



# THE MILITARY PSYCHOLOGIST

*The Official Newsletter of the Society for Military Psychology*

*Division 19 of the American Psychological Association*

*Volume 31 Number 2 Summer 2016*



## **In this issue:**

Editor's Column..... 3

President's Column..... 4



Feature Article: A Model for Developing Community-Based,  
Grass Roots Laboratories for Postdeployment Adjustment ..... 6

Feature Article: A "Tipping Point" for Military Psychology?  
Perhaps ..... 11

Trends: APA Ethics Letter to the Board of Directors ..... 13



Spotlight on Research: Military Enlistment: Motivations of  
Former Military Personnel Coming From Single-Parent Homes..... 16

Spotlight on History: Profiles in Military Psychology:  
Colonel Robert S. Nichols ..... 21

Continuing Education Committee Report..... 25

Membership Committee Report..... 26



Early Career Psychologists Committee Report ..... 28

Student Affairs Committee Report ..... 29

APA Program Committee Report ..... 32

Announcements ..... 34

## Division 19 Executive Committee Officers & Committees

January–December 2016

### DIVISION 19 OFFICERS

President	Ann T. Landes	O: 352-376-1611/E: Ann.Landes@va.gov
President-Elect	Sally Harvey	E: salsterhead@yahoo.com
Past President	Thomas J. Williams	O: 717-245-4511/E: Thomas.j.williams1@us.army.mil
Secretary	Eric A. Surface	O: 919-480-2751/E: esurface@swa-consulting.com
Treasurer	Scott L. Johnston	E: Scott.Johnston@med.navy.mil
Members-at-Large	Nathan D. Ainspan	O: 703-614-8663/E: Nathan.D.Ainspan.civ@mail.mil
	Joel Dubenitz	E: joel.dubenitz@gmail.com
	Christopher Murphy	E: spoon6196@yahoo.com
	CDR Arlene Saitzyk	E: arlene.saitzyk@usmc.mil
Representative to APA Council	Larry James	O: 937-775-3490/E: larry.james@wright.edu

### STANDING COMMITTEES AND CHAIR

Fellows	Michael D. Matthews	Mike.Matthews@usma.edu
Awards	Thomas J. Williams	Thomas.j.williams1@us.army.mil
Membership	David M. Barry	dmbarry63@gmail.com
Nominations	Sally Harvey	salsterhead@yahoo.com
Military Psychology (Journal)	Armando Estrada	military.psychology.journal@gmail.com
The Military Psychologist (Newsletter)	Joseph B. Lyons	joseph.lyons.6@us.af.mil
APA Convention Program	Rebecca Blais	Rebecca.blais@usu.edu
	Lindsey Monteith	Lindsey.Monteith@va.gov
Clinical Practice	Jason Duff	Jason.Duff@cvn73.navy.mil
Military Psychology History	Paul Gade	paul.gade39@gmail.com
Women and Minorities in the Military	Kelly Ervin	Kelly.s.ervin.civ@mail.mil
International Military Psychology	Robert Roland	Robertr885@aol.com
Website	Arwen DeCostanza	arwen.h.decostanza@us.army.mil
Division 19 Listserv	Brian Lees	leesbro@hotmail.com
Student Affairs	Kevin O'Leary (Chair)	koleary@antioch.edu
Reserve Component Affairs	James Griffith	jhgriffith@comcast.net
Early Career Psychologists	Julie M. Landry Poole (Chair)	julie.m.landrypoole.civ@mail.mil
Continuing Education	Jay Morrison	jay.morrison77@gmail.com
Paliamentarian	Paul Bartone	bartonep@ndu.edu

**THE MILITARY PSYCHOLOGIST.** *The Military Psychologist* is the official newsletter of the Society for Military Psychology, Division 19 of the American Psychological Association. *The Military Psychologist* provides news, reports, and noncommercial information that serves to (1) advance the science and practice of psychology within military organizations; (2) foster professional development of psychologists and other professionals interested in the psychological study of the military through education, research, and training; and (3) support efforts to disseminate and apply scientific knowledge and state of the art advances in areas relevant to military psychology. *The Military Psychologist* is published three times per year: Spring (submission deadline **February 1**), Summer (submission deadline **June 1**), and Fall (submission deadline **October 1**). Instructions for Contributors appear on the back cover.

### EDITORIAL BOARD OF THE MILITARY PSYCHOLOGIST

Editor in Chief	Joseph B. Lyons	joseph.lyons.6@us.af.mil
APA Account Manager	Mark Winter	mwinter@apa.org
Production Manager	Abimbola Farinde	Abimbola.farinde@outlook.com
Editorial Departments		
Executive Committee	Eric A. Surface	esurface@swa-consulting.com
Membership	David M. Barry	dmbarry63@gmail.com
Feature Articles	Maureen Copeskey	copeskey@gmail.com
Trends	Joseph B. Lyons	joseph.lyons.6@us.af.mil
Spotlight on Research	Colleen Varga	colleen.varga.1@us.af.mil
Spotlight on History	Paul A. Gade	paul.gade39@gmail.com
Continuing Education	Jay A. Morrison	jay.morrison77@gmail.com
Early Career Psychologists	Julie M. Landry Poole (Chair)	julie.m.landrypoole.civ@mail.mil
Student Affairs	Kevin O'Leary (Chair)	koleary@antioch.edu
APA Program	Rebecca Blais	Rebecca.blais@usu.edu
	Lindsey Monteith	Lindsey.Monteith@va.gov
Announcements	Christina Hein	chein9@gmail.com

## ***Editor's Column***

***Joseph Lyons, PhD***



Welcome to the Summer Issue of *The Military Psychologist*! This issue is packed with content ranging from trending issues in APA to research on military recruitment. Our Division 19 President, Dr. Ann Landes, kicks things off with by discussing some of the challenges facing Division 19 (and more broadly, APA), and she discusses some of the recent milestones accomplished by Division 19.

In our featured articles we will hear from Richard G. Tedeschi and Bret A. Moore as they discuss a nontraditional method for clinical treatment. Dr. DeLeon adds a brief commentary on some recent activities in Congress that have implications for Division 19. I have included a letter from the Ethics Committee related to the Hoffman report in the trends section; this letter was provided by the Ethics Chair and it seemed appropriate as a trending issue. The Spotlight on Research provides a qualitative look at some of the factors that shape military enlistment, pro-

vided by Jada A. Philips. Next, Dr. Gerald Krueger takes a historical look at Colonel Robert S. Nichols in the Spotlight on History. By the way, Dr. Gade is currently looking for some extra support for the Spotlight on History, as well as assistance in archiving some of the historical materials of the division. If you are interested in getting more involved in Division 19 (students included), this is a great opportunity to contribute and learn more about our legacy.

Also, do not forget to check out the detailed reports from our talented and very dedicated committees, including the Student Affairs Committee, the Membership Committee, the Early Career Psychologists Committee, and the Continuing Education Committee. A copy of the Division 19 APA program can also be found in this issue—so let's get ready for Denver!

Thank you to all those who contributed to this issue of *The Military Psychologist*.

Happy Reading!

## ***President's Column***

***Ann T. Landes, PhD***



A sunny day met with a slight cooling breeze out on the small pond. Three different families of geese with their own brood of fuzzy goslings have made the pond home; some are out swimming, and some are on land flapping wet wings and doing what geese do best.

A dark shadow is cast from above, momentarily dimming the brightness about them, interrupting the tranquil scene. Large and swift, the expansiveness of the wingspread and agility of the shadow quickly register as a threat. A hawk. Focused and determined, soaring above with great confidence.

In a matter of seconds, the peaceful landscape has clearly shifted. Without hesitation, the geese launch into action. Focused and determined, the three families gather their goslings into one combined tight formation, all of the parents working together to encircle them securely within.

Waiting. Waiting. Waiting. No movement. No sound. Waiting. Waiting.

The shadow reappears, knowing precisely what it wants. With speed and accuracy of a powerful bird, the hawk dives.

The formation remains unified and unflinching, determined to protect at any price their broods: an instinct that has been passed down through the ages to ensure that they move forward into the future.

With force, the hawk dives directly into the circle. Amazingly, the hawk is unsuccessful in obtaining a gosling and then departs.

The formation remains intact, watching. When the sense of threat abates, the geese families separate and continue on with life as usual.

I begin my column with this salient experience as it clearly provides a narrative of what I have learned during my short tenure as your president. As a division and profes-

sion, we have been presented with many challenges and potential threats stemming from the Hoffman report. Continual issues arise, requiring focus and determination, demanding our attention and immediate action. I believe many will agree when I confess that, at times, it has been physically, emotionally, and psychologically arduous. I also admit that this is not what I expected for my term and have had to fend off transient feelings of being ill-suited, frustratingly unprepared, and just plain angry.

What life has taught me, and what I am reminded constantly of through Division 19, is that challenges and threats will arise, but our power resides in our willingness and ability to stand united. Like the families of geese in the opening story, our strong community of dedicated individuals remains unflinchingly present and prepared, focused on the goal of moving forward in a manner that addresses the concerns at hand while safeguarding our common future. I am continually humbled and inspired when a need emerges and instantly volunteers encircle and selflessly offer their time, knowledge, skills, and support. As a result, we have been successful in strategically responding to immediate and potential perils, while moving steadfastly toward specific divisional goals of continual growth and progress.

A summary of significant and recent Division 19 accomplishments will help illustrate what happens when we stay the course:

1. Established Division 19 Task Force to respond to the Hoffman Independent Review, directed by Dr. Thomas Williams. This report, along with the letter that asks the American Psychological Association (APA) for corrective action and provides recommendations to AOA leadership, can be found on our Division 19 webpage (<http://www.apadivisions.org/division-19/news-events/hoffman-report-response.aspx>).
2. Secured an additional seat on the Council of Representatives (CoR). Thus, Division 19 will be a two-seat division on the 2017 CoR and will have a stronger voice on the



council. This is a timely win, considering APA's current focus on policies that may affect military psychologists, such as policies that stipulate where military psychologists can and cannot be assigned. Thanks to all our members who voted, especially those who cast all 10 of their apportionment votes for Division 19.

3. Created and submitted a divisional response to APA's call for public response to the Proposed Revisions to the APA Ethics Code. This was an intense collaborative effort that involved Drs. Eric Surface, Sally Harvey, Thomas Williams, and Scott Johnston. I also want to thank all of our Division 19 members who took the time to submit their thoughtful public comments.

4. Initiated a successful membership drive for 2016 that has resulted in increased membership numbers. This occurs at a time when membership across APA divisions is drastically declining. Dr. Dave Barry can be credited with this boon. He has also successfully recruited two impressive committee members to join the Membership Committee.

5. Maintained appreciable financial stability through revenues generated from our divisional journal, *Military Psychology*, and membership dues.

6. Proposed a revision of bylaws. I want to thank Dr. Arlene Saitzyk, member-at-large, for spearheading this important project.

7. Drafted a proposal for an official divisional budget. Thank you Drs. Scott Johnston and Joel Dubenitz for your willingness to engage in the daunting task.

8. Drafted a proposal for a more comprehensive travel award policy. Drs. Eric Surface, Armando Estrada, and

Scott Johnston are to be commended for their contribution to this effort.

9. Recruited Dr. Laura Neely as the APA Committee on International Relations–Division 19 Liaison. Thank you to Drs. Robert Roland and Paul Bartone for working with Dr. Neely in this effort as they serve on our Divisional International Military Psychology Committee.

10. Developed an exemplary program for the upcoming APA convention in Denver. Kudos and thanks to Drs. Rebecca Blais and Lindsey Montieth for this accomplishment. (I do hope to see you all in Denver!)

11. Solicited nominations and prepared a slate of venerated candidates for Division 19 elections. Dr. Sally Harvey—I applaud you. And, I express my deepest gratitude to all who made a commitment to run and serve.

Without a doubt, we are an industrious, focused, and committed division. We have effectively pooled our talents and energies to address challenges at hand. But, we are acutely aware that times of uncertainty and change persist. I invite and encourage you all to become more involved in any venue that calls your name. You are important. We need your leadership and service as we harness our collective strength to navigate the waters of change, holding true to our mission of advancing the science and practice of military psychology now and into the future.

Ann T. Landes, PhD  
President

Division 19, Society for Military Psychology  
Ann.Landes@va.gov

---

## A Model for Developing Community-Based, Grass Roots Laboratories for Postdeployment Adjustment

Richard G. Tedeschi  
*University of North Carolina, Charlotte*

Bret A. Moore  
*University of Texas Health Science Center, San Antonio*

---

Over 14 years of war in Iraq and Afghanistan highlight how harsh combat, environmental conditions, and extended separation from loved ones affect the psychological well-being of military personnel and their family members. Although estimates vary, it is generally accepted that up to one third of Iraq and Afghanistan veterans battle some form of psychological ailment as a result of their service (Hoge, Auchterlonie, & Milliken, 2006; Hoge et al., 2004), which translates to roughly 700,000 men and women. More specifically, estimates of posttraumatic stress disorder (PTSD) alone are in the area of 15% (Hoge, Terhakopian, Castro, Messer, & Engel, 2007; Tanielian & Jaycox, 2008).

A secondary issue associated with the increase in mental health needs of our veterans is the demand placed on the military and Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) health care systems. Over the past several years, governmental and private organizations issued critical reports on both systems regarding their ability to meet the ever-increasing needs of current and past members of the military. Consequently, there is a greater focus on achieving a better understanding of the difficulties faced by combat veterans and developing more effective approaches to these problems (GAO, 2014).

An additional outcome associated with these concerns, as well as a societal desire to support those who have served their country, is the proliferation of grassroots civilian programs. To date, there are approximately 46,000 veteran-focused organizations in existence that support the variety of needs of veterans and their families (Armstrong, McDonough, & Savage, 2015). Many of these organizations utilize a variety of complementary and alternative treatments such as mindfulness, recreation, art, and equine therapies as a means of filling in the “gaps” within traditional governmental behavioral health care programs. These grassroots civilian programs are often found within local communities, and are funded almost exclusively by private citizens, foundations, and corporations.

There are several major benefits associated with community-based, nontraditional, grassroots programs. First, these programs have more flexibility with regard to exploring alternative treatment options as opposed to adhering to a relatively rigid menu of manualized treatments. This is by no means an attempt to minimize the importance of evidence-based psychosocial and pharmacological interventions, but rather highlight the idea that many service members and veterans may prefer different treatment options for various reasons (Kearney & Simpson, 2015; Steenkamp, Litz, Hoge, & Marmar, 2015). Second, community-based programs can act as “laboratories” or pilot programs, which can be scaled up (or back) as required. And lastly, the grassroots nature of these organizations affords greater opportunity for veterans and their family members, nongovernmental affiliated clinicians, and community leaders to bring unique perspectives and renewed passion into the topic of serving the mental health needs of veterans and their families.

However, limitations to this model do exist. As with many nonprofit, community-based organizations, finding funding sources is often a challenge, particularly for those who are unfamiliar with the grant writing process. With little notice, even once-thriving programs can decompose rapidly when funding streams disappear. Also, and inextricably tied to the above-mentioned limitation, is often a paucity of program evaluation and outcome research expertise that is crucial for making the case to the community and donors regarding program success. In an age of tough economic times and skepticism about novel grassroots programs with little scientific support available, well-developed, executed, and articulated outcomes are a necessity.

In this article, we offer the example of Boulder Crest Retreat for Military and Veteran Wellness (BCR), a community based, nonprofit, private organization in Bluemont, Virginia, as a program that demonstrates many of the strengths of grassroots programs. Although there are many

programs in existence that offer critical services to the active duty and veteran populations, we have found BCR to be unique in the level of comprehensive care it provides. We are also impressed with the potential the program has to become a model for establishing and developing effective grassroots, community based programs for veterans and family members; an approach that is designed to fill the gap in health care services between the Department of Defense and Veterans Affairs that many veterans experience.

### **A Model for a Community-Based Program**

#### **Veterans in Leadership and Staff Positions**

Although we are unaware of any empirical data to support this notion, it appears that many organizations that serve veterans are founded by veterans or their family members. Dedication to this cause is important because developing and sustaining an effective organization is a daunting task. In the case of BCR, the founder, a retired U.S. Navy Master Chief Petty Officer, donated the first million dollars and 37 acres of his family's 200-acre estate on which he lives in the foothills of the Blue Ridge Mountains to create the campus of the retreat center. He also has the leadership and organizational capabilities honed during his time in the military and as a business owner to create the retreat center and attract initial funding. There is much that could be said about his ability to envision what this retreat center is becoming and to attract the right people to help him.

The right people at the core of his staff are veterans themselves, along with professionals who clearly understand and believe in the vision and the mission of BCR. All staff are seen as providing services of healing and restoration in their personal interaction with veterans, whether it be while preparing food, working on the grounds, or engaged in administrative support. Having veterans as the core of the staff is important for the program to have credibility for participants, and to maintain a perspective on what is going to make sense and work for veterans as it undergoes further development. Unlike many clinic-based programs run by mental health professionals, at BCR, there is very little sense of separateness between program participants and staff. It is an environment that is often characterized by participants as "being home and surrounded by loved ones."

### **An Environment Conducive to Its Methods and Goals**

The methodology of the program at BCR is generally meditative, and the activities, environment, and interactions with the staff are designed to enhance the reflective focus of the program. For veterans and family members under stress, this peaceful experience allows for greater interpersonal connection, emotional focus, and personal discovery. The rural setting is enhanced with the physical structures built of timbers and logs, with warm wood interiors and beautiful views. This physical environment gives a message that participants are going to be cared for and are valued, so the accommodations are part of the process.

In addition, the staff spends virtually all the program time with participants, eating meals together and engaging in the various outdoor activities. The dress is casual and the interactions are informal. The entire day and evening provides an opportunity for contact and conversation and this allows participants to settle in to an emotionally safe physical and social environment. In reality, therapy occurs around the clock as opposed to the traditional time limitations of 45 to 50 min found within traditional behavioral health facilities.

### **Short-Term, Intensive Experiences With Follow-Up**

The programs at BCR take place over several days and are residential. Because there is much time spent together with other participants and staff, participants are involved in many hours of the program experience that may be comparable to many months of traditional therapeutic interventions. But the difference between this type of program and traditional behavioral health interventions is also qualitative. Although BCR includes in some of their programs therapeutic elements such as interpersonal skill building and cognitive change interventions, overall its approach is based on creating a milieu that emphasizes normalization, mutual support, and living skills. Instead of focusing exclusively on the reduction of symptoms, the approach of BCR is one of growth and learning to live a better and more fulfilling life.

One of the biggest challenges to a program like this is extending this experience beyond the time and place of the retreat. There are two approaches to this challenge that are in development at BCR. One is partnering with other organizations that serve veterans back in their hometowns. It is important that these partnerships provide an extension

of the basic philosophy of the BCR experience into interactions with organizations that provide support when the veterans and family members return home.

A second approach is technologically based and allows a continued connection via the Internet. Through peer and professional support, BCR participants will be able to connect with others who can provide assistance with a variety of issues such as accessing care, transition from military to civilian life, and life coaching.

### **A Growth-Focused Philosophy With a Variety of Specific Programs**

Given that there are veterans and families whose needs vary, there needs to be a variety of programs under the overall philosophical umbrella of the organization. Currently, BCR has programs that focus on male and female veterans, military and veteran transitions, veterans' families, and mentorships that link older and younger veterans. These programs share a small group approach and a philosophy that veterans have valuable capabilities that are honed in their military experiences, and that mutual support emphasizes these capabilities. This philosophy runs counter to a general societal assumption that people who are wounded are broken, and instead emphasizes the strengths that can come from stressful and traumatic events if these experiences are treated as catalysts for growth (Tedeschi, 2013).

Using a model that incorporates posttraumatic growth as an assumption rather than a focus on disorder or pathology, participants immediately find themselves treated with respect and encouragement. Veterans themselves tend to value their overall military experience, if not particular traumas. For example, data from Vietnam veterans show that 70% reported a mainly positive impact from their military experience (Dohrenwend et al., 2004), and combat exposure was related to greater life satisfaction (Vogt, King, King, Savarese, & Suvak, 2004). Aligning the philosophy of the program with these realities of veterans, creates a sense of being in a place where military experiences are understood. At the same time it is recognized that participants are coming to the program because there are aspects of these experiences that are traumatizing, and the negative aspects of military service coexist with the positive.

The most important positive aspect of military experience that is recreated in the way the BCR programs are de-

signed is small unit camaraderie. Intensive, shared experience in the program over several days reminds participants of what has been most valuable in their service, the formation of supportive relationships. Participants also find that they are partners in the process of healing each other. The program encourages this kind of support, rather than implying that the most important aspects of the program are what the staff has to offer. Some veterans who need services have not been able to maintain close contact with their units for various reasons, and the design of a program that recreates that connection is healing in itself.

It is obvious how different a program model this is compared to traditional therapies where veterans come to a clinic individually to receive medication or therapy from a professional. Although these traditional models can be useful and have some positive effects, they do not make use of some of the most powerful aspects of veterans' experiences: being understood by others with similar experiences, an emphasis on the value of military experiences, and the sense of personal value and meaning that comes from helping others. BCR participants are truly viewed as individuals who have much to offer each other and the larger society because of their military and combat experiences.

### **Matching Participants to Programming**

We do know that one size does not fit all. Understanding who can benefit most from the programming available is important in making sure that the participants who attend will benefit from their experience. Staff members need to understand whom the programs are designed and built for, and not to assume their methodology will suit every veteran. For example, BCR does not accept participants who are active substance abusers as the facility and staff is not able to manage possible withdrawal reactions, and useful participation is not possible while intoxicated. In the variety of programs offered, there is a process of screening and preparation, with BCR staff starting the development of a supportive relationship before veterans are accepted for participation.

### **Balancing Innovation and Empirically Based Approaches to Intervention**

While BCR is not a treatment center or clinic, it shares goals of traditional clinical treatment centers, of enhancing the functioning of veterans and families in their communities. Being privately funded and using small group pro-



programming, BCR acts as a laboratory for exploring the effectiveness of alternative approaches to helping veterans and families achieve posttraumatic growth. Although there are a variety of activities involved in the programming, all have a common element of meditative, reflective experience that they share. Walking a labyrinth, yoga, kayaking, and archery, working with horses, and similar activities, help to reduce anxiety, and encourage a more mindful self-awareness that helps in allowing participants to consider their emotional wounds and to create a positive idea for their future selves.

Traditional therapies are not offered in these short-term programs, but elements of empirically based therapies are introduced and integrated throughout the activities of the programs. Cognitive-behavioral approaches are represented in how veterans are encouraged to think about themselves and their experiences, relaxation and meditative techniques are emphasized in many activities. Group psychoeducational sessions introduce participants to more accurate ways to understand symptoms, family dynamics, communications, and practical living skills.

### **Evaluation of Outcomes**

Because of the integrative nature of this program, it is difficult to determine which elements of programs are responsible for gains. Dismantling procedures could be used in order to understand which elements operate to produce positive outcomes, but that strategy is hard for programs designed primarily to serve. Good program evaluation is a challenge for community-based programs that have staff that are not necessarily trained in research methodology. Therefore, it is important that community based programs link with resources that can help them establish an ongoing evaluation process if they are to be credible laboratories for innovation.

Most community programs have access to local colleges and universities that may be able to help with evaluation and making sure there is clear ongoing investment and in this process, may involve an ability to fund grants and contracts specifically for this purpose. However, there may be routine measurements that can be incorporated into the programming so that at least some data exist that can be utilized to determine overall effectiveness; if not an in depth understanding of how program components are working. Well-validated measures of symptoms related to PTSD are obvious choices. BCR uses such measures in

tracking their participants over time, and plans to continue this process in order to understand the long-term trajectories of veterans who have attended their programs. BCR utilizes the PTSD Checklist-Military version (PCL-M), The World Health Organization Disability Assessment Schedule (WHODAS), The World Health Organization Quality of Life Instrument (WHOQOL), and The Beck Depression Inventory Version 2 (BDI-II). However, attention should also be paid to other outcomes beside symptom reduction.

In programs such as those at BCR, the philosophy and emphasis is on strength and growth, the development of meaningful living, enhanced relationships, and other outcomes that involve the presence of positive aspects of living rather than the absence of negative experiences such as symptoms of posttraumatic stress. Therefore, adding measures of posttraumatic growth, resilience, and meaning may demonstrate more clearly the strength of programs that have these concepts as a foundation for their design. BCR is currently in the process of designing a comprehensive program evaluation that measures the concept and process of posttraumatic growth, quality of life, and clinical symptoms over an 18-month period.

### **Scaling Up**

Despite the fact that BCR has served over 2,000 veterans and family members in just over 2 years, it is obviously limited in the degree to which it can serve the needs of the larger veteran community. Therefore, the stated vision of BCR is to replicate this approach around the nation, establishing similar retreat centers in locations that have large veteran populations. The practical challenges of such an undertaking are obvious. A less obvious challenge is to preserve the nature of an intimate healing experience for program participants within a large organization. Maintaining a multisite organization's philosophy and programming requires consistency and clarity that only comes from collaboration with experts in curriculum development and program evaluation.

As the need for effective behavioral health care for our veterans and military personnel and their families continues to grow, community based, grassroots organizations like BCR will play an integral role in healing the men and women who have sacrificed so much for our country. Few people who are familiar with the military and VA health care systems believe that these institutions alone can ad-

dress the myriad needs of those they serve. Civilian organizations that have the flexibility, passion, and innovative spirit to champion programs that provide an alternative to traditional behavioral health care will fill these gaps.

### References

- Armstrong, N. J., McDonough, J. D., & Savage, D. (2015). *Driving community impact: The case for local, evidence-based coordination in veteran and military services and the America Serves initiative*. Syracuse, NY: Institute for Veterans and Military Families.
- Dohrenwend, B. P., Neria, Y., Marshall, R. D., Lewis-Fernández, R., Turner, J. B., Turse, N. A., & Koenen, K. C. (2004). Positive tertiary appraisals and post-traumatic stress disorder in U.S. male veterans of the war in Vietnam: The roles of positive affirmation, positive reformulation, and defensive denial. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 72*, 417–433.
- Hoge, C., Auchterlonie, J., & Milliken, C. (2006). Mental health problems, use of mental health services, and attrition from military service after returning from deployment to Iraq or Afghanistan. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 295*, 1023–1032.
- Hoge, C. W., Castro, C. A., Messer, S. C., McGurk, D., Cotting, D. I., & Koffman, R. L. (2004). Combat duty in Iraq and Afghanistan, mental health problems, and barriers to care. *The New England Journal of Medicine, 351*, 13–22.
- Hoge, C. W., Terhakopian, A., Castro, C. A., Messer, S. C., & Engel, C. C. (2007). Association of posttraumatic stress disorder with somatic symptoms, health care visits, and absenteeism among Iraq war veterans. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 164*, 150–153.
- Kearney, D. J., & Simpson, T. L. (2015). Broadening the approach to posttraumatic stress disorder and the consequences of trauma. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 314*, 453–455.
- Steenkamp, M. M., Litz, B. T., Hoge, C. W., & Marmar, C. R. (2015). Psychotherapy for military-related PTSD: A review of randomized clinical trials. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 314*, 489–500.
- Tanielian, T., & Jaycox, L. H. (Eds.). (2008). *Invisible wounds of war: Psychological and cognitive injuries, their consequences, and services to assist recovery*. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.
- Tedeschi, R. G. (2013). Posttraumatic growth. In B. A. Moore & J. E. Barnett (Eds.), *Military psychologists' desk reference* (pp. 321–325). New York, NY: Oxford.
- U.S. Government Accountability Office (GAO). (2014). *Better understanding needed to enhance services to veterans readjusting to civilian life*. Washington, DC: GAO.
- Vogt, D. S., King, D. W., King, L. A., Savarese, V. W., & Suvak, M. K. (2004). War-zone exposure and long-term general life adjustment among Vietnam veterans: Findings from two perspectives. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 34*, 1797–1824. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/42426772?accountid=14605>

### Point of Contact Information

For further information, please contact:

Richard G. Tedeschi

[richardgtedeschi@gmail.com](mailto:richardgtedeschi@gmail.com)

---

## A “Tipping Point” for Military Psychology? Perhaps

Pat DeLeon

---

This spring, the House Committee on Armed Services recommended the enactment of H.R. 4909, its fiscal year, 2017 Department of Defense Authorization Act, by a bipartisan vote of 60 to 2. Included was a proposed major reorganization of the department’s health care system. The Military Officers Association of America (MOAA) proffered, “The most dramatic change would involve placing all military treatment facilities (MTFs) under the direction of the Defense Health Agency, effective October 1, 2018, for purposes of unified policy, administration, and budgeting. MOAA has long supported this proposal based on the cost and inefficiency of building military health care programs around three separate systems for each of the services.” From a public policy perspective, this sounds very similar to the arguments over the past decade for developing a “purple suit” health care system and/or integrating the public and private sectors to better serve the Department of Veterans Affairs beneficiaries.

Reform of Administration of the Defense Health Agency and Military Medical Treatment Facilities. This section would require the Defense Health Agency to become responsible for management of military treatment facilities throughout the Department of Defense, while preserving the responsibilities of the commanders of such facilities for ensuring the readiness of the members of the armed forces and civilian employees at such facilities and for furnishing the health care and medical treatment provided at such facilities. The Defense Health Agency would establish an executive-level management office consisting of professional health care administrators to manage health care operations, finance and budget, information technology, and medical affairs across all military treatment facilities. In addition, this section would direct the Secretary of Defense to submit an interim report to the congressional defense committees not later than March 1, 2017, on the preliminary plan to implement these changes, and a final report not later than March 1, 2018. This section would also require the Comptroller General of the United States to review each of the plans submitted by the Secretary and to submit the Comptroller’s

assessment to the congressional defense committees by September 1, 2017, and September 1, 2018 respectively.

The House proposal further authorized (i.e., urged) the

Secretary of Defense to develop and implement value-based incentive programs as part of the TRICARE contracts to encourage health care providers under the TRICARE program to improve the quality of care and the experience of the covered beneficiaries. [This represents the “Triple Aim” of former Centers for Medicare & Medicaid Services (CMS) Administrator Don Berwick.] Not later than 1 year after implementation of a value-based incentive program and annually thereafter through 2022, the Secretary of Defense would be required to brief the Committees on Armed Services of the Senate and the House of Representatives, and any other appropriate congressional committee, on the quality performance metrics and expenditures related to the incentive program.

Those familiar with the evolving reimbursement changes currently being implemented by CMS, pursuant to President Obama’s Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (ACA), should appreciate the importance of Practice Directorate Executive Director Katherine Nordal’s State Leadership conference charge for psychology to be “at the table” when and where important policy decisions are made. During our health policy seminar this year at the Uniformed Services University of the Health Sciences (USUHS), “Dr. Janet Heinrich, Senior Advisor at CMS’s Center for Medicaid and Medicare Innovation (CMMI), described the mission of CMS to promote healthcare that is better and smarter, as well as health care that ultimately leads to healthier persons. CMMI is pursuing this goal by developing, testing, and implementing new payment and delivery models that not only acknowledge disease symptoms, but also the ‘social determinants of health’ that place individuals at risk for specific diseases and serve to maintain symptomology” (Omni Cassidy, USUHS).

As of January 2015, HHS announced its goals for value-based payments within Medicare fee-for-service as having payments tied to quality or value through alternative payment models at 30% by the end of 2016 and 50% by the

end of 2018. In addition, fee-for-service payments tied to quality or value at 85% by the end of 2016 and 90% by the end of 2018. Medicare growth has fallen below gross domestic product growth and national health expenditures since 2010, due, in part, to these efforts. Currently, 477 accountable care organizations (ACOs)—another initiative established under the ACA to foster systems of organized care—have been established across the nation, with 121 new ACOs in 2016, which cover 8.9 million assigned beneficiaries. Pioneer ACOs were designated for organizations with experience in coordinated care and ACO-like contracts. These models demonstrated savings for 3 years in a row of \$92, \$96, and \$120 million.

Change is definitely coming. The critical question for psychology and for nursing is whether their next generation of clinical providers and professional leaders are

proactively visionary and willing to become personally engaged in the public policy process, focusing upon the real needs of their patients. Ray Folen, HPA Executive Director as of this year, notes that over the past 10 years, while at Tripler Army Medical Center, “I have written 3,178 prescriptions and my colleague Mike Kellar has written 5,780. No adverse events.” Decades ago, U.S. Army Colonel (Retired) Greg Laskow and Colonel Tom Williams fortunately appreciated the importance of prescriptive authority for their Army colleagues. Aloha.

#### **Point of Contact Information**

For further information, please contact:  
Pat DeLeon, former APA president, Division 19  
patdeleon@verizon.net



## **SOCIETY FOR MILITARY PSYCHOLOGY**

*Division 19 of the American Psychological Association*



The National Psychologist - newspaper has published in the May/June 2016 issue an article by the head of the military sexual trauma program at the Bay Pines, Florida, VA Center. It is an informative article about the first VA facility dealing with military sexual trauma and should be of interest to military psychologists. Read the article at The National Psychologist's website located at <http://www.nationalpsychologist.com>

### Open Letter From Former Chairs of the APA Ethics Committee to the Board of Directors Perceived, Potential or Actual Conflicts of Interest in Attorney Hoffman Self-Review May 15, 2016

The Board of Directors again retained Attorney David Hoffman in April 2016. He is to review his previously released and once amended report (referred to as the *Independent Review*). On May 10, 2016 a communication was released to the Council listserv by APA President Susan McDaniel noting that Mr. Hoffman had been “engaged for the limited purpose of analyzing certain Department of Defense (“DoD”) policies recently brought to the Board’s attention in reports by the Association’s Division 19 and several psychologists discussed in the *Independent Review*.” Mr. Hoffman is to specifically “review the relevant policies and assess the extent to which they bear upon the issues, findings, and/or conclusions reflected in the *Independent Review*.” He reportedly “also intends to indicate in his report whether any modifications or clarifications to the *Independent Review* are appropriate in light of these policies.”

President McDaniel characterizes Mr. Hoffman’s current activities as a “supplemental review” that “is a continuation of Mr. Hoffman’s prior work, based on the existence of factual information that has recently been called to our attention.” Mr. Hoffman is described as “shar[ing] APA’s interest in ensuring that his *Independent Review* is fair and accurate.” President McDaniel relies upon these in concluding that new review of his prior work does not constitute a conflict of interest on his part or that of the Board.

A conflict of interest arises when an individual has real or reasonably perceived duties to more than one person or organization which may or does compromise their ability to address potential or actual adverse interests. This includes circumstances in which an individual’s own personal or professional concerns or interests may be or are inconsistent or even adverse to those of a client and/or an organization with whom that individual has a relationship (e.g., employee, an ownership stake, another client). Conflicts of interest may be stark and actions taken clearly

self-serving or self-protecting at the cost of the interests of clients or organizations with whom the individual has a relationship. Conflicts of interest may also be more insidious by leading the individual to ignore or discount information in a less conscious process of confirmatory bias or less conscious adoption of self-serving or self-protection rationalizations for decisions or actions which have the result of being self-serving or self-protective at the expense of other parties.

The message from President McDaniel holds that Mr. Hoffman is not being asked to conduct “an investigation of [his] initial investigation” and is instead “a continuation of Mr. Hoffman’s prior work, based on the existence of factual information that has recently been called to our attention.” As a result, Dr. McDaniel asserts that Mr. Hoffman’s reengagement, to evaluate his prior work, cannot constitute a conflict of interest.

This assertion is problematic in several respects. First, it assumes that a person cannot be in a conflict of interest when being asked to review their own previous work. This is not a correct assumption. For example, an attorney being asked to review their own work in a case may be in a conflict of interest if that review may or does reveal evidence of possible legal malpractice. A physician being asked to review their own work in a case may be in a conflict of interest if that review may or does reveal evidence of injurious medical error. An attorney or physician in these circumstances may intentionally choose to ignore or mischaracterize that evidence, or perhaps even more problematically, engage in well-described processes of confirmatory bias, minimization or rationalization that compromise their ability to identify or to appreciate their earlier missteps.

Second, President McDaniel reports that Mr. Hoffman’s review of his own work is prompted, at least in part, “on



the existence of factual information that has recently been called to our attention.” This “factual information” may have been “recently” called to the attention of the Board but the challenge this information poses is that it was reportedly readily available at the time of the investigation through means as easy as a simple Internet search. If so, possibilities are raised about Mr. Hoffman and his investigation that include: (a) the investigation did not attempt to access this readily available information; (b) the information was accessed and Mr. Hoffman failed to recognize the potential relevance of that information and so did not incorporate it into his investigation or even report that he had accessed it; or, (c) decisions were made to ignore the potential implications of this information for his analysis and conclusions and to not report that it had been accessed during the course of the investigation.

Each of these raises potential issues such as a failure of due diligence given the focus and context of the report (a, above), the possibility of significant confirmatory bias that led him to not identify or appreciate the relevance of the information or a need to report that he had reviewed it (b, above), or deliberate exclusion and failure to report accessing information which would have undermined the inferences and conclusions of his report (c, above).

We want to make it clear that we have no idea whether any of these processes were involved and are not alleging that any of them were involved. However, asking Mr. Hoffman to review his own work for potential evidence of any of these and to report this evidence to the Board clearly places him in at least a perceived conflict of interest and perhaps an actual one.

Third, the potential consequences for Mr. Hoffman and the Sidley Austin law firm with whom he is affiliated would be significant if he were to acknowledge witting or unwitting missteps which will now substantively alter the conclusions and recommendations of the *Independent Review*. Under the circumstances, there are factors which could reasonably be expected to contribute to confirmatory bias, unwitting self-protection (minimization, rationalization), or intentional (self-protective advocacy) efforts to affirm the quality, independence and conclusions of the *Independent Review*. Acknowledging serious missteps that would substantively challenge the investigation itself or the conclusions and recommendations it generated could have potentially grave professional and legal implications for

both Mr. Hoffman and Sidley Austin. It cannot be simply assumed that Mr. Hoffman and Sidley Austin now share any interest on the part of the APA that the *Independent Review* is “fair and accurate.”

Again, we want to clearly state that we do not know whether any of the potentially problematic processes were involved in the original investigation or the *Independent Review*, and we are not alleging any intentional misconduct or unwitting missteps on the part of Mr. Hoffman, his investigation team, or Sidley Austin. However, it is naïve to not recognize the potential or real conflicts of interest arising from retaining Mr. Hoffman to assess his *Independent Review* in light of “factual information” which was reportedly readily available during the original investigation. This is particularly the case since there are potentially significant professional, legal and other consequences for him and Sidley Austin should he now acknowledge that failure to identify, appreciate or incorporate this “factual information” will now substantively alter the conclusions and recommendations in the *Independent Review*.

Additionally, any acknowledgment on his part that the *Independent Review* is flawed in any substantive way would also have implications for APA. This report was relied upon to terminate the employment of APA staff, encourage the transitions of others, limit the involvement of psychologists in national security and/or military settings, direct revision of the Ethics Code, and take other steps which have had or could have substantial organizational, professional and legal consequences. The *Independent Review* has resulted in the personal and professional integrity of APA staff, members and others to be directly or indirectly called into question in ways that have had significant consequences for those individuals.

Under these circumstances, an observer could reasonably wonder whether the interests of the recent past-President, the current President and the Board are aligned with the interests of Mr. Hoffman and Sidley Austin in determining that the “factual information” he is now asked to consider would have had minimal or no impact upon his investigation or the conclusions of the *Independent Report*.

This potential alignment of interests among APA senior governance, Mr. Hoffman, and Sidley Austin has already created a perception of conflict of interest among some APA members and may constitute a potential or actual conflict of interest between these elements of senior gov-



ernance and the broad APA membership and APA's internal constituencies. The interests of APA members and of APA as an organization may diverge—by perception and/or reality—from those of the recent past-President, Dr. McDaniel, and the Board. This potential divergence of interests would be magnified should there ever be (which still could occur) lawsuits against APA or filing of ethics and/or licensure complaints against individuals in APA governance arising from steps taken in reliance upon the *Independent Review*. Yet, APA Presidents and the APA Board of Directors have a prevailing duty to serve the best interests of the membership and the organization and not their own professional, organizational or personal interests.

It is always professionally and organizationally prudent to avoid perceived, potential or actual conflicts of interest whenever possible. Retaining Mr. Hoffman to review his own work raises difficult and potentially unresolvable potential or actual conflicts of interest.

As past Ethics Chairs, we have previously called for an independent assessment of the investigation conducted by Attorney Hoffman and the subsequent *Independent Review* report. We again call for timely initiation of this independent assessment as in the best interests of the Association. Under the current circumstances, simply the

perceived potential or actual conflicts of interest arising from the Board retaining Mr. Hoffman to review his own investigation and report are unlikely to yield an outcome viewed as credible among many APA members or constituencies, or by many external parties.

Respectfully,

Robert Kinscherff, PhD, JD, Chair, 2000, 2001

Steven Sparta, PhD, ABPP, Chair, 2002

Michael D. Roberts, PhD, Chair, 2003

Katherine Di Francisca, PhD, Chair, 2005

Robin M. Deutsch, PhD, ABPP, Chair, 2007

W. Brad Johnson, PhD, Chair, 2008

Jeffrey Barnett, PhD, Chair, 2009

Nancy McGarrah, PhD, Chair, 2010

Nadya A. Fouad, PhD, Chair, 2012

James N. Bow, PhD, ABPP, Chair, 2013

#### **Point of Contact Information**

For further information, please contact:

Joseph B. Lyons

joseph.lyons.6@us.af.mil

## ***Spotlight on Research***

***Colleen Varga, PhD, ABPP***

Welcome to the Spotlight on Research column! This column showcases research activities and projects underway in many of the research laboratories within the U.S. Department of Defense, partnering organizations, and the academic and practitioner community in military psychology. Research featured in the column includes a wide variety of studies and programs, ranging from preliminary findings on single studies to more substantive summaries of programmatic efforts on targeted research topics. Research described in the column is inclusive of all disciplines relevant to military psychology—spanning the entire spectrum of psychology including clinical and experimental, as well as basic and applied. If you would like your work to be showcased in this column, please contact Colleen Varga at colleen.varga.1@us.af.mil.

This edition of the newsletter includes an interesting qualitative study that looks at factors that influence individuals from single-parent homes to enlist in the U.S. military. While it is a small pilot study, it provides valuable insight into the socioemotional, socioeconomic, and personal reasons influencing youth who enlist shortly after high school. While large data sets and quantitative results can provide more robust and replicable results, qualitative and descriptive studies such as this one help us to hear the “voices” behind the data. This edition of the column describes the challenges and gaps that the research addresses and identifies future research questions that developed from the results.

---

### **Military Enlistment: Motivations of Former Military Personnel Coming From Single-Parent Homes**

Jada A. Philips, PhD

*Walden University*

---

#### **Research Overview**

The present research seeks to examine how single parenthood, together with other socioeconomic and demographic attributes, impacts the decision to join the military. When adolescents finish high school, they are faced with life altering choices including career goals and aspirations. One of the options that are open to youth at that age is enlisting into the military. A small pilot study was conducted using social media sampling to recruit participants who enlisted in the military within 2 years of graduating from college and had separated from the military on their volition. Themes that emerged from the data suggested several socioeconomic and demographic variables impacting participants’ decisions to enlist, including those who were raised by “absentee mothers” and viewed the military as the place to spread their social liaisons, those who reported a troubled upbringing and saw the military as a place of solace, those who enlisted to evade conflicts in

their family of origin, and those who suffered deprivation of basic human needs. An understanding of these influences could be important for guiding military recruitment personnel in determining the acceptability of potential candidates for military jobs.

#### **Problem to Solve**

U.S. Department of Defense statistics as of 2004 show that 200,000 youths enlist in the U.S. military every year (U.S. Department of Defense, 2004). Factors influencing the typical adult to join the military include social isolation, socioeconomic status, being raised in a single-parent home, and financial advantages (Bachman, Sigelman, & Diamond, 1987; Spence, Henderson, & Elder, 2012). Some enlist because they do not have opportunities locally and find that enlistment may assist in changing their circumstances. Finally, recruiters may specifically target individuals from certain backgrounds, highlight-

ing the financial reward aspect of the jobs to entice potential recruits who may not have the initial motivation to serve in the military.

Only a few studies have investigated the role that motivation plays in joining the military. Some have focused on common concerns that young adults face including social isolation, unstable homes, and abuse (Bachman et al., 1987; Spence et al., 2012). Research has shown that belonging to single-parent homes, social isolation, and socioeconomic status are common predictors of military enlistment (Bachman et al., 1987; Spence et al., 2012). Kleykamp (2006) suggests that economic benefits that accrue from enlistment can also provide motivation to join, such as social mobility for disadvantaged minorities, steady employment, civilian-equivalent jobs, and educational benefits. However, others may choose to enlist as a means of breaking away: from financial inadequacy at home, due to a lack of opportunity, or even simply due to the persuasiveness of recruiters (Hagopian & Barker, 2011). Of these potential motivations, breaking or moving away from problems and difficulties that exist in enlistees' home lives is one of the common concerns, which often include unstable and/or alternative homes, social isolation, and even abuse (Spence et al., 2012). In cases where enlistment is motivated by a desire to move away from home rather than to the military, it is unclear why one would choose enlistment rather than civilian options.

Further, an analysis of military service suggests the presence of a significant number of undertrained soldiers who might have been more efficient if provided the proper training (Krueger, 2008). Perhaps a subsection of military enlistees do not fulfill their potential due in part to the challenging personal factors that led them to join in the first place. Efficient management of resources would require that those who join the military have the desire and capacity to gain more expertise, upgrade skills, and effectively utilize technology.

### **Solution and Approach**

To determine the suitability of individuals who enlist in the military and understand their backgrounds, two open-ended questions were posed to all participants:

*Research Question 1:* Based on their experience, what aspects or characteristics of a single-parent home contributed to the decision of young adults to enlist in the military?

*Research Question 2:* What demographic characteristics of young adults influence their decision to enlist in the military?

The nature of the question and the investigative aspect used in the survey arose from the Roger's theory of self-concept, which states "the self is the central ingredient in human personality and personal adjustment" (Purkey, 1988, para. 6). This theory emphasizes how experience, personality, social factors, and environment affect the choices individuals make. Motivation is viewed as being central to how a person conducts him- or herself in the course of his or her lifetime. Both internal and external factors can determine how a person is motivated in the discharge of duties. In that context, motivation would be viewed not just regarding how a person behaves but also how the behavior is influenced by factors such as values, the environmental context, and goals (Shamir, House, & Arthur, 1993). Consequently, the present research suggests that motivation is critical in the decision to join the military, but that decision is also affected by critical social and environmental factors.

### **Design**

To obtain participants for the present study, social networking sites (Facebook and LinkedIn) were used to recruit nine participants that met the inclusion criteria. Interested parties were sent detailed information about participating in the study through e-mail. The interested parties received preliminary questionnaires, consent forms, and a personal information form used to determine their eligibility in participating in the study. The results of the initial e-mail correspondence then determined who was included in subsequent face-to-face and phone interviews; both were audio recorded. A semistructured interview was conducted with responses recorded verbatim. The verbatim transcript was subjected to thematic content analysis, while a phenomenological analysis was conducted for the face-to-face and phone interviews. The data procured was then analyzed by performing the following steps outlined by Moustakas (1994):

1. Horizontalization: Go through the transcripts from the interviews and highlight all significant statements. These highlighted areas will reflect an understanding of each participant's experience with the phenomenon.
2. Cluster of meanings: Develop a cluster of meanings from the statements and make themes from them.

3. Textural/structural description: Take the themes and make a description of what was experienced by the participants. As Moustakas (1994) noted, descriptions of the settings that influenced the experience are also made from the themes/significant statements.

4. Essential, invariant structure: This section is a paragraph or two of descriptive passages that focus on the common experiences found among the participants to provide a clear understanding of the experience of the phenomenon.

### Participants

The study consisted of nine individuals selected from those that met study criteria. A phenomenological study that uses interviews should have a minimum of eight participants to reach the required threshold for data saturation point (Mason, 2011; Moustakas, 1994; Silverman, 2011).

The inclusion criteria for participants in this research were as follows: (a) individuals currently separated from the military by their accord (one's choice without coercion), (b) individuals between the ages of 25 and 35, (c) individuals who came from single-parent homes, (d) individuals who were high school graduates, and (e) individuals that had enlisted in the military within two years of finishing high school.

The open-ended questions allow a structured understanding of the issues that the interviewer wanted to pursue while also allowing the interviewee the leeway to answer every question in an individual way. Previous research findings that demographic profiles were important predictors of military enlistments informed the decision to limit participation as above. It is also assumed that the stringency and discipline of military training that makes many recruits abandon training in the early phases significantly affects those who had temporary motivations for joining the military, such as coming from single-parent homes or problematic home environments. This research examined the experiences of young adults coming from single-parent homes who were motivated to enlist in the military and why enlistment ended up being the route chosen.

### Findings

Four commonalities among the nine participants emerged from the study. For high school graduates from single-parent homes who joined the military within 2 years of

graduating high school, strong reasons for joining included being raised by a single mother who was frequently absent from the home, high levels of stress or conflict in the home, avoidance of family or social conflicts, and not having their basic needs met within that home environment.

The first thematic label, *childhood experiences of individuals with absentee mothers*, was determined from three themes or invariant constituents. This theme answers Subresearch Question 1: Based on their experience, what aspects or characteristics of a single-parent home contribute to the decision of young adults to enlist in the military? The invariant constituents central to the theme are as follows: (a) mothers worked full time, (b) grandparents assumed the role of the parents, and (c) children self-identified as receiving less care, love, and attention. All participants in the study mentioned these constituents. Common responses included the following:

My mother was not really around, so my eldest sister was more like my mother. My mother was a truck driver who had her CDL, and she was always out working a lot.

My mom was a single mother, so she worked two full time jobs, and she was very concerned about us, and we didn't live in the best neighborhood.

My oldest sister did a lot of the motherly duties when my mother was not home. My sister even took us, my sisters and I, to church . . . My mother never took us to church. From ages 8–10, my mother sent my sisters and me to live with my grandparents while she did her own thing with another man and her fifth child, my youngest sister . . . These years were rough years for me, as I felt like a motherless child, wondering why my mother was not around and why she did not want us in her care.

The second thematic label, *adolescent experiences of individuals with troubled homes*, was determined from three themes. This theme also answers Subresearch Question 1. The invariant constituents central to the theme are as follows: (a) family conflict, (b) drug abuse and alcoholism, and (c) focus on personal needs. Common responses included the following:

I know my dad came to pick us up and my mom wouldn't let us go because he was already drunk and she didn't want us to get in the car. So it caused a lot

of, you know, animosity between me and my mom. I didn't understand why, I thought she was just being mean and not letting me go with my dad.

One instance was my friend had got his hands on a bunch of drugs. This was a changing factor in high school . . . It was a sense of numbing the situation that I didn't talk about yet. At this point in time, no one knew I was raped yet.

You gotta work; you gotta earn your keep pretty much, you know? I don't even know how to word it, but if you don't work, then you don't eat, so I was always doing something, you know.

The third thematic label, *motivations of young adults to enlist in the military service*, was determined from four themes. This theme also answered Subresearch Question 1. The invariant constituents central to the theme were as follows: (a) stable income to start a new life, (b) avoiding family conflict, (c) college education through military benefits, and (d) perceived financial success in military service. Common responses included the following:

I really didn't have much money, I had a job, but it really wasn't enough, and I did need the structure you know, I figured I need something along the lines, the structural level.

The fourth thematic label, *identified personalities of young military service members*, was determined from four themes. This theme answers Subresearch Question 2: What demographic attributes of young adults affect their decision to enlist in the military? The invariant constituents central to the theme were as follows: (a) emotionally and materially deprived, (b) rebellious, (c) optimistic, and (d) impulsive. Common responses included the following:

My mom, yeah, she was working full time at a packing house kinda like in the fields with oranges, and afterwards, she would go to her second full time job as a janitor, but then after, she couldn't do it no more, then yeah, sometimes, we were moving in with our grandma just 'cause it was kinda too much for her, you know?

I felt like I have been through everything . . . So I could console somebody if they lost a parent and console and understand when someone said their parents were going through a divorce. I could understand having a drunk mom . . . So it was easier for me

to take a kinder ear and let people know how to get through it.

So when she died, it was different. I became colder . . . I flirted, I started drinking excessively, and I started having random sex like nobody's business, so I became popular.

### Implications

The importance of the family or the influence of the primary parent on possible military recruits was highlighted by the first theme. It was apparent from the results of the study that the single-parent home environment experienced by those interviewed was not very structured. The parent was often working a lot, with the children learning to take care of themselves while living fairly independently by the time they were teenagers. The implications of this address the core of society—the family. Perhaps further education and information for young adults about the options and resources available to them as single parents might help to increase awareness of the impact of their choices on their children's futures. With the family as the basic building block of American society, improving the structure of single-parent families through attention to socioeconomic or child-care policies could potentially widen the options available to these families.

In addition, this study can offer insights into integrating new recruits into the military. This can help military professionals, recruiters, families, and potential recruits alike. Military professionals and recruiters can look to develop and/or use tools that can further assess one's ability to sustain the military lifestyle. Preenlistment information and trainings can be structured to provide interested individuals with a view and perspective on what the military culture entails. With this being said, families and potential recruits may then be offered the opportunity to truly decide if the military is the best choice.

### Limitations

This study had a number of limitations. The first limitation dealt with the age range and war era when the respondents served, as all participants were between the ages of 25 and 35 years old. The second limitation was the fact that the participants were individuals who had served and were now separated; there was no examination of individuals who were in the process of enlisting or seeking to enlist. Participants

provided reflective feedback based on memories as opposed to new recruits, who could have provided and expressed their current experiences and feelings as they were happening. There was also no examination of enlistees who dropped out of basic training. A third limitation was the process in which participants were recruited (via social networks and listservs). Other potential participants who do not routinely use social networks or listservs were not included, and they may differ in important ways from the current participants. Finally, another factor that affected the study was the limited sampling with regard to the sample size, single-parent home status, and the lack of a comparison group. Further research would do well to expand the scope of the current study and add comparison groups.

### References

- Bachman, J. G., Sigelman, L., & Diamond, G. (1987). Self-selection, socialization, and distinctive military values: Attitudes of high school seniors. *Armed Forces & Society, 13*, 168–187. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0095327x8701300201>
- Hagopian, A., & Barker, K. (2011). Should we end military recruiting in high schools as a matter of child protection and public health? *American Journal of Public Health, 101*, 19–23. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2009.183418>
- Kleykamp, M. A. (2006). College, jobs or the military? Enlistment during a time of war. *Social Science Quarterly, 87*, 272–290. Retrieved from <http://www.radicalmath.org/docs/CollegeJobsMilitary.pdf>
- Krueger, G. P. (2008). Contemporary and future battlefields: Soldier stresses and performance. In P. A. Hancock & J. L. Szalma, *Performance under stress* (19–44). Ashgate Publishing Company: Burlington, VT.
- Mason, M. (2011). Sample size and saturation in PhD studies using qualitative interviews. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research, 11*, 8. Retrieved from <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1428/3027#gcit>
- Moustakas, C. (1994). *Phenomenological research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Purkey, W. W. (1988). An overview of self-concept theory for counselors. Highlights: An ERIC/CAPS Digest. Retrieved from <http://www.ericdigests.org/pre-9211/self.htm>
- Shamir, B., House, R. J., & Arthur, M. B. (1993). The motivational effects of charismatic leadership: A self-concept based theory. *Organization Science, 4*, 577–594. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/10717919070130010501>
- Silverman, D. (2011). *Qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.
- Spence, N. J., Henderson, K. A., & Elder, G. H., Jr. (2012). Does adolescent family structure predict military enlistment? A comparison of post-high school activities. *Journal of Family Issues, 34*, 1194–1216. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0192513X12457347>
- U.S. Department of Defense. (2004). *Population representation in the military services, Fiscal Year 2002*. Retrieved October 6, 2012, from <http://prhome.defense.gov/rfm/MPP/ACCESSION%20POLICY/poprep.aspx>

### Point of Contact Information

For further information, please contact:

Jada A. Philips

[jada.a.philips@gmail.com](mailto:jada.a.philips@gmail.com)



## ***Spotlight on History***

***Paul A. Gade, PhD***

Just to note, I am still looking for new members for the history committee. I should add that student members are most welcome. We have many things we could do to improve the Society's history knowledge and to ensure we archive important historical facts and events as they unfold. I need help. As of now I am a committee of one—need I say more? Maybe. We'll see how many volunteers I get for the committee.

—Paul A. Gade, Editor,  
Spotlight on History

---

### **Profiles in Military Psychology: Colonel Robert S. Nichols**

Gerald P. Krueger

That said, the true focus of this issue's spotlight on history is a profile of one of our important ancestors, Bob Nichols, contributed by Jerry Krueger, a fellow and former president of our Society. Jerry has not only contributed this excellent profile but still continues to serve the Society in many important ways, including as a member of the Fellows Committee. I should point out that the Society's **Robert S. Nichols Award**, established in Bob's honor, recognizes excellence in service by uniformed clinical psychologists to military personnel and their families. I should also note that Charles Gersoni, another of our important ancestors, was one of Bob's heroes and Bob was instrumental in the renaming of the Society's Military Psychology Award as the Charles S. Gersoni Award.

Jerry's profile article of Bob describes his many contributions to psychology and to military clinical psychology in particular. Bob was one of our Society's most significant and beloved members, as you will see in Jerry's profile of his career. We are indebted to Bob's daughter Kathryn and especially to his wife Rose Ann, who was always at Bob's side and a great supporter of his military psychology endeavors, for the photo of Bob that appears in the article.

Colonel Robert Stanton Nichols had a distinguished 30-year active duty career as an Army clinical psychologist.



**Colonel Robert S. Nichols**

He served as president of our Society in 1982–1983 and as its representative to the American Psychological Association (APA) Council from 1983–1986. In his life's work, Dr. Nichols was truly dedicated to improving the lot of those people who chose to serve our nation in the military. Bob, as he was always known to his friends and colleagues, was a tireless advocate of military psychology, focusing his numerous efforts first within the U.S. Army and, then after retirement, as an active, prominent spokesperson for our profession within the APA.

Bob earned his bachelor's degree and his commission as an Army Medical Service Corps lieutenant at Lehigh University in Bethlehem, Pennsylvania, graduating Phi Beta Kappa in 1950. He received his PhD in clinical psychology

at the University of Rochester, New York in 1956 and was board certified in clinical psychology by the American Board of Professional Psychology in 1961. He earned a master's degree in hygiene from the Harvard School of Public Health in 1963. He was a graduate of the U.S. Army's Medical Field Service School at Ft. Sam Houston, Texas; the Army's Command and General Staff College at Fort Leavenworth, Kansas, in 1969; and of the Army War College in Carlisle, Pennsylvania, in 1973.

Bob did his psychology internship at Walter Reed Army Medical Center in Washington, DC. He then served as a staff psychologist at Fitzsimons Hospital in Denver, Colorado, and as the chief psychologist in the mental hygiene consultation service at Womack Army Hospital at Fort Bragg, North Carolina. From 1964–1968, Bob served as the chief psychologist in the psychiatry department at the Army hospital in Stuttgart, Germany, where he supervised those providing mental health services to 50,000 military and dependents throughout southwest Germany and served as regional mental health consultant to commanders, chaplains, dependent schools, and medical agencies.

From 1969–1973, he served in the Mental Hygiene Consultation Service (MHCS) at the Army's Silas B. Hays Hospital at Fort Ord, California. In 1972, Bob became the first psychologist to be appointed as chief of that MHCS, a role that previously was limited to psychiatrists, and at the time, this was considered to be an exception to Army policy. It would be 1984 before the Army acknowledged the greater autonomy and broader roles of nonphysician professionals. In his role as chief of the Fort Ord MHCS, Bob directed 35 members of a multidisciplinary staff providing community mental health services to 100,000 active duty and retired personnel and their families. While also serving as chief psychologist and director of training (1970–1973), Bob founded and developed the Army's new community-oriented clinical psychology internship program. The interns were encouraged to live on the military base, where they could and did have frequent contact with the military community's personnel and activities where Bob said they learned the skills of community psychology in addition to more traditional clinical skills. Bob shepherded that internship program through the process of attaining full APA accreditation in 1971. The Fort Ord internship program lasted over two decades. It ended when Fort Ord was downsized in 1993.

Colonel Bob Nichols was indeed a very unique military psychologist. From 1973–1978, he was director of human resources development and of curricular research and was director of American studies at the U.S. Army War College at Carlisle, Pennsylvania. There he taught high-level command and management; national and international security studies, including political, economic, and social psychological military analyses of the United States and

foreign nations; and special applications of military psychology.

As assistant dean for academic support and assistant professor of medical psychology at the Uniformed Services University of Health Sciences in Bethesda, Maryland (1978–1979), Colonel Nichols directed admissions for the new military medical school. As chief of the Health Education and Training Division at the Army Medical Department (AMEDD) Personnel Support Agency in Washington, DC (1979–1981), Colonel Nichols supervised all Army medical health-related education, which included formulating training for 45,000 AMEDD students per year while overseeing an annual budget of over \$50 million.

Bob completed his distinguished 30-year military career by serving 2 years as the psychology consultant to the Army Surgeon General where he supervised recruitment and career development for 150 commissioned Army psychologists and 50 psychology graduate student officers. For senior leaders in the Pentagon, Bob provided advice on psychological aspects of a wide variety of military operations. At his retirement from the active U.S. Army in December 1982, Colonel Nichols received the Legion of Merit medal. The Legion of Merit is one of the U.S. military's most prestigious awards, ranking just below the Silver Star and ahead of the Distinguished Flying Cross. It is one of only two decorations to be issued as neck wear, the other being the Medal of Honor. Later, in 1988, he received the Award for Excellence in Army Psychology from the Association of Army Psychologists.

Bob became the director of Mental Health Programs, Policy and Planning for the Fairfax and Falls Church, Virginia Community Services Board (1983–1994). There he directed a large community mental health program with a budget of over \$24 million and a 500-person staff providing clinical and community services to 17,000 clients per year.

In his retirement years, Bob did much volunteer work, such as representing the Association for the Advancement of Psychology in the Washington-based Mental Health Liaison Group. Bob served as president of APA's Division 19 (1982–1983) and as chairman of Division 19's Clinical Practice Committee, and he served as the division's representative to the APA Council of Representatives (1983–1986). For the benefit of all of us in Division 19, Bob continued tirelessly to teach and to advocate,

making significant progress on the important issues that were the hallmark of his active duty career, stressing the following: social and psychological aspects of the military experience in Vietnam, dealing with ineffective military personnel, equal opportunity, drug and alcohol abuse problems, understanding women's changing roles in the military and society, prevalence and nature of race relations, concerns over acceptance of gays and lesbians in the uniformed service of our nation, provision of clinical psychology and social services for military families, and pushing for improvements in community organizational psychology and mental health programs.

For several decades, Bob became our principal spokesperson and advocate for ensuring that the broader membership of the APA understood and recognized the significant accomplishments of deserving military psychologists. He served for years on the Division 19 Fellows Committee. One of my own recollections of Bob in action was watching him educate the APA Membership Committee as to why deserving uniformed clinical psychologists ought to be recognized as APA Fellows for their numerous contributions in caring for our troops, their leaders, and their families in the military theater and on deployments overseas to harsh environments. He patiently explained that such noteworthy assignments simply are not conducive to producing published articles in referred journals, but the impact of providing cogent consultation and advice to field commanders on the preservation of the health, performance, and morale of thousands of troops in a combat zone was critically important to accomplishing the military mission. The eye-opening insights into the career of uniformed psychologists was much appreciated by our APA psychologist colleagues as most of them have too little grasp of what we do for a living.

In the post-Vietnam era, there was within the APA somewhat of a rift among the APA general membership, some outspoken members of the APA Council, and those of us who called ourselves military psychologists. During the years of friction over the role of military psychologists in an unpopular war and over Department of Defense (DoD) policies regarding gays and lesbians in the military, Bob worked ardently within the APA to help resolve the disagreements. He worked to regain recognition of the importance of decades of good work by military psychologists. He was a key member of the APA's Division 19/44 Task Force on Sexual Orientation and Military Service.

The groundbreaking work of this task force led to a number of forward-looking recommendations and resulted in rescinding APA's restrictive ban on DoD recruitment or internship advertising in APA publications and at APA conventions.

Bob spearheaded efforts to convince the APA Council to recognize and honor those uniformed psychologists who made numerous contributions during the Vietnam conflict over three decades previously. Through Bob's considerable efforts, the APA president and the APA Council, at the 2001 convention in Chicago, gave formal recognition and presidential citations for their contributions to all psychologists who served in the Vietnam War. Colonel Paul Bartone, past president of Division 19, recalled the moving moments when the APA Council members gave a spontaneous standing ovation to those veteran psychologists. This moving tribute was a turning point in the modern era of the APA, for it helped to restore the rightful recognition of the contributions and role of military psychologists.

Among his mentors, Bob included Colonel Charles S. Gersoni, the first clinical psychology consultant to the Army Surgeon General (1947–1951). Colonel Gersoni established precedent by requiring all uniformed clinical psychologists to have doctoral training. Additionally, Bob admired Colonel Charles A. Thomas as the most effective clinical psychology consultant to the Army Surgeon General. Bob was particularly inspired by Patrick H. DeLeon (president of APA in 2000), whom he regarded as one of APA's hardest workers. Particularly noteworthy among DeLeon's significant efforts was his work to enact congressional legislation that greatly assisted military psychology, including directing the military to ensure that psychology services at hospitals where psychologists were trained were organizationally separated from psychiatry departments and thus free of psychiatric control. DeLeon also exhibited support of military psychology by guiding the legislative effort to initiate the DoD Psychopharmacology Demonstration Project, which, beginning in 1991, trained seven military clinical psychologists to prescribe psychoactive medications—a seminal initiative that later found its way into civilian health care settings.

In addition to being a Fellow in our Society, Bob was a Fellow in APA Divisions 12 (Society of Clinical Psychology) and 48 (Society for the Study of Peace, Conflict and

Violence). The Association for the Advancement of Psychology presented him with the Outstanding Advocate for Psychology Award in 1998. In 2002, our Society recognized Colonel Nichols's long history of service to military psychology by awarding him the John C. Flanagan Award for "Lifetime Achievements in Military Psychology."

During his last year with us, Bob organized our first annual workshop for military clinical psychologists: "Psychological Services for Warriors During Combat and Combat-Related Missions." It was a grand success at the APA 2005 convention, and it has continued from time to time in Bob's memory.

At the August 2005 APA convention in Washington, DC, Brigadier General Dana Born and Colonel Paul Bartone recognized Bob Nichols with a special APA Division 19 Award for Exceptional Service to Military Psychology for his many contributions to military psychology over several decades. Colonel Bartone pointed out that Bob's life exemplified service and that he continually worked for the ethical and humane applications of psychology within the military. Bob Nichols worked vigorously within the APA and in our Society to advance military psychology, always with the clear goal of helping those who serve.

For a fascinating historical perspective explaining the history and achievements of the remarkable clinical psychologists

who served in the U.S. Army after World War II, it is recommended that readers see Bob Nichols's (2006) chapter, which describes how uniformed Army clinical psychologists were recruited and trained, explains the services they provided, and discusses the important professional innovations that have greatly benefited soldiers and their families.

Recipients of the Robert S. Nichols Award are as follows:

- 2010: L. Morgan Banks III
- 2011: Larry C. James
- 2012: Thomas Williams
- 2013: James A. Young
- 2014: Scott Edwards
- 2015: Sally C. Harvey

### Reference

Nichols, R. S. (2006). Clinical psychology in the U.S. Army: 1946–2004. In A. D. Mangelsdorff (Ed.), *Psychology in the service of national security* (pp. 153–167). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

### Point of Contact Information

For further information, please contact:

Paul A. Gade  
paul.gade39@gmail.com



# ***Continuing Education Committee Report***

***Jay A. Morrison, PhD***

---

*Continuing Education Committee Members (in alphabetical order): Nathan D. Aispan, PhD, Jay A. Morrison, PhD, Freddy A. Paniagua, PhD, and Yaron Robinowitz, PhD*

---

The Continuing Education (CE) Committee is pleased to report the continued support of the Office of CE Sponsor Approval in its ongoing efforts to provide high-quality CE opportunities to psychologists. The primary goals of our committee are as follows:

1. Assist in the development of high-quality preconvention CE opportunities for psychologists during the annual convention of the American Psychological Association (APA), in collaboration with APA's Continuing Education Committee.
2. Assist in the development of preconvention CE presentations, scheduled prior to the annual convention. The committee is accepting applications for the 2017 convention to be held in Washington, DC.
3. Help psychologists fulfill their licensure requirements by facilitating the development of in-person CE opportunities year-round that are free of charge. These are intended to benefit all psychologists but particularly those in remote locations or those who are unable to obtain funding for program attendance due to budgetary restrictions or duty demands.
4. Aid psychologists in developing their unique professional interests further by creating and delivering a CE program.

Since the last edition, the committee has approved the delivery of three CE programs, two of which utilized virtual media either exclusively or in conjunction with live delivery. These successfully reached a range of audiences, including student groups, junior professionals, and independent practice providers in the community interested in gaining a better understanding of military culture for their charitable work with uniformed personnel and veterans. The committee continues to be interested in facilitating the development of more CE programs that can be delivered virtually, as well as in person. Please contact us and we

will be glad to discuss with you ways to hold virtual programming while meeting the reporting requirements of APA for CE credit.

The committee encourages the submission of APA Pre-Convention Workshops for 2017 in Washington, DC. The committee wants to alert members of Division 19 that on August 1, 2013, the Division 19 Executive Committee approved a motion to subsidize the Division 19 Pre-Convention CE Workshop fees at APA annual meetings for five graduate students and five early career psychologists (2 years postdoctorate). Division members interested in being considered for one of these awards should contact the cochairs of the committee.

Applications for new CE programs are welcome from both military and civilian psychologists, provided that the content remains relevant for the military psychology community. Those interested in submitting a proposal are encouraged to contact the committee's cochairs, Jay Morrison at [jay.morrison77@gmail.com](mailto:jay.morrison77@gmail.com) and Freddy Paniagua at [faguapan@aol.com](mailto:faguapan@aol.com). The application process is simple and straightforward, and all relevant forms are available at the Division 19 CE website: <http://www.apadivisions.org/division-19/students-careers/continuing-education/index.aspx>.

Thank you all for your continued support of psychologist CE, and we greatly look forward to working with you to develop your interests and share them with your colleagues!

## **Point of Contact Information**

For further information, please contact:  
Jay A. Morrison  
[jay.morrison@cvn71.navy.mil](mailto:jay.morrison@cvn71.navy.mil)

# **Membership Committee Report**

**David M. Barry, PhD**

## **Updates from the APA Membership Office**

Until recently, membership in American Psychological Association (APA) was coordinated through two separate entities: APA Membership Office and Division Services (a suborganization that coordinates division-specific administrative activities). If you wanted to join Division 19 as a member, you would have to go to two distinct websites ([www.apa.org/membership/](http://www.apa.org/membership/) and <http://www.apa.org/divapp>), pay dues through two separate channels, and wait to hear back from two separate groups of people approving your membership. Furthermore, if you were once a Student Affiliate trying to upgrade to Member, you would have to first upgrade your APA Membership, wait several days while it was approved, and then upgrade your Division 19 membership. The process was convoluted, redundant, and inefficient. I would know, because this was my experience in December 2015.

APA, to their credit, recognized their membership systems were flawed and hired Ian King as its first Executive Director for Member Recruitment and Engagement. Through Ian's leadership, APA and Division Services are merging systems and promoting greater coordination. One of their initiatives is a consolidated join/renewal website, making it easier for people to sign up or renew membership with APA and divisions all in one place. This website should be "live" by the 2016 APA convention.

As the Membership Committee learns of new developments, we will be sure to share them with you using any and all of our communications platforms. For your awareness, here are the different communications systems Division 19 currently uses. Please email me at [dmbarry63@gmail.com](mailto:dmbarry63@gmail.com) if you would like more information about them.

## **Division 19 Communications Platforms**

- 1) Division 19 Announcement-Only Listserv:  
[DIV19@lists.apa.org](mailto:DIV19@lists.apa.org)
- 2) Division 19 Announcement-Only Student Listserv:  
[DIV19STUDENT@lists.apa.org](mailto:DIV19STUDENT@lists.apa.org)

- 3) Division 19 Discussion Listserv:  
[DIV19DISC@lists.apa.org](mailto:DIV19DISC@lists.apa.org)
- 6) Division 19 Facebook page: APA Division 19 – Military Psychology
- 7) Division 19 ECP LinkedIn page: APA Division 19 Military Psychology Early Career Psychologists
- 8) Division 19 Twitter account: @APADiv19
- 9) Division 19 Student Twitter account: @div19students
- 10) Division 19 Newsletter: *The Military Psychologist*
- 11) *Military Psychology* journal
- 12) APA Convention events
- 13) Division 19 website:  
<http://www.apadivisions.org/division-19/>
- 14) Division 19 student website:  
<http://www.division19students.org/>
- 15) Direct email
- 16) Direct mail

## **Division 19 Membership Committee Updates**

- 1) The Membership Committee recently added two members to enhance the Division's ability to serve its members. Please welcome Dr. Michelle Kelley and Dr. Alexander Wind to the team. Michelle is a Professor and Chair of Psychology at Old Dominion University in Norfolk, VA. She has conducted considerable research on deployment and military family issues and related issues, and is a long-term member of APA. Alexander is a research psychologist with the Army Research Institute in the Personnel Assessment Research Unit.
- 2) If you're attending the 2016 APA Convention in Denver, CO, be sure to check out the Division Services booth. Division 19 will have representatives there from military, civilian, research, and clinical backgrounds to answer questions and discuss opportunities to get involved. Please stop by . . . we'd love to meet you!



3) If you join or renew membership with Division 19 during or after the APA Convention, your dues will be credited for the remainder of the 2016 calendar year and all of the 2017 calendar year. It's basically getting 16 months for the price of 12. For this reason, the vast majority of people who join and renew membership with Division 19 do so between August and December each year. Student Affiliates who join or renew their membership prior to December 31 are automatically entered into a dues raffle, where 10 free student memberships are up for grabs.

4) Division 19 will be represented at the 2016 International Congress of Psychology (ICP2016) in Yokohama, Japan, to an expected 6,000–8,000 participants. Eligible psychologists who join APA during the Congress will be offered a free 1-year membership with Division 19. We will have a booth in the exhibitor's hall at the congress and will share brochures and information about Division 19 with congress attendees. If you or someone you know is going to this event, please have them stop by the APA/ Division 19 booth.

5) Be on the lookout for opportunities to be recognized for your accomplishments! Earlier this year, Division 19 asked for students who matched with a clinical internship to let us know about their achievement. We received an overwhelming response and published the list in the previous newsletter. We will be sending out periodic calls for the following achievements:

- a. Matched to a clinical internship
- b. Earned doctorate or Master's degree

- c. Awarded research grant
- d. Published research in peer-reviewed journal
- e. Obtained state license to practice psychology
- f. Selected for postdoctoral residency, research position, or fellowship
- g. Completed ABPP board certification
- h. Selected for leadership position
- i. Promotions, appointments, and new jobs
- j. Major awards or recognitions

#### **Need to Renew Your membership? Want to Help a Colleague Join Division 19?**

- Simply go to <http://www.apa.org/about/division/join.aspx> and click on the link for Division 19: Military Psychology.
- Enter your APA User ID and password or register for an APA website account.
- Follow the instructions to renew/sign up!
- **Note: even if you're not an APA member, you can join Division 19** as a Professional Affiliate (\$30; for nonstudents) or a Student Affiliate (\$10; for graduate and undergraduate students).

#### **Point of Contact Information:**

For further information, please contact:

David M. Barry, PhD  
dmbarry63@gmail.com

## ***Early Career Psychologists Committee Report***

***Julie M. Landry Poole, PsyD, ABPP***

The Early Career Psychologists (ECP) Committee is seeking additional Division 19 and/or Military Psychology Colleague mentors and graduate student mentees for our Internship Mentorship Program. Currently in its third year, the program is designed to assist students interested in Army, Navy, Air Force, and VA internship programs. Ideally, mentors and mentees meet via email or phone 1–3 times to discuss internship materials, site selection, preparing for interviews, and site ranking. If you are interested in providing mentorship support or are a student seeking additional guidance, please contact Lieutenant Adrienne Manasco at [adrienne.manasco@gmail.com](mailto:adrienne.manasco@gmail.com) by July 15, 2016. In the email include your name, preferred email address, clinical interests, graduate program information (mentee), and potential internship sites (mentee).

In January of this year, Secretary of Defense Ash Carter announced DoD policy changes designed to improve quality of life for military personnel, including the notable expansion of maternity leave from 6 weeks to 12. These changes occur amid a broader cultural conversation regarding demand for paid parental leave, a call to “lean in,” and whether one can truly “have it all.” As psychologists settling into our careers, the push and pull between the personal and professional is particularly salient. Thus, the ECP Committee seeks to open the conversation about how

we as military psychologists manage the challenge of work/life balance for ourselves, and we encourage senior and junior members to join us. The conversation will begin on the Division 19 discussion listserv to better determine initial interest in the topic, with potential to move to another forum. To suggest a specific topic within the context of work/life balance, contact Adrienne Manasco, ECP Chair-Elect at [adrienne.manasco@gmail.com](mailto:adrienne.manasco@gmail.com).

Please note that the discussion listserv is only available to dues paying members, associates, and affiliates. To join Division 19 please go to <http://www.apa.org/about/division/div19.aspx>.

To join the discussion listserv, request membership in one of two ways:

1. Proceed to the link <http://lists.apa.org/cgi-bin/wa.exe>.
2. Send an email to [listserv@lists.apa.org](mailto:listserv@lists.apa.org), leave the subject line blank, and type the following in the body of the email: `subscribe div19disc`.

### **Point of Contact Information:**

For further information, please contact:

Julie M. Landry Poole  
[julie.m.landrypoole.civ@mail.mil](mailto:julie.m.landrypoole.civ@mail.mil)

# ***Student Affairs Committee Report***

***Kevin O'Leary, MS***

Greetings, Division 19 members!

The Student Affairs Committee (SAC) is proud to present our summer report. As a trainee at the Lowell Vet Center in Massachusetts, I spent the week prior to Memorial Day working with The Mass Military Heroes Fund to plant the 37,000 flags in the Boston Common, including the 231 who have died since 9/11, to remember the men and women from the Commonwealth who have died while serving their country from the Revolution to the present. This field of flags was a stark reminder of the importance of the work we do every day. It is our privilege and honor to play a part in helping our dedicated students realize their goals and care for the service members, friends, and families that these flags represent.

As the months before the convention wind down, we are working hard to create a meaningful and exciting convention experience for our students and to advance our online programming. As chair, I am excited to report that we are meeting our goals for 2016 and have a great deal planned for the remainder of the year. It is our goal and privilege to continue to be a part of your development and training.

## **2016 Midyear Meeting Summary**

In February, Angela, Nate, and I attended the Division 19 midyear Executive Committee (EXCOM) business meeting. For those of you who are relatively unfamiliar with our governance process, the EXCOM meets twice each year, once at the American Psychological Association (APA) and once at the midyear meeting, which takes place during the spring of each year. In February, Human Resources Research Organization hosted the midyear meeting at its main office, overlooking the Potomac River in the historic downtown Alexandria, Virginia. The minutes of that meeting (and all meetings, for that matter) are recorded and published in this newsletter, and we encourage you all to read them and stay informed of potential changes and discussions regarding the future of our division. As the meeting notes are rather extensive, I will

briefly highlight our planned activities that were approved by the EXCOM.

## **Student Awards Program**

The SAC will continue to offer 12 Student Travel Awards (\$750 each) in 2016 to all Division 19 student members who demonstrate outstanding commitment to advancing the science and practice of military psychology. In addition, the EXCOM voted to approve the continued funding of our two Student Research Grants (\$1,500 each). For those unfamiliar with our grants program, the research grants are awarded to our two highest scoring grant applicants with the option of an additional \$750 for recipients to attend the APA convention to present their findings. Please visit our website at [www.division19students.org](http://www.division19students.org) for annual deadline and application details.

This year has also been the first ever T-shirt contest wherein students have nominated their local chapter to be the recipients of newly created Division 19 T-shirts. We hope this will serve as a token of our appreciation for all that the students do but also as a way for students to be recognized in their community as they wear their new T-shirts around.

## **Travel Awards**

We would like to celebrate the achievement of the following 12 students who were chosen to receive our \$750 Travel Awards for the 2016 Annual APA Convention in Denver, Colorado.

Aaron Banas, George Washington University

Cara Blevins, University of North Carolina–Charlotte

Dominika Borowa, Texas Tech University

Joshua Camins, Sam Houston State University

Tiffany Duffing, Fielding Graduate University

Katie Fry, Fielding Graduate University

Ryan Hess, Ball State University

Jeremy Jinkerson, Fielding Graduate University

Megan O'Shea, Chatham University

Allison Robbins, Virginia Consortium Program in Clinical Psychology

Kelsi Rugo, Tennessee State University

Tiffany Urquhart, Palo Alto State University

### **Outstanding Student Highlights**

Additionally, we would like to highlight our outstanding student members for their exceptional contributions. Below are their respective write-ups by their organizations and students who nominated them.

#### **Aaron Banas (George Washington University)**

Aaron is a student at George Washington University. He continues to amaze us with his passion for military training and how he proactively seeks opportunities to serve. This month, Aaron is "hosting a fairly broad training session to get people interested in working with military and veterans and also to increase awareness about military and veteran-related issues." How awesome is that? And that's not all that we have to look forward to from him. He's already planning on coordinating a regional event in Washington, DC later this spring that will be geared toward APA Division 19 members and students and will be an awesome training opportunity! Way to go Aaron! Thanks for being a great example of what we want from our Give an Hour Student Liaisons! (from Give an Hour's newsletter).

#### **Katie Fry (Fielding Graduate University)**

Katie's contributions are all the more amazing considering that she is a first-year student. Her level of participation, her tireless advocacy on our chapter's behalf, and her can-do attitude are an example to us all and are a large part why she was nominated for the position of executive officer for the chapter despite being a first-year student. She continues to bring credit to our chapter and is always looking for ways to improve herself.

#### **Lynnea Vis (Adler University)**

Lynnea has a longstanding history of military-specific psychology interest, and it is only natural that she has joined Division 19 at the inception of her doctoral degree. Since then, she has served on the leadership team as a regional representative for the Midwest. Additionally, she is the president of Adler University's Military Psychology

Student Organization. She works tirelessly to secure presenters, host events, and bring military psychology scholarship to the campus. She intends to join the Armed Forces as a clinical psychologist in the United States Navy.

### **Webinar Programming**

We have been able to successfully present four new webinars in the past several months, including our most attended online webinar, Successful Preparation for U.S. Army Internships, which had 40 participants in Adobe Connect. We also proudly conducted an in-uniform Clinical Psychology Careers Webinar involving an active duty ECP member and two senior Division 19 active duty members. Our hard-charging East Coast representative, Katie Fry, successfully put together an Applying for HPSP Scholarships Panel. And last, we held a major collaboration with Give an Hour that produced an Introduction to Veterans' Mental Health Issues and Provider Resources. This was our first hybrid webinar, involving an in-person meeting with providers in the Washington, DC area and online connect providers and students from across the country. A big shout-out to Dr. Andrew Blatt, our moderator; Angela Legner, the in-person host; and our presenters, Dr. John Whirley and Lashanta Petroski-Ackley, MSW. Recordings of these webinars can be found on our website, [www.division19students.org/webinars.html](http://www.division19students.org/webinars.html).

We will be continuing our webinar programming by starting our leadership webinar series. It is our hope that we can bring to bear the considerable knowledge and experience of Division 19 to help our students train and develop as leaders. This role is often overlooked in graduate programs, but it plays a vital part of our identities in psychologists whether we are active duty, Veterans Affairs (VA), or independent practice.

We are working to produce a series of webinars presenting leadership theory, showing applications of leadership in military psychology, and creating an online space for exploring leadership as students and future psychologists. If any students or members have interest in being a part of this programming, please email us at [div19studentsrep@gmail.com](mailto:div19studentsrep@gmail.com). The SAC is extremely excited to expand the services we can offer our students and members, and we are proud to offer leadership training.

### **2016 Denver APA Convention**

This year, the SAC is excited to work with the ECP Committee and Division 18 to provide you with an excit-

ing mentorship luncheon along with some great presentations and panels. We will have an internship preparation panel with students, ECPs, and training directors. We hope that having a mix of professions across the career life span will offer a comprehensive view of the internship process. We will have active duty, civilian Department of Defense, and VA psychologists and interns. An informal social hour with panel members and others will follow in the suite. We are also excited to hold our annual Military Research Q + A Panel. Research-interested students will be able to seek out brief mentorship on careers and conducting research. Last, but far from least, we will have a presentation from one of last year's Division 19 Student Research Award winners, Sarah Carter, who will be presenting on her study: "Interpersonal Mechanisms of Suicide Risk in Service Members: A Daily Diary Study."

One of the highlights of the convention for us students has been the opportunity to connect and socialize outside of the convention. If you are following Nate Tenhundfeld's excellent work producing our biweekly newsletters, you will notice the exciting opportunities we have available to us while we are out there. We are hoping to utilize the things that really make Denver unique in an effort to provide social events that truly capture the essence of the city; if you have any suggestions for things you would like to see us do collectively while we are out there, please let us know!

Did you know that over 200 different types of beer are brewed every day in Denver? What about that the city of Denver has over 14,000 acres of parkland, making it the largest city park system in the nation? With its over 300 days of sunshine every year, 140-mile panorama of the Rocky Mountains, bike-sharing service, and hundreds of miles of trails immediately in or near Denver, we plan on exploring much of the great outdoors. Whether we take a trip up to the infamous Red Rocks Amphitheater, visit the local outdoor shooting range, go on a sunset hike, or even a brewery tour or three, the only thing better than the conference itself will be the events and outings we will plan for our time out there. We hope to see you all there!

#### **Early Bird Membership Dues Raffle**

As an incentive for renewing your Division 19 membership early, the SAC will offer a raffle drawing to reim-

burse the \$10 fee for 10 students who renew their membership prior to December 31, 2016. Please visit our website for more details.

#### **Division 19 Student Website Update**

We have endeavored to build and rebuild our website to best serve our student members. Thanks largely to the work of Nate Tenhundfeld, our website has become even more robust and user-friendly. Please take a look at our APA Convention and resources pages for upcoming programming. We will keep them updated as we record programming and schedule new ones. Please keep an eye out for our upcoming Leadership Reading list!

#### **Social Media**

Our social media presence has grown to include a separately run Facebook page for the SAC. Regular postings there, on Twitter, and in the Division 19 group have allowed us to establish more of a direct connection with students. We hope to continue to use our social media presence to see what the students are interested in, to share pertinent information in a timely manner, and to hopefully reach out to students who have an interest in military psychology but do not currently know that we as a community exist. We have already had several social media contests raffling off signed copies of books authored by Division 19 members and hope to have more exciting giveaways in the future.

The SAC is continually amazed by our students, and we are honored to serve as your division student representatives. We love to hear about all the great work our students are doing and are interested in being notified of any student presentations, publications, or projects. Please help us show off your great work by emailing us at [div19studentrep@gmail.com](mailto:div19studentrep@gmail.com). Please also email us with feedback, suggestions, or specific interests for programming. We always want to hear from our students!

#### **Point of Contact Information**

For further information, please contact:  
Kevin O'Leary, MS, 2016 SAC Chair  
[koleary@antioch.edu](mailto:koleary@antioch.edu)



## ***APA Program Committee Report***

***Rebecca K. Blais and Lindsey L. Monteith***

On behalf of your Convention Programming Committee, we hope to see you at the annual meeting in Denver, Colorado, from August 4–7, 2016. For general information about the conference, please visit <http://www.apa.org/convention/index.aspx>.

### **Submissions and Review Process**

Consistent with prior years, we received a high number of submissions that exceeded available presentation time. We received 21 symposia and 82 poster submissions, which were reviewed by our volunteer team of nearly 100 psychologists. Each submission was reviewed by two to three psychologists. It is always disappointing to turn away strong proposals due to scheduling restrictions, but it is heartening to see the continued interest in ongoing dialogue related to military psychology. If your submission was not accepted for presentation, we encourage you to resubmit next year. Please see the final program for the convention in Table 1.

### **Presidential Address**

We welcome everyone to attend Dr. Landes's Presidential Address on Friday, August 5, 2016, from 3:00–3:50 p.m. at the Hyatt Regency Hotel Centennial Ballroom C.

### **Welcome Reception and Social**

We invite everyone to attend Division 19's Welcome Social on Thursday, August 4, 2016, from 4:00–5:50 p.m. at the Hyatt Regency Hotel Mineral Hall D. We also invite everyone to attend the Annual Social on Friday, August 5, 2016, from 4:00–5:50 p.m. at the Hyatt Regency Hotel Centennial Ballroom C. Beverages and tapas will be provided at no charge.

### **Suite Sessions**

We have several programs planned for our suite in Denver. Based on feedback from last year, we scaled back on the number of presentations held in the suite to not compete with formal convention programming. In addition to hosting Division 19 subcommittee meetings, including those for students, emerging psychologists, and early career psychologists, we look forward to welcoming the National Center for Telehealth and Technology and the Rocky Mountain Mental Illness Research, Education, Clinical Center. A final schedule will be posted to the listserv in the days immediately preceding the conference. At that time, we will also have the suite room number available. For the current schedule, please see Table 1.

### **Continuing Education**

Several of our sponsored presentations were accepted into the continuing education programming. American Psychological Association is offering over 300 sessions with continuing education credits. For additional information on sessions that have these credits and how to register for credits, please visit <http://www.apa.org/convention/ce/sessions/index.aspx>.

We look forward to seeing you in Denver. Safe travels, and as always, thank you for your continued support of our division.

Rebecca K. Blais and Lindsey L. Monteith  
Convention Chair and Co-Chair



Table 1

*Division 19 Suite Programming*

Date and time	Event	Host(s)
Thursday, August 4, 2016		
9:00–9:50 a.m.	Human dimension: Person/environment fit emphasizes human side of technology use	Dr. Mary Gregerson and Dr. Richard Parker
12:00–1:50 p.m.	Technology for connected health: Implementation across the spectrum of care	National Center for Telehealth and Technology
2:00–2:50 p.m.	Moral injury: Recent advances, current challenges, and future directions	Dr. Phil Held and Dr. Brian Klassen
4:00–5:50 p.m.	Division 19 Welcome Reception <sup>a</sup>	President Ann Landes, PhD
Friday, August 5, 2016		
8:30–10:20 a.m.	Global perspectives on Military Psychology Round Table	Dr. Bob Roland and Dr. Paul Bartone
10:30–11:50 a.m.	Diversity in the Military: New Ideas and Perspectives	Dr. Kelly Ervin
11:00–11:50 a.m.	Poster Session <sup>b</sup>	
12:00–1:50 p.m.	Preventing Suicidal Self-Directed Violence in Service Members and Veterans	Rocky Mountain Mental Illness Research, Education, and Clinical Center and Military Suicide Research Consortium
2:00–2:50 p.m.	Business Meeting <sup>c</sup>	
3:00–3:50 p.m.	Presidential Address <sup>c</sup>	
4:00–5:50 p.m.	Division 19 Annual Social Hour <sup>c</sup>	
Saturday, August 6, 2016		
8:00–8:50 a.m.	Identifying and assessing moral injury in combat veterans	Mr. Jeremy Jinkerson
10:00–10:50 a.m.	Perspectives on internship application processes	Student Affairs Committee
11:00–11:50 a.m.	Student Mentorship Hour	Early Career Psychologists Committee and Student Affairs Committee
12:00–12:50 p.m.	Poster Session <sup>b</sup>	
4:00–5:30 p.m.	Early Career Psychologists Membership Social	
Sunday, August 7, 2016		
9:00–10:50 a.m.	2015 Member and Student Research Grant Awardee Presentations	

*Note.* All events held in our suite unless otherwise noted.

Locations: <sup>a</sup> Hyatt Regency Mineral Hall D. <sup>b</sup> Convention Center Exhibit Hall ABC. <sup>c</sup> Hyatt Regency Centennial Ballroom C.

## **Announcements**

**Christina Hein**

Welcome to the Announcements section and your chance to spread the word about relevant information you'd like shared with the community. Please take advantage of this resource by emailing me at [chein9@gmail.com](mailto:chein9@gmail.com) with a short write-up of your announcement details.

My name is Christina Hein, and I am a second-year clinical psychology graduate student at the University of Nebraska – Lincoln. My research interests are combat-related PTSD and suicide risk in the military. I am looking forward to getting to know the members of this wonderful community. Please do not hesitate to reach out to me.

### **General**

#### **Join Division 19 on social media!**

- Facebook group: APA Division 19 – Military Psychology
- Twitter: @APADiv19, @Div19students
- LinkedIn group for ECPs: APA Division 19 – Military Psychology – Early Career Psychologists

#### **Nominations for Division 19 Fellow Status**

Nominations for Division 19 initial fellow status and for those holding fellow status in other APA divisions are due 15 January 2017. Self-nominations and nominations of deserving members are encouraged. For initial fellow status, the nominee must

- Possess a doctoral degree;
- Have been a member of Division 19 for at least one year;
- Show active engagement in the advancement of psychology;
- Have 5 years of acceptable postdoctoral experience; and
- Have achieved a record of unusual and outstanding contributions to military psychology.

The APA portal to submit nominations opens in August, 2016 and must be completed by 15 January 2017 in order

to be considered in this cycle. For more information, please visit <http://www.apa.org/membership/fellows/>, or contact the Division 19 Fellows Committee Chair, Dr. Michael D. Matthews ([lm6270@usma.edu](mailto:lm6270@usma.edu)).

### **Conferences**

#### **APA Annual Convention workshop: Implementing and Adapting PTSD Treatment With Active Duty Service Members**

Friday, August 5, 2016; 0800–1550

This intermediate workshop describes treatment considerations and hands-on techniques for clinicians utilizing prolonged exposure and cognitive processing therapy pertinent to treating military personnel with PTSD. Challenges in assessment, including risk of suicide, aggression, or violence, are addressed. Developing culturally sensitive case conceptualization skills is emphasized. How to flex and adapt the protocols is discussed. Presenters elaborate on treatment considerations for traumatic loss, moral injury, and close call traumas. Workshop leaders utilize demonstrations, including videos, modeling, and role plays, and tailor the workshop to the participants' consultation needs.

Leaders: Katherine A. Dondanville, PsyD, Brooke Fina, LCSW, and Alan L. Peterson, PhD, University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio; and Joshua N. Friedlander, PsyD, Walter Reed National Military Medical Center, Bethesda, MD.

#### **Conference on Child Protection and Well-Being, University Park, PA**

October 10–11, 2016

More than ever before, schools and teachers are called upon to identify and respond to the unique challenges of childhood trauma, with estimates indicating that one of every four students in U.S. schools has been exposed to a traumatic event that can affect learning and/or behavior (National Child Traumatic Stress Network).

The purpose of this fifth annual Penn State University conference is to bring together key members of the research, educational, and child welfare communities in order to create an interagency and transdisciplinary dialogue about how schools can more effectively move toward a coordinated, multifaceted trauma-informed framework. Sessions will include child welfare legislations changes, school-based maltreatment prevention efforts, the developmental impact of trauma, and mandated reporter trainings.

Registration is \$175 until 2 September, after which it is \$225 until 23 September. On-site registration is permitted, but will include an additional \$30 fee. The Penn State Psychological Clinic is approved by the APA to sponsor CEUs for psychologists.

### **Research Participant Requests**

Virginia Commonwealth University student Janette Hamilton seeks research participants for an IRB approved study. The study's purpose is to determine which types of treatment options are best suited for some issues faced by spouses or partners of service members and veterans. Specifically, the authors are interested in identifying care that is better suited to the military culture and challenges specific to military family members. If you are the current or former spouse or partner of a military service member or veteran, are 18 years of age or older, and are interested, you are invited to participate in a voluntary, anonymous, online survey that will take approximately 15–20 min to complete. The survey can be found at the following link: <https://redcap.vcu.edu/rc/surveys/?s=QnZk39VB9N>

Long Island University researchers seek research participants for an IRB-approved study. The purpose of this study is to contribute to the emerging literature on the construct of “moral injury” by examining its relationship to several risk and resilience factors for postdeployment mental health. Participants must have completed at least one deployment for OEF/OIF/OND. The survey will take approximately 30 min to complete. If you are interested, the survey can be found at the following link: <https://redcap.vcu.edu/rc/surveys/?s=QnZk39VB9N>

Drexel University student seeks research participants for an IRB-approved study. The purpose of this study is to understand how everyday problems and stress impact military veterans in order to better understand the types of problems affecting veterans to inform new treatment options and programs. Participation will take no longer than 30 min. The survey can be found at

the following link: <http://goo.gl/A3hxGu>. For additional information, please contact study coordinator Alexa Hays at [amh474@drexel.edu](mailto:amh474@drexel.edu).

### **Employment Opportunities**

#### **The Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory (JHU-APL), Baltimore/Washington DC**

The Johns Hopkins University Applied Physics Laboratory, a national leader in scientific research and development, is seeking a behavioral scientist. The employee will work with a growing team of researchers from a variety of backgrounds, including psychology, human factors, and cognitive science, who creatively apply behavioral research and experimental methodologies to answer real-world challenges of national importance. Specific duties and estimated amount of time per week are as follows:

- Engage on projects focused on the study of collaborative problem-solving techniques used by intelligence analysts, a study of cognitive biases that influence data visualization and interpretation, a study of user interface design for health systems, and multiple studies related to training and workload assessment in cyber defense. Work is in a fast-pace environment. (80%)
- Share knowledge by clearly articulating ideas through papers and presentations to technical staff and management. Take advantage of opportunities to participate in working groups, customer meetings, proposal writing, and conferences. (20%)

Required qualifications expected of applicants:

- Graduate degree in psychology or a related social/behavioral science
- Early career professional level experience in data analysis using both quantitative/qualitative methods, statistical analysis and data management, experimental methods, and human subjects research
- Demonstrated strong teamwork and interpersonal skills
- Excellent oral and written communication skills
- Ability to obtain a US government security clearance

#### **Desired Qualifications:**

- Experience with ‘R’
- Experience with multilevel statistical modeling for analyzing group performance

- Ability to do some scripting/coding
- High comfort level with advanced technology
- Experience in usability and design
- Active Secret clearance

**Benefits:**

APL offers a comprehensive benefits package including a liberal vacation plan, a matching retirement program, significant educational assistance, a scholarship tuition program for staff with dependents, and competitive salaries commensurate with skills and experience.

For more information, please visit [www.jhuapl.edu](http://www.jhuapl.edu)

**George Mason University (GMU), Fairfax, VA**

The clinical science program at George Mason University is currently seeking an adjunct supervisor for either (1) the introductory CBT for Adults practicum (2nd year students) or (2) the advanced evidence-based therapy for adults practicum (3rd year students). The position will be for the 2016–2017 academic year, with the possibility of renewal for subsequent years.

**Introductory CBT for Adults:**

The 2nd year practicum involves a combination of didactic instruction in CBT techniques, and full audio/video review of sessions. This course is cotaught and cosupervised with a core faculty member (Keith Renshaw). The core faculty member and adjunct supervisor each supervise one case per student (6 total cases).

**Advanced EBT for Adults:**

The 3rd year practicum is primarily supervision-based, with a combination of group supervision (typically 1 hour/week) and individual supervision. Audio/video review is used as needed. Approximately 9 students will be seeing 2–4 adults/week.

The position includes a formal appointment as an adjunct faculty member. Salary is based on the GMU adjunct faculty salary matrix. If you are interested but have questions, please contact Keith Renshaw directly at [krenshaw@gmu.edu](mailto:krenshaw@gmu.edu) directly. For a formal job posting, see the link below: <https://jobs.gmu.edu/postings/31379>

**Cognitive Behavior Therapy and Mindfulness Center, San Ramon, CA**

The Cognitive Behavior Therapy and Mindfulness Center in San Ramon, CA is seeking a clinician for a 3-year

training position that starts September 2016. The position involves effectively implementing scientifically supported treatments in an evidence-based independent practice. Upon successful completion of the position, clinicians will have the skills needed to run their own practices treating a variety of patient problem sets. The desired candidate has a firm CBT theoretical orientation and is excited to take on a full caseload of clients.

**Qualifications:**

- APA-accredited MA, PsyD, or PhD
- Have completed a CBT-oriented clinical internship
- Have supervised clinical experience in CBT in the following areas: assessment of child, teen, and adult anxiety and depressive disorders, exposure therapy with children, teenagers, and adults, empirically supported therapies for OCD, anxiety disorders, and depression, and parent training/behavior modification.

Candidates must thrive in a patient-focused work culture that requires responsiveness, attention to detail, flexibility with evening clinical hours, and a high level of professionalism at all times. Weekly supervision is provided by Robin Yeganeh, PhD. For more information about the position, please e-mail your CV, three references, and a letter of interest to [dr@cbthealth.com](mailto:dr@cbthealth.com).

**Postdoctoral Fellowship**

**Aaron T. Beck Psychopathology Research Center at the University of Pennsylvania**

The Aaron T. Beck Psychopathology Research Center of the University of Pennsylvania is seeking applicants with previous training in Cognitive Therapy (CT) or Cognitive Behavioral Therapy (CBT) and knowledge of implementation science to join the Beck Community Initiative, under the direction of Torrey A. Creed, PhD and Aaron T. Beck, MD. Since 2007, the Beck Community Initiative has served as a model for the successful implementation of CT in community behavioral health settings, increasing access to evidence-based treatment for economically, culturally, and ethnically diverse urban populations. The emphasis of the fellowship will be the implementation of CT in services for adolescents in acute inpatient settings, as well as individuals seeking recovery from substance abuse. Responsibilities may also include working with providers across a wide range of treatment settings to support

adults or children in their recovery from anxiety, depression, anger, recent incarceration, homelessness, and other common behavioral health issues. Primary responsibilities will involve the systematic use of implementation strategies to integrate CT into current practice settings, including engagement of agency staff, delivery of workshops, and group supervision. Applications from postdoctoral level or license-eligible individuals are sought for this position.

**Qualifications:**

- Advanced professional discipline. PhD, PsyD, or MD in clinical psychology, counseling psychology, social work, psychiatry, or related discipline

- 1–2 years of experience with equivalent combination of education and experience is required
- candidates with expertise in CT/CBT, the treatment of substance abuse/adolescents in acute settings, or implementation science will be considered, but the ideal candidate will have significant experience in several of these areas
- bilingual applicants are particularly encouraged to apply.

This position is open immediately. Please send a CV, statement of interest, and two letters of recommendation to Torrey Creed, PhD at [tcreed@mail.med.upenn.edu](mailto:tcreed@mail.med.upenn.edu).



**SOCIETY FOR MILITARY PSYCHOLOGY**

*Division 19 of the American Psychological Association*

**Call for support–Spotlight on History  
Column/Division 19 Archiving**



Do you like history? Are you looking for an opportunity to support Division 19? If you answered “Yes” to these questions then we have an opportunity for you! The Division 19 Historian is seeking help with archiving Division 19 materials and support for the Spotlight on History section. This opportunity is open to students as well as more senior Division 19 members. If you think you might be interested please contact Dr. Paul Gade at: [paulgade39@gmail.com](mailto:paulgade39@gmail.com) - Come learn about Division 19’s history and contribute to its future.

## Division 19 Membership Application Form

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

Mailing address: \_\_\_\_\_

City, state, postal code, country: \_\_\_\_\_

Work phone: \_\_\_\_\_ Home phone: \_\_\_\_\_

Fax: \_\_\_\_\_ E-mail address: \_\_\_\_\_

APA membership number/category (if applicable): \_\_\_\_\_

Member       Associate       Fellow       Life Status

Student Affiliate       International Affiliate       No Membership in APA

### Division 19 Membership Desired:

Member/Associate/Fellow (\$27)       International Affiliate (\$30)       Professional Affiliate (\$30)

Student Affiliate (\$10)       Life Status Publication Fee (\$19)

Cardholder name (the name appearing on credit card): \_\_\_\_\_

Cardholder's billing address: \_\_\_\_\_

Credit card number: \_\_\_\_\_ Expiration date: \_\_\_\_\_

Card type (only MasterCard, Visa, or American Express): \_\_\_\_\_

Daytime phone number and email address (if available): \_\_\_\_\_

Amount to be charged in US Dollars: \_\_\_\_\_ Cardholder signature: \_\_\_\_\_

### MAIL APPLICATION TO:

**APA Division 19 Services, ATT Keith Cooke, 750 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20002-4242**

For questions call Keith Cooke at 202-216-7602 or email [kcooke@apa.org](mailto:kcooke@apa.org)

**Please DO NOT fax or email credit card information!**

**Online application is available at <http://www.apa.org/about/division/div19.aspx>**



## **INSTRUCTIONS FOR CONTRIBUTORS TO *THE MILITARY PSYCHOLOGIST* NEWSLETTER**

*Please read carefully before sending a submission.*

*The Military Psychologist* encourages submissions of news, reports, and noncommercial information that (1) advances the science and practice of psychology within military organizations; (2) fosters professional development of psychologists and other professionals interested in the psychological study of the military through education, research, and training; and (3) supports efforts to disseminate and apply scientific knowledge and state of the art advances in areas relevant to military psychology. Preference is given to submissions that have broad appeal to Division 19 members and are written to be understood by a diverse range of readers. *The Military Psychologist* is published three times per year: Spring (submission deadline **February 1**), Summer (submission deadline **June 1**), and Fall (submission deadline **October 1**).

*Preparation and Submission of Feature Articles and Spotlight Contributions.* All items should be directly submitted to one of the following Section Editors: **Feature Articles** (Maureen Copeskey: copeskey@gmail.com), **Trends** (Joseph B. Lyons: joseph.lyons.6@us.af.mil), **Spotlight on Research** (Colleen Varga: colleen.varga.1@us.af.mil), and **Spotlight on History** (Paul Gade: paul.gade39@gmail.com). For example, Feature Articles must be of interest to most Division 19 members; Spotlight on Research submissions must be succinct in nature. If longer, please, consider submitting the article to the Division 19 journal, *Military Psychology* military.psychology.journal@gmail.com). If articles do not fit into any of these categories, feel free to send the contribution to the Editor in Chief (Joseph B. Lyons: joseph.lyons.6@us.af.mil) for potential inclusion.

Articles must be in electronic form (Word compatible), **must not exceed 3,000 words**, and should be prepared in accordance with the most current edition of the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (e.g., references/citations). All graphics (including color or black-and-white photos) should be sized close to finish print size, at least 300 dpi resolution, and saved in TIF or EPS formats. Submission should include a title, author(s) name, telephone number, and e-mail address of the corresponding author to whom communications about the manuscript should be directed. Submissions should include a statement that the material has not been published or is under consideration for publication elsewhere. It will be assumed that the listed authors have approved the manuscript.

Preparation of Announcements. Items for the **Announcements** section should be succinct and brief. Calls and announcements (up to 300 words) should include a brief description, contact information, and deadlines. Digital photos are welcome. All announcements should be sent to Christina Hein (chein9@gmail.com).

*Review and Selection.* Every submission is reviewed and evaluated by the Section Editor, the Editor in Chief, and American Psychological Association (APA) editorial staff for compliance to the overall guidelines of APA and the newsletter. In some cases, the Editor in Chief may also ask members of the Editorial Board or Executive Committee to review the submissions. Submissions well in advance of issue deadlines are appreciated and necessary for unsolicited manuscripts. However, the Editor in Chief and the Section Editors reserve the right to determine the appropriate issue to publish an accepted submission. All items published in *The Military Psychologist* are copyrighted by the Society for Military Psychology.

**American Psychological Association  
The Military Psychologist Division 19  
750 First Street, NE  
Washington, DC 20002-4242**

**Non-profit Org.  
U.S. POSTAGE  
PAID  
Permit #6348  
Washington, DC**

**ADDRESS SERVICE REQUESTED**



**“Printed in the USA”**

**PLEASE RECYCLE**

