a difference. He recommended that we prepare a compendium of the contributions of the profession of psychology to the betterment and fulfillment of the lives of Americans and persons in need throughout the world. A second initiative focuses on the unification of psychology. All of us, professional practitioners, teachers, and researchers alike, are striving for excellence. We must all work together to pursue the problems that the people of our country are confronted with today. A third initiative involves expanding minority representation in APA and throughout psychology. We need creative solutions to expand representation in all areas of psychology. A final initiative involves the modification of the format of the annual convention to be held in Chicago including a shortened and more intense format of presentations, opening and closing ceremonies, entertainment by well-known musical groups, presentations by Gail Sheehy and Hilary Clinton, and presentations by experts on terrorism. For the most part the convention will be housed in one geographic area (the McCormick Center) rather than a series of hotels reducing the time needed to attend presentations distant from one another.

Ray Fowler, Chief Executive Officer and Executive Vice-President of APA, presented a State-of-the Union (APA) summary emphasizing the following.

1. He noted that APA and its members had made an impressive response to the terrorists attack on the World Trade Center on September 11. The disaster response network and the participating psychologists made impressive contributions and continue to do so.
2. Dues collections improved significantly over previous years. However, membership is not growing.

Current membership is about 87,000 to 89,000 and the number of members lost to retirement and death is almost exactly equal to the new members joining the organization. Of special concern is the drop in the number of student members. To improve this situation the APA Graduate Student Newsletter will change to a magazine format similar to the APA Monitor and focus on issues specifically addressing student concerns such as loans, internship opportunities, mentoring, and job search.

3. Ray indicated that newly created publishing products are selling quite well. The publications manual has sold well over 450,000 copies and has become the standard for nearly all scientific associations. The encyclopedia during the first six weeks of sales has generated more than \$3 million over creation costs and continues to sell well.

4. Under the leadership of Dorothy Cantor, the American Psychological Foundation has met \$5.2 million of its \$7 million five year goal. Dorothy has aggressively pursued gifts and endowments.

The current financial status of the association was discussed by Gerald Koocher (Chair of the Finance Committee) and Jack McKay (Chief Financial Officer of the Association). They reported that the current net worth of APA is \$40 million. However, a loss of \$5.5 million was incurred during the year 2001 reducing net worth to \$34.5 million. Major elements of net worth were listed to be the budget operations, profit from the buildings owned by APA, and the stock market investments. Koocher and McKay noted that the income and expenses of the association are monitored on a constant basis. The proposed budget including an estimated deficit of \$1.5 million was passed at the meeting.

President Zimbardo announced that an organization DRG Executive Search has been selected to conduct the search for a new Chief Executive Officer to replace Ray Fowler when he retires in the near future. Submission of forms available on the APA website for suggestions or qualities of the individual to be selected and nominations are strongly solicited from members of APA. The APA Search Committee will be co-chaired by Carol Goodheart and Robert Sternberg. Other members of the committee are Bill Howell, Dorothy Cantor, Jill Reich, and Larry Jones. A student member and diversity representative have not yet been confirmed.

On the Sunday morning session four discussion groups were formed focusing on the topics of public awareness, diversity enhancement, advocacy for science, and visions for the future of psychology. Outcomes of these discussions groups are to serve as a springboard for the council meetings to be held in Chicago in August at the APA Convention.

Council also passed several measures that will enable the association to explore and have an impact on societal issues such as children's mental health and end-of-life issues for children and adolescents. For more information on these issues see the APA Monitor, April 2002. Also, to view the minutes of the council meeting, go to [www.apa.org/governance](http://www.apa.org/governance).

W. Bruce Walsh, Ph.D.  
Division 34, APA Council Representative

## BOOK REVIEWS

### Stress at Work

Review of: Peterson, C.L. (1999). *Stress at work: A sociological perspective*. Amityville, NY: Baywood Publishing.

Reviewed by Roger D. Masters, Nelson A. Rockefeller Professor of Government, Emeritus; President, Foundation for Neuroscience and Society, Dartmouth College.

Researchers in Evolutionary Psychology and in other fields that apply biological perspectives to the analysis of human behavior are often puzzled by the wall of silence or hostility to this research by conventional social scientists. In genetics, neuroscience, ethology, sociobiology, and medicine, we are witnessing astounding advances. Many of these new fields can transform understanding of individual and social human behavior. With an estimated 83 million Americans on Prozac, why are so few social scientists even vaguely interested?

Peterson's *Stress and Work* suggests an answer. The author has presented a sober attempt to link all available work on stress and work environments. He cites publications from an impressive variety of scientific perspectives. Given his focus on a sociological approach, it is especially interesting that he begins from the physiological studies of stress pioneered by Selye and expanded over the last generation by Mason, Cannon, and others. Peterson then surveys "psychological" perspectives before turning to sociological factors with a special emphasis on analyses of "labor process," social class and the work environment, and health outcomes.

In his attempt to integrate different viewpoints, Peterson reduces all biological factors to a narrow view of stress physiology. For example, the "hormonal reaction" after the adrenal cortex is "activated" is summarized as "producing a group of adrenocortical hormones known as the glucocorticoids." (p. 23). After briefly reviewing the principal hormones involved, Peterson notes "the role of emotional or psychological reaction in precipitating and maintaining the stress response." (p. 23). His first chapter concludes: "The stress response must be regarded, at one level, as psychophysiological: a psychological response that has a corresponding physiological response. We cannot carry out adequate model building, however, without understanding the interaction of these processes with broader socio-cultural and political processes." (p. 24) Peterson seems to view each field as utterly distinct. Apart from a mechanistic view of physiology, evolutionary or biological research are not mentioned. In the following, for example, psychology seems to be a mental process unrelated to (or prior to) brain function: "The stress responses... presumes an understanding of the emotional and psychological response. This can manifest in physiological reactions. Psychological research has added an extra dimension to the purely physiological approaches..." (p. 29). That Peterson has little grasp of contemporary neuroscience is evident in the remark that "Future research may show a much higher degree of central nervous system functioning with psychological stimulation than has yet been realized." (p. 15).

Many other fields in contemporary human biology are totally ignored (e.g., behavior genetics, ethology, or

sociobiology). For instance, face-to-face social interactions in the workplace are described in terms of "loss of control," with no reference to the social ethology characteristic of hominid evolution and most known pre-industrial cultures. Since dominant individuals play as much a role in groups of humans as among most other primates, even animal behavior studies can illuminate human brain chemistry, mood, and behavior. For example, McGuire's finding that serotonin levels increase in the weeks after an individual gains dominant status is obviously relevant to working environments in which no member of the face-to-face group has unquestioned status. Peterson's analysis of "labor processes" in terms of "alienation" misses such complexities. Indeed, his use of the Marxist term lacks the full range of its original connotation for Marx himself, who was quite aware that in French, "aliéné" (alienated) means "insane."

Isolating each field and treating it in a conventional manner (citing well-known authors and assessing their work literally without seeking underlying functions) makes it impossible to discover biological contributions at every level from psychology and sociology to health outcomes. Ultimately, this approach remains in the tradition of the "blank slate" model of human nature found in philosophers like Locke. Consider the following: "Two people may be affected quite differently by the same stimulus. This identifies differences in the physiological and psychological responses resulting from perceiving a situation as threatening or noxious.... As a result of viewing people as cognitive creatures, a sociological approach sees human needs as shaping perceptions of situations and therefore as an important factor in understanding stress. Needs are learned and sustained through social encounters. Those who are unable to meet demands involving important needs experience stress." (p. 50).

One can't quibble over the fact that people are "affected quite differently by the same stimulus." But to attribute perceptions to needs, and then treat needs as "learned and sustained through social encounters" makes it very difficult to imagine the relevance of studies in cognitive neuroscience or primate ethology to human stress. Even within the narrow field of stress research, it is therefore not surprising that Peterson ignores the work of Robert Sapolsky of Stanford, whose work on the "endangerment" of neurons by prolonged stress links stress hormones and neuronal function to RNA expression and health outcomes in a medically innovative as well as behaviorally important manner.

In this book, the disciplinary narrowness characteristic of most social scientists persists despite Peterson's attempt to develop an integrative framework cutting across fields. Views of human nature that rely primarily on Lockean psychology or Marxian sociology are scientifically obsolete but very much alive in our university faculties. As a result, *Stress at Work* helps explain why so many evolutionary psychologists find that explaining their work to conventional sociologists and psychologists is a stressful experience.

© Roger D. Masters.

*Editor's Note: This review originally appeared in The Human Nature Review, 2, 164-165 (<http://human-nature.com/nibbs/02/stress.html>). Reprinted here with permission.*

## Two out of Three Ain't Bad<sup>1</sup>

Review of: Heft, H. (2001). *Ecological Psychology in Context: James Gibson, Roger Barker, and the Legacy of William James's Radical Empiricism*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum. 435 pp. ISBN 0-8058-2350-6. (hardcover).

Reviewed by Louis G. Tassinary, Director, Environmental Psychophysiology Lab, College of Architecture, Texas A&M University.

The names James Gibson and Roger Barker are undoubtedly familiar to most psychologists. If my experience is representative, however, we invariably pigeonhole them as autochthonous iconoclasts, thus discussing them in the classroom and ignoring them in our research. Prof. Heft has done the field a service by writing an accessible monograph that places them in a shared historical and intellectual context, arising from the radical empiricist philosophy of William James as filtered through the teachings of Edwin Holt and the writings of pioneering Gestalt theorists such as Kurt Lewin and Fritz Heider.

The impetuses behind this work were to cultivate a deeper appreciation for Gibson's approach by articulating its theoretical commitments, explicate a set of foundational ideas to bridge the ecological programs of James Gibson and Roger Barker, and consider the place of ecological psychology in the discipline of psychology generally (p. xxvii). The first two goals are clearly accomplished and, despite being occasionally prolix, the monograph is well-worth reading if only to recognize both theorists as gifted spokesmen for a long-standing minority opinion on the relationship between the knower and the known. The discussion concerning the relationship between the concepts of affordance (Gibson) and behavior-milieu synomorphs (Barker) is particularly noteworthy (p. 287).

It is with respect to the third goal, however, that Prof. Heft's effort falls short of his mark. Put simply, enervated non-ecological alternatives are presented and then summarily dismissed as either "illogical" (p. 230) or "unworkable" (p. 315). For example, at the conclusion of an abstract and terse discussion of levels of organization, we are told that "within psychology, little attention has been directed at extra-individual processes" and that other disciplines "devoted to social structures" have failed "to identify lawful relations between social structures and individuals actions" (p. 244). Such statements will certainly come as a surprise to social psychologists, environmental psychologists, developmental psychologists, sociologists, population biologists, political scientists and historians. Consider as well a section titled "Environmental Structure or Scripts" (p. 269). Here we are informed that "scripts" fail in principle as explanatory concepts because if sufficiently specific they would be unworkably complex and if simple enough to be workable they would be so general as to be useless. At best, such an argument is conclusory. At worst, it undermines the case for environmental structure because (a) the identification of environmental

structure remains largely a promissory note (p. 150), and (b) an abstract argument regarding specificity and workability applies equally to "exploratory actions" as it does to "twenty questions."

The general problem can perhaps be illustrated by contrasting a quotation cited favorably by Prof. Heft with its antipode. In a section criticizing a classic monograph from the early 1960's the following quotation from an article in the journal *Ecological Psychology* appears:

"The big idea behind *Plans and the Structure of Behavior* also was the big mistake, that people operate on plans just as computers "run" on programs. It was this idea that led not only these authors but the whole cognitivist movement to suppose that behind the various verbal and non-verbal strategies and tactics by which we coordinate our own and each other's activities, there exists layer upon layer of increasingly minute plans exhaustively controlling our every move." (p. 312)

Compare:

The big idea behind *The Senses Considered as Perceptual Systems* also was the big mistake, that people encounter latent structure just as radios "resonate" to signals. It was this idea that led not only this author but the whole ecological movement to suppose that behind the various verbal and ... there exists layer upon layer of increasingly specific constraints controlling our every move.

The problem with both "quotations" is that they are equally unhelpful; that is, they neither provide sufficient detail and reasoning nor do they cite to relevant experimental data.

In the final paragraph Prof. Heft poses a hypothetical: If the viewpoint offered by ecological psychology is roughly correct, then perceptual information is publicly available and there is "reason for hope." In attempting to achieve his first two goals Prof. Heft assumes the role of scholar and does an admirable job. In attempting to achieve his third goal, however, he inadvertently assumes the role of advocate and thus the portrayal of the place of ecological psychology in the context of psychology generally is at times intemperate.

Overall, this is important monograph that I highly recommend to readers interested in a sophisticated and nuanced treatment of the varied theoretical consequences of a philosophical commitment to realism. It will not convert the skeptics.

## ANNOUNCEMENTS

### Books

*The Drama of the Commons*, E. Ostrom, T. Dietz, N. Dolsak, P.C. Stern, S. Stonich, and E.U. Weber, Editors.

A publication of the Committee on the Human Dimensions of Global Change, National Research Council (U.S.), National Academy Press, February 2002 (\$25.00 US, or order it on the Web for \$20.00 at [www.nap.edu](http://www.nap.edu)).

<sup>1</sup> Title of a song written by Jim Steinman and performed by Meat Loaf on the album "Bat Out of Hell" (1977).

The metaphor of the "tragedy of the commons" has had tremendous value for stimulating research, but it accurately describes the reality of human-environment interactions only in very special situations. Research over the past thirty years has helped clarify how human motivations, rules governing access to resources, the structure of social organizations, and the resource systems themselves interact to determine whether or not the many dramas of the commons end happily. In this book, two dozen leaders of research in the field review the evidence from several disciplines and many lines of research and present a state-of-the-art assessment. They summarize lessons learned and identify the major challenges facing any system of governance for resource management. They also highlight the major challenges for the next decade: making knowledge development more systematic; understanding institutions dynamically (processes such as decision making, adaptation, and conflict management); considering a broader range of resources (such as global and technological commons); and taking into account the effects of social and historical context (e.g., the institutional linkages, the globalization phenomenon, and broad social and technological change). They conclude that the commons perspective, as researchers are now developing it, can be applied to an increasingly broad range of public policy problems. The book will be a valuable and accessible introduction to the field for students and a resource for advanced researchers.

-----

*Handbook of Environmental Psychology*. Robert B. Bechtel & Arza Churchman, Editors. ISBN: 0-471-40594-9. Hardcover, 736 pp. February 2002, US \$95.00

An international team of leading scholars explores the latest theories, research, and applications critical to environmental psychology

Featuring the latest research and concepts in the field straight from the world's leading scholars and practitioners, *Handbook of Environmental Psychology* provides a balanced and comprehensive overview of this rapidly growing field. Bringing together contributions from an international team of top researchers representing a myriad of disciplines, this groundbreaking resource provides you with a pluralistic approach to the field as an interdisciplinary effort with links to other disciplines.

Addressing a variety of issues and practice settings, *Handbook of Environmental Psychology* is divided into five organized and accessible parts to provide a thorough overview of the theories, research, and applications at the forefront of environmental psychology today. Part I deals with sharpening theories; Part II links the subject to other disciplines; Part III focuses on methods; Part IV highlights applications; and Part V examines the future of the field.

Defining the ongoing revolution in thinking about how the environment and psychology interact, *Handbook of Environmental Psychology* is must reading for anyone coping directly with the attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors that are destroying our environment and putting our lives in jeopardy.

*Handbook of Environmental Sociology*, Riley E. Dunlap & William Michelson, Editors (ISBN 0-313-26808-8).

Designed as an overview of the first quarter century of American environmental sociology, the volume is intended to provide a good introduction to the major emphases in environmental sociology (particularly in the USA).

The HANDBOOK can be ordered directly from the publisher at [http://www.greenwood.com/books/BookDetail.asp?dept\\_id=1&sku=DHE/](http://www.greenwood.com/books/BookDetail.asp?dept_id=1&sku=DHE/).

## New Journal

*Children, Youth and Environments* will soon be published as a web-based journal. It will be peer-reviewed according to high standards. It will have an experienced and expert group of editors and an eminent editorial advisory board. CYE will be multidisciplinary in nature and international in scope. It will bridge across academic research and professional fields.

Aside from journal articles, the CYE-website will have other useful features, including book reviews, a searchable directory of organizations in the field, ditto for individuals, upcoming events, legislative reviews, and a searchable bibliographic database. There will also be a section on "best practices" and an interactive component that will allow readers to comment on published articles and authors to respond. CYE will be richly illustrated and will include video as well.

Supported by NSF-funding, access will be free. The purpose is to create a first-rate source of information that includes but goes beyond the publication of high-quality refereed research articles. CYE will be the foremost resource that people will want to consult for questions about any aspect of the relationships between children, youth and their environments.

If you are interested in reviewing submissions or books for CYE, send the editors an email, describing your interests and expertise in a brief paragraph, along with a few keywords, and preferably attaching a resume or c.v. as well.

Papers submitted for publication, should be accompanied by a cover note that specifies the file format. Any illustrations should be attached as separate files, clearly labeled. Publication in CYE will be governed by non-exclusive copyright, allowing subsequent publication elsewhere with acknowledgement of CYE.

Editors:

Professors Willem van Vliet- and Ernesto Arias  
College of Architecture and Planning  
University of Colorado, CB 314  
Boulder, CO 80309-0314  
Email: [Willem.Vanvliet@colorado.edu](mailto:Willem.Vanvliet@colorado.edu)  
[Ernesto.Arias@colorado.edu](mailto:Ernesto.Arias@colorado.edu)

**Plan 1 - Memorial Plaza****Plan 2 - Memorial Square****Plan 3 - Memorial Triangle****Plan 4 - Memorial Garden****Plan 5 - Memorial Park****Plan 6 - Memorial Promenade**

The Lower Manhattan Development Corporation (LMDC) and the Port Authority of New York and New Jersey (PA) have released six concept plans for the WTC site and adjacent areas. Public input has made some goals for the WTC site clear. A memorial and new public open spaces are fundamental aspects of the plans. Battery Park City and the World Financial Center must be integrated with the rest of Lower Manhattan. A new transportation hub, possibly akin to a new downtown Grand Central Terminal, would accommodate the mass transit needs of residents, workers, and visitors. These plans also respond to the PA requirement that the 12,000 sq. feet lost in the WTC disaster be recouped. The LMDC and the PA are accepting comments via the LMDC web site, [www.RenewNYC.com](http://www.RenewNYC.com).

# BRING A FRIEND INTO DIVISION 34!!

## Population and Environmental Psychology

Members of Division 34 receive this newsletter three times a year. You're probably a member, if you received this issue by mail -- but maybe you have friends and colleagues who are not members. Professionals who are members of related organizations can join the Division even if not members of the American Psychological Association. Our dues are only US\$9.00, with the first year FREE. We encourage students to join as student affiliates. All members, associates, and affiliates are eligible to vote and to hold office in Division 34.

To join, complete this form and mail to: Margaret Topf, Ph.D., Secretary, 4800 Hale Parkway #602, Denver, CO 80220.

I wish to join APA Division 34:

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Address: \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail: \_\_\_\_\_

Circle one: I wish to join as:      APA Member                  APA Fellow                  APA Associate  
   Student Affiliate                                  Non APA Member

Circle all that apply: I am also a member of:      EDRA   PAA   APHA   AMA   IAPS   MERA

Other associations: \_\_\_\_\_



NONPROFIT  
U.S. POSTAGE  
PAID  
WASHINGTON, D.C.  
PERMIT NO. 6348

**THIRD CLASS MAIL**

DIVISION 34  
AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION  
750 FIRST ST., N.E.  
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20002-4242 USA



Printed on recycled paper made from 100% post-consumer fiber