

APA



Division 12

CLINICAL SCIENCE

Society for the Science of Clinical Psychology
Section III of the Division of Clinical Psychology of
the American Psychological Association

Developing clinical psychology as an experimental-behavioral science



NEWSLETTER

FALL 2014: VOLUME 17, ISSUE 3

SSCP Executive Board

President:

Bethany Teachman, Ph.D.
University of Virginia

Past-President:

Michelle Craske, Ph.D.
University of California, Los Angeles

President-Elect:

Mitch Prinstein, Ph.D.
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

Secretary/Treasurer:

Stewart Shankman, Ph.D.
University of Illinois-Chicago

Division 12 Representative:

Douglas Mennin, Ph.D.
Hunter College

Student Representatives:

Victoria C. Smith, M.S.
University of Maryland-College Park

Rosanna Breaux
University of Massachusetts Amherst

At Large Members:

Lauren B. Alloy, Ph.D.
Temple University

Ben Hankin Ph.D.
University of Denver

Clinical Science Editor:

Sara Bufferd, Ph.D.
California State University San Marcos

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Presidential Column

B. Teachman.....2

Diversity Corner: New Column

D. Rosmarin & B. Hankin.....4

Treasurer’s Report

S. Shankman.....6

SSCP APS Student Poster Winners.....7

SSCP & APS “How Did I Get Here” Video Series.....8

Clinical Science Early Career Paths Series

J. Gruber.....9

Student Perspectives Series

K. Wilborn.....12

Clinician Perspectives Series

J. Persons.....14

Update from the Student Representatives

SSCP Outstanding Graduate Student Researcher Award Winners

V. Smith & R. Breaux.....16

Articles published in *Clinical Science* represent the views of the authors and not necessarily those of the Society for a Science of Clinical Psychology, the Society of Clinical Psychology, or the American Psychological Association. Submissions representing differing views, comments, and letters to the editor are welcome.

PRESIDENTIAL COLUMN

EVERYONE SHOULD BE SO LUCKY!

BETHANY TEACHMAN PH.D., UNIVERSITY OF VIRGINIA

We are lucky. Of course, I personally am lucky for a great many reasons (my family and our friends, our health, financial stability, etc...), but I am referring to the luck that all of us as members of SSCP share. We are lucky to be clinical scientists.

Regardless of how you are using your clinical science training right now – whether it's as a researcher, clinician, teacher, administrator, consultant, or some other totally unique application - we are so privileged to have this knowledge and way of learning. Sometimes I forget this, and then I am reminded in a hundred little ways in any given week. Consider just a few examples from my last couple days.

As I write this, it's Sunday night, and I have literally just come downstairs from trying to help my 7-year-old daughter stay in bed and go to sleep. She is worried that her difficulty falling asleep and 'thinking bad thoughts' is a catastrophe. As a mom, I am fortunate to know about CBT for insomnia so I can help her restructure that thought, and normalize her difficulties. As an anxiety and thought suppression researcher, I find it wonderfully useful to know that it won't help my daughter for me to tell her 'not to think about being put in a dungeon' (yes, my children have vivid imaginations, for better and worse!). Instead, I know to tell her about pink flamingoes and white bears, and ways to more helpfully redirect her thinking.

On Thursday, I had felt grumpy about summer being over, and the need to prep for classes again (I am currently teaching an intervention class to our 2nd year doctoral students as they prepare to start with their first therapy clients). As clinical scientists, we have the great fortune to have a literature we can draw from to form a nomothetic formulation, and the

tools to integrate that with idiographic data from the client.

After my class on Thursday, I saw a client – someone who had been severely depressed. We've been working together for a while, and she's not so depressed anymore, and we're soon going to shift to just meeting once a month. Now, I know enough to realize that our treatment isn't necessarily the reason she's doing better, but what a privilege to have played some part in her making such amazing changes in her life. And the best part is that while I am thrilled by her progress, I am not shocked. When she first came in for therapy, she had little hope that things would get better for her, but I did, because I knew there were efficacious treatments we could try. Now, of course, these treatments don't always work (not by a long shot!), but how amazing to be in a position to honestly tell someone who is suffering terribly that because of countless research studies that others have done, I have good reason to believe that she will get some relief.

I could go on and on, because there is really no aspect of my life – professional or personal - that doesn't benefit from the training I've received and the research I have read. But here's the thing: I don't think we should be the only lucky ones. I want everyone to have access to this knowledge. That is why I have focused on dissemination of clinical science during my term as President. We have formed many new committees this year to work on various aspects of dissemination across different domains: Science in Practice Committee, Diversity Committee, Public Education and Media Committee, International Outreach Committee, and the Continuing Education task force and other education initiatives. Of course, I don't think everyone should get 5-6 years of clinical science training, but I want lots more people to know a little bit of what we've learned. This kind of luck

should be shared!

Finally, in my last column as President, I want to note one other reason I have been so lucky this year. In particular, I want to express my gratitude to the many people who have worked so hard throughout the year to help SSCP grow and further its mission of promoting clinical science. I have had the distinct pleasure of serving with a phenomenal Board, and I especially want to thank those individuals whose terms are ending. Michelle Craske is finishing her term as Past President on the Board, and has taken SSCP in important directions through her work to advance dissemination and implementation of clinical science on the Delaware Project. Lauren Alloy is completing her term as member-at-large, and has contributed many great ideas to advance SSCP, including starting the Susan Nolen-Hoeksema Early Career Research Award. Doug Mennin is ending his term as the Division 12 rep, and has done a great job increasing communication between SSCP and the division, and he has been an anchor on multiple SSCP committees. Finally, Victoria Smith has been a remarkable student rep - she has helped start or continue an amazing number of initiatives, including the new Outstanding Student award series, the student listserv guest speaker Q & As, the student journal club, and the new student campus rep program, among many others. In addition to the wonderful Board members, I want to thank the SSCP membership. You have been asked to do a lot this year - many of you have joined our new SSCP committees and initiatives, or you're serving as a reviewer for one of our awards, or just offering advice on the listserv - and I have been amazed at how willing people have been to contribute and step up.

It is clear that we share a deep belief in the importance of the work SSCP is doing to push for a stronger voice for clinical science in our field -

I have greatly enjoyed the opportunity to be President this year, and cannot wait to see the exciting directions Mitch Prinstein will take us as he begins his term as President in the new year!

DIVERSITY CORNER: NEW COLUMN

DAVID H. ROSMARIN & BEN HANKIN

Above all, psychological clinical science is dedicated to the integration of empirical methods into the practice of mental health treatments, and the advancement of clinical psychology as an applied science. But only slightly beyond these core value lies another lauded and cherished ideal: Diversity. From psychology training programs to licensing board requirements to NIMH guidelines regarding sampling methods and beyond, our field recognizes and appreciates that race, ethnicity, culture, gender, sexual orientation, religion, language, socioeconomic status, age, geography, nationality, physical ability, and other factors can indelibly shape human experiences and must be considered in the context of our work.

Consonant with this value, earlier this year SSCP undertook to sample its membership to examine how diverse, in fact, we truly are. Admittedly, the survey instrument did not assess for many important aspects of diversity (such as those noted above). Nevertheless, the sobering results from the survey, which was completed by approximately 1/3 of SSCP members (n = 184), suggest that we are a rather homogenous group (see Table below).

Diversity of SSCP Members

Race		Sexual Orientation		Gender	
White	161	Heterosexual	154	Female	114
Asian	10	Bisexual	11	Male	69
African American	5	Gay	9	No response	1
Multi-Racial	4	Lesbian	4		
Pacific Islander	1	Other	4		
No response	3	No response	2		

These results seem to indicate that a disparity exists between our value of diversity and the degree to which diverse populations are represented by our membership. More broadly, they were viewed as a symptom of a greater problem: While our field gives much lip service to the importance of diversity, its representation – in real terms! – within psychological clinical science remains minimal, if not dismal.

To this end, under Bethany Teachman's leadership, SSCP formed its very own Diversity Committee in April of this year, including the following founding members:

- David H. Rosmarin, McLean Hospital/Harvard Medical School (Chair)
- Ben Hankin, University of Denver (Representative to SSCP board)
- Joye Anestis, University of Southern Mississippi (Member)
- Joseph P. Gone, University of Michigan (Member)
- Sarah Tarbox, Yale University (Member)
- Susan Lin, University of Hawaii (Student Member)
- Adam Miler, George Mason University (Student Member)
- Yesel Yoon, University of Massachusetts Amherst (Student Member)

The SSCP Diversity Committee was charged with the following two tasks: (1) To enhance and increase the diversity of SSCP membership, and (2) to further the mission of psychological clinical science as it applies to diversity issues.

The committee's first initiative is this very column, "The Diversity Corner," which will be repeated in each issue of Clinical Science. Planned future columns include interviews with successful clinical scientists from diverse backgrounds, features of recent research on the science of diversity as it applies to clinical psychology, and "how to" guidelines about promoting diversity within SSCP and more broadly.

Beyond this contribution, SSCP's Diversity Committee has already conducted a review of diversity initiatives by other organizations within our field (e.g., APA, ABCT), and generated a list of potential initiatives to implement, including: (1) Compiling lists of evidence-based treatments and assessment tools that have been implemented with diverse groups; (2) Assembling a special issue for a peer-reviewed clinical science journal on diversity-related issues; (3) including a section on the SSCP website about diversity; and other ideas as well. As a precursor to implementation, however, an informal interview process is now underway with the leadership from APA Division 12, Section VI (Clinical Psychology of Ethnic Minorities) and APA division 45 (Society for the Psychological Study of Culture, Ethnicity and Race) and other prominent psychologists who study diversity and are not (yet) SSCP members to determine why they have yet to join our ranks. Ultimately, it is hoped that these initiatives will go beyond the ubiquitous "awareness-raising" when it comes to diversity, and create measurable outcomes that will make us all proud.

SSCP TREASURER'S REPORT
STEWART SHANKMAN, PH.D.
UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS-
CHICAGO

BALANCE as of October 6, 2014:
\$33,977.93

FINANCIAL HIGHLIGHTS:

EXPENSES: Div12 fees (-\$10);
Peterson Management Services (Yearly
Div 12 fees; -\$950)

INCOME: None.

PENDING: Wild Apricot website
monthly costs (-\$100); Residual 2015
membership dues from Div 12 (+\$80)

**Check out the
Psychological
Science Job
Mentorship
Match site!**

**Join the mentor
network here:**

[HTTP://APS.PSYCHOLOGICALSCIENCE.
ORG/JOIN-RENEW/HOME.CFM](http://aps.psychologicalscience.org/join-renew/home.cfm)

SSCP APS STUDENT POSTER WINNERS

AWARD WINNERS: \$200 prize and APS membership

Krista Clews De Castella, *Australian National University*

Implicit Theories of Emotion and their Role in Psychopathology and Treatment

Maureen E McQuillan, *Indiana University*

Toddlers' Sleep, Sustained Attention, and Adjustment

Ann Roepke

University of Pennsylvania

Randomized Controlled Trial of a Smartphone-Based Tool that Reduces Depression Symptoms

Kristin Wilborn, *University of Texas, San Antonio*

Appraised Discrimination Predicts Inflammation via Increased Depression and Blunted Cortisol in Mexican-Americans

DISTINGUISHED CONTRIBUTIONS: \$100 prize and APS membership

Kathleen Crum, *Florida International University*

Lisa Hecht, *Georgia State University*

Juliette Iacovino, *Washington University in St Louis*

Huiting Liu, *University of Illinois at Chicago*

Andrea Niles, *University of California, Los Angeles*

Mercedes Fernandez Oromendia, *University of California, Santa Barbara*

Gabriella Quiñones-Torres, *University of Massachusetts-Amherst*

Sarah Smith, *Emory University*

CONGRATULATIONS!

Thank you to the judges: Marc Atkins, Sara Bufferd, Connie Hammen, Phil Kendall, Scott Lilienfeld, Katie McLaughlin, Thomas Olino, Bethany Teachman

SSCP & APS: “HOW DID I GET HERE” VIDEO SERIES

Ever wondered how different psychological scientists ended up doing what they do? We did!

The SSCP and APS video series entitled “How Did I Get Here” was designed to complement the Psychological Science Career Mentorship Match program to help students and early career psychologists obtain more information about a variety of career paths available to them.

In this video series, psychological scientists in various positions describe their career path, discuss obstacles that were overcome along the way to their current position, and share what they wish they had known earlier in their career. These are the personal stories you don't get from a CV!

We currently have five videos posted with the following psychological scientists:

1. **Jacqueline Persons, Ph.D.:** Director of the Cognitive Behavioral Therapy and Science Center
2. **Gerald Davison, Ph.D.:** Professor of Psychology and Gerontology at the University of Southern California
3. **Marc Atkins, Ph.D.:** Professor of Psychiatry and Psychology and Director of the Institute for Juvenile Research at the University of Illinois at Chicago
4. **Ann Garland, Ph.D.:** Professor and Founding Chair of the Department of School, Family, and Mental Health Professions at the University of San Diego
5. **Dr. Guadalupe Suchi Ayala, Ph.D.:** Professor in the Graduate School of Public Health at San Diego State University and Co-Director of the Institute for Behavioral and Community Health

You can access the videos here: <http://www.psychologicalscience.org/join-renew/mentor-vids.cfm>

This video series was developed and moderated by Sara Bufferd, Ph.D.

Additional videos will be added as they are recorded. Let us know if there's someone you'd love to hear interviewed! You can contact Sara at SBufferd@csusm.edu

CLINICAL SCIENCE EARLY CAREER PATH SERIES

THE “5 Ws” OF BECOMING A CLINICAL SCIENTIST

JUNE GRUBER, PH.D.

Being a clinical scientist is an inspiring and humbling career. It's a unique professional path where you get to spend your time exploring interesting questions that can be translated into real-world outcomes and potentially impact lives of others. Below I detail the “5 Ws” (who, what, when, where and why) of my path towards becoming a clinical scientist.

“Who” am I? I am currently an Assistant Professor of Psychology at a research-oriented university, where I direct the Positive Emotion and Psychopathology (PEP) Laboratory. My work primarily centers around three major themes that include research, teaching, and service. With respect to research, my work focuses on examining disturbances in positive emotional systems. There is a fair amount of research on associated difficulties of negative emotions like fear in anxiety disorders or sadness in depression. We know almost nothing about the potential negative consequences of positive emotions. My work focuses on delineating the nature of positive emotion disturbance along a continuum in people with normative degrees of positive emotion (college students and community samples) as well as clinical patient samples characterized by extreme degrees of positive emotion (bipolar disorder and depression, for example). At the moment, my laboratory is conducting work that utilizes multi-method and multi-level approaches -- by measuring experiential, behavioral, and biological indices of emotion response -- to understand the bidirectional relationship between positive emotion and mental health outcomes. We're exploring new directions in this domain including the addition of neuroimaging and neuroendocrine tools to identify pathophysiological processes underlying positive emotion disturbance as well as conducting translational studies linking laboratory assessments of emotion functioning with longitudinal health outcomes in populations suffering from mood disturbance. In addition, I try to instill in my students to keep an open mind and spirit so that we can leave room to appreciate unexpected new ideas and directions that arise.

“What” advice would you give? As my students will tell you, I am passionate about mentoring future clinical scientists. Below I share recommendations for becoming a clinical scientist:

- 1. Keep things moving.** Good research flows like a stream, and one that keeps moving along. To keep things progressing I recommend my students think of the “wheel of 3” which includes brainstorming new studies, actively conducting studies (collecting or analyzing data), and writing up completed studies. At any one time you should have something going on in each of these 3 domains. When one domain moves forward then a new spot will open up for the next project, and in the meantime you will remain stimulated by keeping your feet active in all facets of the research process.
- 2. Collaboration is key.** Research never takes place with one person. The most interesting and novel research often cuts across labs and traditional research areas. When choosing collaborators always remember to choose people you like to interact with, people with complementary (not necessarily the same!) work styles, form symbiotic relationships where you can help them and they can also help you, be kind and generous to others, and be responsive and timely.

3. Tell a story about your work. No matter how productive you are, without being able to “tell a story” about your work, you will have a hard time finding a position after graduate school. Think about the story you can tell about your work. One way to do this is to create a “research pyramid” where you navigate bottom up through generative layers of a research program, including first mapping a phenomenon (the “what”), next isolating mechanisms (the “why”), and then testing its clinical significance (the “so what”).

4. You are not a mentor’s “mini-me.” Do not become a mini-me version of your mentor. Define a research area that is original, but is within your mentor’s area of expertise.

5. Be humble. We are all standing on the shoulders of giants. We constantly confront questions we cannot answer, and new methodological tools we feel inadequate to undertake. Even Einstein once said: “If we knew what we were doing, it wouldn’t be called research.” Be humble. Don’t over-brag, or compare yourself to others. We are all small pieces in a much bigger collective mission to discover truths about human nature.

6. Be clear. Clarity is the key to most good mentoring relationships and to productive collaborations. Set clear guidelines, ask direct questions (don’t be afraid), and put things in writing whenever possible to ensure clear communication (such as notes from meetings with your mentor, timelines and authorship expectations). When you feel confused, rather than ruminating, be proactive and set up a meeting with your mentor or colleague to discuss things in the open.

7. Gratitude is golden. Express thanks to those who help you, and appreciate all the resources you have. Most professors help you because they care, and spend their time giving (sometimes tough) feedback because they want you to flourish. Let them know you appreciate it. Gratitude builds amazing “research karma” points.

8. Don’t give up. You will get discouraged. That is completely normal. That is not a sign that you are not meant for this profession. Getting involved in science is akin to signing up for a lifelong marathon, and perseverance even in the most challenging of spots is what will carry you through to the finish line.

9. Take care of yourself. You cannot do good science, or be a good therapist, if you do not have a healthy core from within. Take breaks, breathe, and stay in touch with what makes you feel happy. You will be happier, and your work will shine brighter.

10. Stay curious. Spend time doing the things that you are genuinely curious about. Be true to yourself what those things are. As John Cacioppo [said](#): *“Play with ideas, feel free to be imaginative with ideas but always respect the data, consider alternative conceptualizations, search for the most useful, comprehensive, generative, parsimonious, and falsifiable formulations you can conceive. And when you have succeeded, do it all over again. Be serious and not at all serious about your science, at the same time, all the time.”*

“When & Where” did I become a clinical scientist?

Like many people, I wanted to understand emotion better. For good reason: emotion is a fundamental ingredient of what makes us human, we know it so intimately well in our own first-person experiences, yet it remains an elusive mystery from a scientific perspective. I first got involved in research on emotion as an undergraduate at UC Berkeley focusing on the ways different types of positive emotions promote well-being and health. This exposed me to a rich landscape of literature and methodological tools in clinical affective science. Specifically, as an undergraduate at UC Berkeley, this involved beginning a volunteer research assistant position with Ann Kring who first exposed me to research on psychopathology and emotion and Dacher Keltner who has the amazing ability to cultivate a sense of

excitement and positivity in affective science. Both of them were kind and supportive mentors and encouraged me to pursue my independent ideas. During my subsequent graduate studies in clinical psychology where I remained at UC Berkeley, I worked intensively with patients diagnosed with bipolar disorder and gained invaluable mentorship from Allison Harvey, Sheri Johnson and Robert Levenson. My increasing work with adults and adolescents with bipolar disorder taught me that there are two sides to every story, even for positive emotion. Specifically, working with bipolar patients exposed me to periods of mania characterized by intense and exaggerated positive mood, elevated self-esteem, and seeming invincibility to concerns of the external world. It was here that I first saw the potential negative consequences of too much positive emotion, and how it could lead to risky and even life-threatening behaviors. This got me hooked, and I've continued to focus on understanding this "dark side of positive emotion" ever since. After graduate school, I began my career as an Assistant Professor in the Psychology Department at Yale University. It was a tremendous place to launch my career and lab by providing outstanding resources and always reminded me to remember the "big picture" and not be afraid to connect your work to the broader public, through disseminating work in news outlets or via teaching (in which I published a series of free online lectures and interviews with experts in human emotion). Since then I recently joined the faculty at the University of Colorado Boulder and feel incredibly fortunate to call it my research home.

“Why” should one consider a career in clinical science? Answering why is perhaps the easier question. No other field lets you exercise such a diverse palate of skills as does the many hats a clinical scientist wears. You can be – in whatever relative balance suits you – a teacher, a leader, a helper, a thinker, and an advocate for change. You can pursue the questions that excite you the most and then find ways to translate them into changing the ways we think about the human mind. On top of all this, there is immense freedom to live the kind of daily life you want to live. For these reasons, answering why not is a much harder question to answer.

Recommended Readings

- The Compleat Academic: A Career Guide
- How to Write a Lot: A Practical Guide to Public Academic Writing
- Public Speaking for Psychologists: A Lighthearted Guide to Research Presentation, Job Talks, and Other Opportunities to Embarrass Yourself

About the author: Dr. June Gruber received her B.A. and Ph.D. from University of California, Berkeley University. Dr. Gruber is currently an Assistant Professor of Psychology at the University of Colorado Boulder (was previously faculty at Yale University) and is the Director of the [Positive Emotion and Psychopathology Laboratory](#). She is also a Licensed Clinical Psychologist. Dr. Gruber's research focuses on the ways in which positive emotion can go awry and towards developing an integrated model of positive emotion function and dysfunction using the theoretical lens and methodological tools of affective and clinical science. She has authored over 70 journal articles and chapters, and has co-edited a comprehensive book volume with Oxford University Press, *Positive Emotion: Integrating the Light Sides and Dark Sides*. Dr. Gruber is the Director of the Experts in Emotion Series and has a freely available and nationally recognized online course in Human Emotion available through YouTube and iTunes U, as well as a TEDx talk on the dark side of happiness. Her work has been recognized as a Rising Star by the Association for Psychological Science, NARSAD Young Investigator Award, Early Career Award from the Society for Research in Psychopathology, and Yale University's Arthur Greer Memorial Prize for Outstanding Junior Faculty. Her work has been covered by various media outlets including the BBC, NPR, NY Times, Boston Globe, Washington Post, Huffington Post, WIRED, Telegraph and the LA Times.

STUDENT PERSPECTIVES SERIES

WHAT, ME GRADUATE?

KRISTIN WILBORN, M.A.

When sitting down to write this article, I realized that my journey is not what I would call normal for someone closing in on a PhD. I do not expect others to have a similar path, especially because all I have ever wanted to be was “not clinical” (blame it on my mother’s social work experience).

Incidentally, my aberrant path may have some relevance to others, but I digress. At 18, my main goal and focus was to become a division I athlete. Little did I know, my choice of school would lead me to a love of research. As an undergraduate, I earned a degree in Political Science from Furman University. My students often wonder how I went from Political Science to Psychology, but it was really the research that enthralled me, which is the common denominator for both disciplines. From there, however, my path was clear: get out and find a job. Be done with school! Who would want to remain poor and struggling through more years of school? Oh, that’s right, me.

I worked for 6 months and decided that a Master’s Degree in Health Psychology is really what I needed to get. Health Psychology – the perfect combination of doing lots of research and all things associated with exercise. So I took more psychology undergraduate classes, applied, and chose my program. Although I loved learning; completing my thesis and analyzing the data was completely exhilarating (shocking, right?). I loved every second of it. Still, once again, I was incredibly tired of being poor and consistently busy, especially since I was then of the age where most of my friends from high school and college already had real jobs. Surely, trying at a real job for the second time, I would find success. Unfortunately, the fit still wasn’t quite right. It wasn’t until I was encouraged to try my hand at teaching at a local community college that I knew I would have to get a PhD.

The thing about teaching at a community college is that you get to experience profound moments of challenge and success. Small class sizes allow you to get to know your students and understand the difference that you can make. Beyond that, it allowed me to once again live and breathe psychology. How had I forgotten just how invigorating learning could be? So, I started researching programs. Around that same time, a friend told me about a brand new PhD program starting in our area. It would have a huge emphasis on statistics and methods, but would not have a clinical part to the program. I felt like everything had magically fallen into place. I had approximately six weeks to apply, get my letters of recommendation together, and re-take my GRE. No big deal.

Three years later, as I am entering what I hope to be my final year (I really mean it this time), I marvel at the possibility that I would have done anything else. I was fortunate enough to be paired with an incredible advisor/mentor, who encouraged me to extend my boundaries and explore research areas outside of my comfort zone. While allowing me to remain in charge of my own direction, she introduced me to foreign and admittedly, scary concepts. Along the way, I have hit some speed bumps and have questioned my decision to go back to school one last time, but the vast majority of the time, I’ve been incredibly happy with my decision. It is incredibly rewarding to be able to control

my job duties and tailor them to fit my passion.

Although I may not have had the most straight and narrow path, I have continued to learn valuable pieces of information along the way:

- **Expand your research boundaries.** Certainly, we are encouraged to specialize for a reason, but it is also important during your graduate career to explore a variety of topics within your field, even those you may not initially be drawn to.
- **Along with that, don't ever sell yourself short.** One of the concepts I learned all too well is imposter syndrome. If you have made it this far, then your thoughts and ideas are valid and will make an important contribution, whether it is to a group of people at a conference or in a small setting, like a classroom. Be confident in your knowledge.
- **Research your advisor.** I have been incredibly fortunate to work with two incredible women, both of whom have allowed me to grow professionally and personally. Others are not so fortunate. You need to know yourself well to choose your advisor. I, for example, work very well independently and do not require a lot of stringent deadlines, so an advisor who micromanages me would have been a disaster. A colleague of mine, however, knows that she needs weekly deadlines and due dates to be able to get her work completed, so she chose accordingly. You will be spending an enormous amount of time with your advisor, so choose wisely.
- **Don't be afraid of statistics!!** Even at the advanced stage of graduate school, so many still go into their statistics classes with dread. Although you don't have to be a statistical guru, if you can master some of the advanced techniques, you will be putting yourself in a much better position. Those who can't use or design statistics will rely on those who can (which means more publications for you!).

Throughout my academic career, I kept saying "this is it." I kept looking for the end so that I could begin my real journey. Now, as I am finishing the last degree that I will ever get, I am saying "this is just beginning." Enjoy every ounce of blood, sweat, and tears (maybe we should change that saying to coffee, coffee, and tears) throughout your graduate career. It is at this point that you will define your path, although, if you want to change in the middle, you can always go back!

About the Author: Kristin Wilborn, M.A. is a Doctoral Candidate at the University of Texas at San Antonio. Her research focuses on the biological effects of chronic trauma, specifically childhood trauma and intimate partner violence, and subsequent mental and physical health outcomes.

CLINICIAN PERSPECTIVES SERIES

SOME PERSONAL OBSERVATIONS ABOUT CONDUCTING RESEARCH IN A CLINICAL SETTING

JACQUELINE B. PERSONS, PH.D.

Conducting research in a clinical setting is difficult. Why do it? It is a lot of work, and, in a clinical setting, like the private practice in which I work, usually unfunded. In fact, not only is the research unfunded, in private practice, the time you spend doing research is time you could spend seeing a client and earning money. So that means that you, yourself, fund the research. Why do it?

I do research for four main reasons, and I write about them here with the hope that this description might be helpful to SSCP readers, especially students and young professionals, as you think about this issue for yourself.

One reason I do research is that it is important to me to make a larger contribution than I believe I can make with my clinical work. Clinical work allows me to influence one client at a time. Research allows me to contribute to science, to knowledge, to the advancement of the field. Of course the view that contributing to science is bigger and more significant than changing a life has in it certain assumptions and values about what is important. As a colleague once pointed out to me, changing the trajectory of one person's life in a positive direction through my clinical work is a truly invaluable and huge contribution. And I do value that contribution. Nevertheless, in my own calculus and values, changing the lives of the handful of individuals that I can see in my career as a clinician does not satisfy my wish to make a contribution to science and knowledge that will live on after I'm gone.

Second, I enjoy the processes of thinking about and designing research studies, writing up the results, and presenting research at professional meetings. I love to read, learn, and think. Many parts of the research process are tedious and frustrating, but I love the pieces that involve formulating an idea and a hypothesis, devising a test of the hypothesis, writing up the results and presenting them, and working with collaborators and students to do all those things. I don't love the tasks of organizing databases, conducting statistical analyses, and responding to journal editors' and reviewers' critiques. And I don't love it that my skills in some of those areas are not so good. (To address that problem, I rely on collaborators.) But I love the thinking, designing, and writing parts of research. The love of those things makes the research process intrinsically rewarding to me, and that makes research possible and sustainable for me.

Third, a thing that is REALLY exciting to me is the way that conducting research in a clinical practice setting provides the opportunity to combine science and practice in multiple creative and elegant ways. To me, one of the most exciting things in the world is to be sitting in my office working with a patient and collecting data that simultaneously guide the clinical work and allow me to write an empirical paper that makes a contribution to the field. That is the best! Several of my empirical papers

are based on data collected in my clinical practice. I've published an uncontrolled trial showing that naturalistic CBT for depression in private practice produces outcomes comparable to the randomized trials of CBT for depression (Persons, Bostrom, & Bertagnolli, 1999), an uncontrolled naturalistic outcome study showing that a case formulation-driven approach to CBT produces outcomes comparable to the randomized trials of CBT for depression (Persons, Roberts, Zalecki, & Brechwald, 2006), two studies presenting data collected from single cases showing that use of a case formulation helped the therapist rescue a failing treatment (Persons, Beckner, & Tompkins, 2013; Persons & Mikami, 2002), a study showing that changes in degree of belief in automatic thoughts and the quality of the relationship with the therapist both contributed to mood change during sessions of cognitive therapy (Persons & Burns, 1985), and a study showing that sudden gains in CBT for depression can occur even when change is gradual (Thomas & Persons, 2013).

Finally, doing research allows me to participate in a larger professional community, larger than the local professional community in my city. Research work allows me entry to the national and international community of scientists and scholars. I go to conferences and present my research and interact with the leading scientists and scientist practitioners in my field. I learn a lot and have a lot of fun. I stay up to date with the field in a way that strengthens both my clinical work and my research.

So I do research because it allows me to make a larger contribution than I feel I can make through my clinical work, because I enjoy the process, because it allows me to creatively combine science and practice in exciting ways, and because it allows me to participate in the international community of scholars and scientists. If these reasons, or others that support research, are important to you, perhaps research is or can be a part of your professional life too.

References

- Persons, J. B., Beckner, V. L., & Tompkins, M. A. (2013). Testing case formulation hypotheses in psychotherapy: Two case examples. *Cognitive and Behavioral Practice, 20*, 399-409.
- Persons, J. B., Bostrom, A., & Bertagnolli, A. (1999). Results of randomized controlled trials of cognitive therapy for depression generalize to private practice. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 23*, 535-548. doi: 10.1023/A:1018724505659
- Persons, J. B., & Burns, D. D. (1985). Mechanisms of action of cognitive therapy: The relative contributions of technical and interpersonal interventions. *Cognitive Therapy and Research, 9*, 539-551.
- Persons, J. B., & Mikami, A. Y. (2002). Strategies for handling treatment failure successfully. *Psychotherapy: Theory/Research/Practice/Training, 39*, 139-151. doi: 10.1037/0033-3204.39.2.139
- Persons, J. B., Roberts, N. A., Zalecki, C. A., & Brechwald, W. A. G. (2006). Naturalistic outcome of case formulation-driven cognitive-behavior therapy for anxious depressed outpatients. *Behaviour Research and Therapy, 44*, 1041-1051. doi: 10.1016/j.brat.2005.08.005
- Thomas, C., & Persons, J. B. (2013). Sudden gains can occur in psychotherapy even when the pattern of change is gradual. *Clinical Psychology: Science and Practice, 20*, 127-142.

About the Author: Dr. Jackie Persons is Director of the [Cognitive Behavior Therapy and Science Center](#), a group private practice in Oakland, California, and she is Clinical Professor, Department of Psychology, University of California at Berkeley. She can be reached via e-mail at persons@cbtscience.com.

You can hear about Dr. Persons' career path in her SSCP and APS
"How Did I Get Here" series video [here](#).

UPDATE FROM THE STUDENT REPRESENTATIVES

VICTORIA C. SMITH, UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND COLLEGE PARK

ROSANNA BREUAX, UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AMHERST

As your student representatives, we would like to take this opportunity to update you on a couple opportunities and resources for our members:

• **SSCP Outstanding Student Researcher Award Winners** – The award committee has completed its review of applications, and was very impressed by the very large number of phenomenal, truly exceptional candidates and their exceptionally advanced research contributions to clinical psychology. We are very pleased to announce the five winners of the first ever SSCP Outstanding Researcher Award! Please look in the Winter Newsletter for interviews with each of our five award winners.

Autumn Kujawa

Advisor: Daniel Klein, Ph.D.

University: Stony Brook University

Expected graduation: 2015

Internship: University of Illinois at Chicago

Catharine Fairbairn

Advisor: Michael A. Sayette, Ph.D.

University: University of Pittsburgh

Expected graduation: 2015

Internship: Ann Arbor VA/University of Michigan

Cheri Levinson

Advisor: Thomas L. Rodebaugh, Ph.D.

University: Washington University in St. Louis

Expected graduation: 2015

Internship: University of North Carolina School of Medicine

Quetzal Class

Advisor: Brian M. D'Onofrio, Ph.D.

University: Indiana University Bloomington

Expected graduation: 2015

Internship: Indiana University School of Medicine

Stephanie Gorka

Advisor: Stewart A. Shankman, Ph.D.

University: University of Illinois at Chicago

Expected graduation: 2016

• **SSCP Campus Representatives** – We are pleased to announce the rollout of the SSCP Campus Representatives. We are really excited about this new position and the enthusiasm that the representatives have shown so far. The primary purpose of the Campus Representative position is to increase awareness of SSCP. Campus Representatives are graduate students with an interest in the practice and advancement of science in clinical psychology. Our current group of SSCP Campus Representatives are:

Peter Castagna - Connecticut College
Leanna Garb - Florida International University
Courtney Walker - Mississippi State University
Faith Summersett-Ringgold - Northwestern University
Tammy Rosen - Stony Brook
Grace Gu - Suffolk University
Shannon Blakey - UNC Chapel Hill
Ryan Jacoby - UNC Chapel Hill
Sarah Victor - University of British Columbia
Stevie Grassetti - University of Delaware
Casey Sarapas – University of Illinois at Chicago
Alex Williams - University of Kansas
Christine Wang - University of Maryland College Park
BreAnne Danzi - University of Miami
Kasey Stanton - University of Notre Dame

• **SSCP Outstanding Student Teacher Award** – Our first SSCP Outstanding Student Award was a great success! Please check out our 5 winners in this edition of the newsletter! At this time, we are pleased to announce that our next Outstanding Student Award is the Outstanding Teacher Award. This award is intended to recognize outstanding graduate students who are providing exceptional contributions to the field of clinical psychology through their teaching. One student will be selected based upon his/her dedication to, creativity in, and excellence in teaching in the area of clinical science (this can include experience as a teaching assistant).

Applications must be received by December 1, 2014. Complete guidelines and the cover sheet can be found on the student blogspot: <http://sscpstudent.blogspot.com/p/student-awards.html>. Students may be nominated by their advisor, or may self-nominate. Please send nomination packages to SSCP Student Representative Rosanna Breaux (rbreaux@psych.umass.edu).

Only graduate students (including students on internship) will be considered for this round of nominations. Graduate students must be student members of SSCP. The annual student membership fee in SSCP is \$15. The membership application form can found at <http://www.sscpweb.org/join-us>

• **SSCP Student Poster Award Competition at APS Convention** - The 2015 SSCP Student Poster Award Competition will take place at the 27th APS Annual Convention, May 21-24, 2015 – New York City. If you would like to have your poster considered for the award, select ‘SSCP Poster’ in the first step after you select poster and start new submission.

SSCP hosts an annual student poster session at the APS Annual Convention. Those receiving the top award receive \$200. Winners of the “Distinguished Contributions” Award receive \$100. The SSCP poster submission can deal with any area within scientific clinical psychology. The research and analyses presented in the poster submission must be completed. Please be sure to provide enough relevant detail in the summary so that reviewers can adequately judge the originality of the study, the soundness of the theoretical rationale and design, the quality of the analyses, the appropriateness of the conclusions, and so on. Complete submissions include a brief 50 word abstract and up to a 500 word summary of the work. Please follow the link for a complete call for submissions:

<http://www.psychologicalscience.org/index.php/convention/call-for-submissions/rules-guidelines#.VEUjDWB0zDc>

To be eligible to submit an SSCP poster, the first author of the poster must be a student and must be a member of SSCP at the time of submission. Submissions to the SSCP student poster session must be completed by January 31. You will also be contacted by email in April to submit a copy of the final version of your poster by May 10, 2015.

If you have any questions please contact Thomas Olino of SSCP at thomas.olino@temple.edu Please put “SSCP Poster” in the Subject line to ensure your question is answered promptly.

Follow us on Social Media!

Twitter: https://twitter.com/_SSCP

Facebook: <https://www.facebook.com/pages/Society-for-a-Science-of-ClinicalPsychology/333436279606?ref=hl>

Blog: <http://sscpstudent.blogspot.com/>

Contact Us!

We would love to hear from you with any suggestions, comments, questions, or concerns regarding SSCP student membership or resources for students.

Victoria Smith: vsmith@umd.edu

Rosanna Breaux: rbreaux@psych.umass.edu