Highlights From the *PsycCRITIQUES*® Film Reviewer Guidelines

(*Complete Guidelines are attached*)

Danny Wedding, PhD, MPH, Editor **Ryan Niemiec, PsyD, Associate Editor (Film)**

Editorial Staff: E-mail PSQJournals@apa.org; **Fax** (202) 336-5549 (Attn: PsycCRITIQUES staff)

American Psychological Association, 750 First Street NE, Washington, DC 20002-4242

***PsycCRITIQUES* Spotlight** www.apa.org/pubs/highlights/psyccritiques-spotlight/

You must obtain copy of the film (see p. 2): **APA does not provide films**. You, the reviewer, are responsible for seeing the film in the theater or obtaining a copy of the film on video or DVD.

Length of Review (see p. 2): ***Range of 900 to 1,500 words for a review of a single film, NOT TO EXCEED 2,000 words*** **(excluding references). Reviews longer than 2,000 words will be returned immediately for shortening.** For a review of multiple films, the range is 2,500 to 3,000 words.

Title Page for the Review (see pp. 3, 7): ***Format your review as illustrated in the Sample Review*** on page 7. In particular, provide a title page that includes a title for your review (*please do not use* "Review of XXX" as a title), film citation information, reviewer name(s), and reviewer contact information for production staff.

References (see p. 4): ***All film reviews must include at least three scholarly references in order to be accepted for review*.** We suggest up to seven references for reviews of 2,000 words. References must be in APA style.

Content of the Review (see p. 2)**: *A film review should address psychological, cultural, and societal factors well beyond the film's plot or story.*** Reflect upon the larger scope of the field, noting relevant research, developments in the field, and the accuracy of the film in addressing or not addressing issues pertinent to contemporary psychologists.

Abstract of Review for *PsycINFO*® (see pp. 3, 8): Providing an abstract of your review for use in *PsycINFO* is optional, but encouraged. An abstract should be one paragraph up to 250 words long.

Deadline (see p. 3): Our mission is to publish timely reviews, so *please take deadlines seriously*. The standard due date is 35 days after you agree to review a film, unless otherwise arranged.

Adding a Coreviewer (see p. 3): ***You must get approval from the Editorial Office to add a coreviewer, and the person invited to write the review must be the first author.*** See the Guidelines for the allowed number of coreviewers and information about doctoral student coreviewers (who must serve as second authors).

Tables or Figures (see p. 4): We don't accept them.

Biography of Reviewers (see p. 4): Reviewers should provide a short biography (around 100 words or less) that will be linked to all of their published reviews. A photo (JPG or TIFF format) is optional.

Submitting Your Review (see p. 6): ***Be sure to format your review***. You can submit your review through our Reviewer Portal at http://jbo.apa.org/cprs_reviewer/(requires login), or send it as an e-mail attachment to the Editorial staff at PSQJournals@apa.org.

Forms (attached at end): ***You must sign the Publication Rights form (sign in both Sections 1A and 2) and the Full Disclosure of Interests form***. Complete the other forms only if applicable. **We prefer forms scanned to PDF and e-mailed,** or they may be faxed to (202) 336-5549 (Attn. PsycCRITIQUES staff)**.**

Film Reviewer Guidelines for *PsycCRITIQUES*®

Danny Wedding, PhD, MPH, Editor, *PsycCRITIQUES*

Professor and Chair, Department of Behavioral Sciences, College of Medicine
American University of Antigua

Ryan Niemiec, PsyD, Associate Editor (Film). E-mail: rmjn@sbcglobal.net

Editorial Staff*:* E-mail PSQJournals@apa.org**; Fax** (202) 336-5549 (Attn: PsycCRITIQUES staff)

American Psychological Association, 750 First Street NE, Washington, DC 20002-4242

***PsycCRITIQUES* Spotlight** www.apa.org/pubs/highlights/psyccritiques-spotlight/

PsycCRITIQUES®, the online continuation of *Contemporary Psychology: APA Review of Books*, publishes evaluative reviews of books, films, and other materials of interest to psychologists. **The quality of *PsycCRITIQUES*® depends on the quality of its reviews, so please read these guidelines completely.** A set of forms is included with these guidelines.

Obtaining a Copy of the Film

We cannot provide copies of films to reviewers. You, the reviewer, are responsible for seeing the film in the theater or obtaining a copy of the film on video or DVD. If you cannot locate a copy of the film, please contact the Editorial Office to discuss options.

Length of the Review

We suggest a range of 900 to 1,500 words for a review of a single film, NOT TO EXCEED 2,000 words (excluding references). Reviews longer than 2,000 words will be immediately returned to be shortened. The nature or complexity of a film may warrant a longer review, but this should be negotiated with the film editor prior to submission. For a review of multiple films, the length should be 2,500 to 3,000 words.

Content of the Review

Reference Policy: All film reviews must include at least **three scholarly references** in order to be accepted for review.

A *PsycCRITIQUES*® film review should address psychological, cultural, and societal factors well beyond the film's plot or story. Reflect upon the larger scope of the field, noting relevant research, developments in the field, and the accuracy of the film in addressing or not addressing issues pertinent to contemporary psychologists. One should aim to make a contribution to the scholarly advancement of psychology as *PsycCRITIQUES*® reviews are frequently cited as sources of ideas.

From its inception, *Contemporary Psychology* (now *PsycCRITIQUES*®) has aspired to literary as well as scholarly excellence. The journal thus continues to adhere to the guidelines for reviewers set out by its first editor, E. G. Boring. Some of his "Comments to Reviewers" are reproduced below [for application and consistency purposes, minor changes in language for film reviews have been added].

> *Contemporary Psychology* is a journal of critical reviews. It aspires to literary excellence... Primarily, the quality of this [journal] depends upon the reviewers' skills.
>
> *Contemporary Psychology* expects to publish value-judgments and criticism... even the short review may and should contain evaluations.
>
> Good criticism requires tact, objectivity and a sense of good taste. Personal aspersions are taboo. Criticize the [film], the ideas, the logic, the accuracy, not the [director or producers]. Let all criticism be *ad verbum*, never *ad hominem. CP* does not provide space for the discussion of the intelligence or integrity of the [director]. Always try to see how nearly the [director] has realized his [or her] own aspiration, whether you approve of the aspiration or not.

> Do not abstract the [film]. Talk about it and in doing so indicate the range and nature of its content. Readers will not go to *CP* for [a summary of the film]. Indicate the [film's] purpose, the way in which the [director] seeks to achieve the purpose and your estimate of his [or her] success. Compare the [film] with other [films] of similar kind or intent. Place it in perspective in the contemporary psychology scene. Give it an historical perspective too, if that seems appropriate. A good review is critical, and a good critic needs all the scholarship he [or she] can command.
>
> Address your review to the whole range of the readers of *CP*, not to your own special group. Let the expert in personality write to psychophysicists and to experts in animal learning. Let the physiological psychologist write to religious psychologists, historians, and statisticians…One of *CP*'s most important functions is to tell psychologists about one another.

If after becoming familiar with a film you feel it does not warrant review in *PsycCRITIQUES*® (e.g., the film seems of limited interest/value to psychologists), please send a brief explanation to the Editorial Office as to why, so the editors can decide if the review should be cancelled.

Write Abstract of Your Review for *PsycINFO*® (Optional)

If you wish to write an abstract that would be used for the *PsycINFO*® entry for your review, provide a single paragraph up to 250 words long (see sample, p. 7). It should be written in the third person, and active voice is preferred. Use words that you think readers would use in electronic searches. General information on writing an abstract is available in the APA *Publication Manual* (6th edition), section 2.04. Submitted abstracts may be edited by APA's abstracting service; you will not be contacted, nor will you see the abstract before it is published. If you do not provide an abstract, APA will have one prepared by the abstracting service.

Adding a Coreviewer

Reviewers may solicit the assistance of a colleague or an advanced doctoral candidate in preparing the review. Please note: **The individual initially recruited to do the review is expected to take the lead in writing it and should always be the senior author, and the addition of a coauthor must be approved by the editorial office before the review is written.** Please provide mailing address, email address, and a brief description of the coauthor's qualifications to assist with the review. **We reserve the right to refuse a review with coauthors who were not previously approved**. Our readers expect the reviews to be completed by individuals with established credentials, and we appreciate your cooperation to ensure that this is so.

Doctoral Students as Coreviewers

Doctoral students are welcome to **serve as second authors** on reviews. We realize that student authors may sometimes do most of the work on a review; however, we purport that *PsycCRITIQUES*® offers genuine peer review. We have set up a formal vetting process for our reviewers at the behest of the APA Publications &Communications Board. It dilutes the review and approval process if we abdicate responsibility for selecting the best possible reviewers and let students who have not been vetted take responsibility for the quality of the review.

Deadline for the Review

Please take the deadline very seriously. If *PsycCRITIQUES*® is to be of value to its readers, it is important that reviews be published quickly. **The standard deadline for film reviews is 35 days after you agree to review the film**, unless other arrangements are made with the film editor. Also, if circumstances arise that would significantly delay your review, please notify the editorial office so as to determine whether the film in question should be reassigned to another reviewer.

Format of the Review (See Sample Film Review p. 7)

TITLE PAGE

ALERT: You must format your review, including a title page, for it to be evaluated and edited.
Provide a title page as the first page of your review that has the following information: review title, citation of the film reviewed, reviewer by-line, and a reviewer's correspondence address.

Title of the review: It should call attention to some important point or critical comment in the review. It should be concise, interesting, and attention-getting.

Citation of the film reviewed: Provide a citation of the film or films under review that has the film title, year released, country of origin, and the director of the film. The format should be as follows:

A Beautiful Mind (2001); Directed by Ron Howard

Reviewer by-line: It goes below the citation of the film, in the form "Reviewed by NAME."

Correspondence address: This should be a complete mailing address where readers can send correspondence. Also provide an e-mail address (if available).

SUBHEADINGS

If the review exceeds 1,000 words, the addition of subheadings is recommended to clarify its organization. A good rule of thumb is that a subheading should occur at 500-word intervals. If subheadings are added, *you must use at least two.*

NO FIGURES OR TABLES

PsycCRITIQUES® will not accept any figures or tables.

REFERENCES and FOOTNOTES

Footnotes within the main text should *not* be used. Regarding references, as mentioned above in the section "Content of the Review," **all film reviews must include at least three scholarly references that relate to the film you are reviewing in order to be accepted for review.** In most cases, we suggest up to seven references for reviews of 2,000 words or less, and up to 10 references for reviews (of multiple titles) of up to 3,000 words. In formatting references, you must use standard APA style for references as described in the *Publication Manual of the American Psychological Association* (6th ed.).

Please note that any film referred to in the text, other than the film under review, needs to be listed in the References section. An example of a reference for a film is as follows (see APA style manual for more details):

Scorsese, M. (Producer), & Lonergan, K. (Writer/Director). (2000). *You can count on me* [Motion picture]. United States: Paramount Pictures.

As an online journal, we will add hypertext links for references when possible, in particular when the articles are APA publications available through *PsycNET*®. The ability to use hyperlinks to quickly download relevant research will significantly enhance the value of your review.

BIOGRAPHY OF REVIEWERS

Reviewer(s) should provide a short biography (up to 100 words per biography), which will be linked to the review online. This biography can be submitted through the online Reviewer Portal described in the Submission section (p. 6), or placed on the last page of the review. A digital photo (JPG or TIFF format) may also be included, if desired. If you send a digital photo, please sign a Photo Permission form and send it in with your other forms.

Style Notes

QUOTATIONS

Short quotations (40 words or less) are set off by double quotation marks; longer quotations are set off from the text as a freestanding block with no quotation marks. APA requires permission for a quotation that contains 400 or more consecutive words or 800 or more words of nonconsecutive text excerpts. Most scholarly publishers have adopted similar fair use guidelines; however, it is your responsibility to confirm the fair use guidelines for the relevant copyright holder to determine whether you need to secure permission (see Permissions Alert form). It is particularly important that all quotations conform exactly to the material in the

book. The validity of an entire review may be called into question if it contains inaccurate quotations. **Please double-check the accuracy of each quotation**. Cite a page number at the end of every quotation.

Text inserted into a quotation (as a comment or to create complete, understandable sentences) should be contained in brackets [ ], rather than in parentheses, to avoid confusion with parenthetical material that is part of the original text. Specify when italics have been added by inserting "[italics added]" directly following the material emphasized.

LINGUISTIC CONVENTIONS

PsycCRITIQUES® avoids sexist language. Please review the section on bias in language in the APA's *Publication Manual* (6th edition; pp. 70–77) before submitting reviews.

Avoid the use of titles (Dr., Prof., Mrs., Ms., etc.) with authors' or editors' names. A last name will usually suffice; however, first names should be given the first time a reference is made to a particular individual (e.g., Alfred Adler, Albert Bandura, Raymond Corsini).

COMBINED and COMPANION REVIEWS

Combined reviews are invited when the Editors believe that *PsycCRITIQUES*® readers will benefit from having two or more films evaluated together, with comparisons and contrasts drawn where appropriate. We thus expect to receive in these cases one single review (rather than separate reviews for each film), with one title and of the approximate length suggested.

Companion reviews are invited when the Editors believe that *PsycCRITIQUES*® readers will benefit by having a film reviewed by people from two different professional perspectives and/or areas of expertise. In these cases, two reviews are solicited, with two different titles, and are published in the same issue.

Editorial Actions and Production Process

The policy of this journal is to request reviewers to evaluate substantive changes and respond to queries from the Editors or copyeditor. Editors may make minor changes (e.g., to improve clarity or conform to APA style) in manuscripts *without* informing the reviewer when deemed appropriate. Once accepted by an Editor for publication, your review will be sent to APA for copyediting. You will be contacted by APA only if copyediting changes are made that might risk altering the meaning of your text. You will have 48 hours to respond. Please keep your final copy of the review handy to refer to in this instance. If the copyeditor makes only standard changes for APA style, grammar, or punctuation, you will not see the review until it is published. **No page proofs will be sent before publication.**

It is *PsycCRITIQUES*'s policy that, **prior to publication, no portion or description of the contents of a review are to be disclosed** to either (a) the writers/directors/producers of the film or films under review or (b) any other third party (e.g., but not limited to, publicity agents).

Conflict of Interest (See Full Disclosure of Interests Form)

You must fill out and sign a Full Disclosure of Interests form. Occasionally *PsycCRITIQUES*® will inadvertently invite a reviewer who may be perceived by the author(s) of the work and/or by the readers to have a conflict of interest that prevents an objective evaluation of the work. *If for any reason you suspect that the perception of conflict of interest may cast a shadow over your review, please contact the editorial staff to discuss BEFORE you begin the review*. They will then decide if it is appropriate for you to proceed with your review. Sensitivity to this issue by invited reviewers is appreciated because it is impossible for editors to know of all the conditions and circumstances that might lead readers to dismiss a review because of a perceived conflict of interest.

PsycCRITIQUES Spotlight

The APA-sponsored *PsycCRITIQUES* Spotlight is located at www.apa.org/pubs/highlights/psyccritiques-spotlight/. The forum is publicly accessible. Once or twice a month the editors release a Spotlight based on a recent book, film, or video review. Reviewers are notified at the time of posting when their reviews are highlighted for discussion on the Spotlight.

Submitting Your Review

We appreciate your help in ensuring that your manuscript is sent to *PsycCRITIQUES*® in proper form. Please check the following:

1. Prepare the review as a Word document, and ***format your review, including a title page,*** as described on page 3 and illustrated in the Sample Review (p. 7). *Double space the review.*

2. Quotations must be accurate. If quoting from a book, include the page number(s) on which the quote appears.

3. Submit review as follows: Go to http://jbo.apa.org/cprs_reviewer/to log in and submit your review. If you need log-in information, there is help available at this site, or contact the Editorial staff for assistance. Once logged in, choose from the Menu Options "Upload Reviews," and then fill in the requested information and upload your review. The system will let you know if you successfully submit your review.

Alternatively, you may send your review (and digital photo, if you choose to send one) as an e-mail attachment to the Editorial staff at PSQJournals@apa.org.

4. Submit forms as follows: For the following forms, fax or scan them as a PDF and submit as an e-mail attachment (or mail, if these methods are inconvenient) to the editorial assistant (contact information below):

1) APA Publication Rights form, ***signed on both pages in sections 1A and 2;***
2) Full Disclosure of Interests form, signed;
3) *If applicable*: (a) the Photo Permission form, if you send a digital photo to include with your biography; (b) the Permissions Alert form *plus* letters granting permission to use copyrighted material. Your manuscript cannot be published without these letters.

REVIEW SUBMISSION CHECKLIST

- ☐ **Formatted review, with title page**
- ☐ Electronic file of review as a Word document
- ☐ Reviewer biography (with optional photo)
- ☐ APA Publication Rights form (signed on both pages, in Sections 1A and 2)
- ☐ Full Disclosure of Interests form
- ☐ Additional forms, if applicable
- ☐ Abstract of review (optional)

Reviewer Portal: http://jbo.apa.org/cprs_reviewer/

Editorial staff: PSQJournals@apa.org

Fax: (202) 336-5549 (Attn: PsycCRITIQUES staff)

Sample *PsycCRITIQUES*® Film Review

Stuttering: Fact or Fiction?

The King's Speech (2010)

by Tom Hooper (Director)

Reviewed by Nina Ghiselli and Gina Davis

Nina Ghiselli, [fill in contact address for production staff]. E-mail: XXXXX

[Start your review on new page.]
[Single spacing of sample review is to save space. Your review should be double spaced.]

The King's Speech, which recently won the Academy Award for Best Picture, is one of the first films to portray a person who stutters in a sympathetic and heroic light. Directed by Tom Hooper and written by David Seidler (who himself is a person who stutters), it portrays the triumph of King George VI of England (played by Colin Firth), who, with the help of his speech therapist Lionel Logue (Geoffrey Rush), is able to overcome stuttering and deliver the important "call to action" radio address in 1939 marking England's declaration of war upon Germany. The film has garnered numerous awards and accolades: in addition to winning Best Picture, both Tom Hooper and David Seidler won Academy Awards for Directing and Screenwriting, respectively, and Colin Firth received the Academy Award for Best Actor.

Stuttering (or "stammering" as it is referred to in the movie) is a communication disorder characterized by repetitions, prolongations, and interruptions in one's speech. It is defined in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders* (*DSM–IV–TR*; 4th ed., text rev.; American Psychiatric Association, 2000) as a disturbance in fluency affecting communication in the academic, occupational and social realms, characterized by the following (American Psychiatric Association, 2000, p. 69):

1. Sound and syllable repetitions.
2. Sound prolongations.
3. Interjections.
4. Broken words (e.g., pauses within a word).
5. Audible or silent blocking (filled or unfilled pauses in speech).
6. Circumlocutions (word substitutions to avoid problematic words).
7. Words produced with an excess of physical tension.
8. Monosyllabic whole-word repetitions (e.g., "I–I–I–I see him").

According to the National Stuttering Association (2009), stuttering typically begins in childhood, between the ages of two and a half and five years old. According to the *DSM-IV-TR* (American Psychiatric Association, 2000), in adulthood, approximately less than 1 percent of the general population stutters, with men outnumbering women. Many adults who recall having stuttered as children claim to have overcome or outgrown the disorder as they aged. This phenomenon is referred to as *spontaneous recovery*. Although many children experience spontaneous recovery, it is still important that they receive early intervention to facilitate communication (Guitar, 2006).

The King's Speech opens with Prince Albert, Duke of York, delivering an address to a large crowd at the close of the 1925 British Empire Exhibition at Wembley Stadium. Prince Albert's stuttering is clearly a painful experience: Both he and the audience he is addressing are visibly unsettled by the halting, repetitive nature of his speech. The incident inspires his wife, Elizabeth, to seek support for her husband, and she makes the acquaintance of Lionel Logue, an Australian speech therapist.

Albert, who has undergone various ineffective treatments for his speech (including the antiquated practice of placing marbles in one's mouth while attempting to speak), is initially resistant to the idea of working with Logue. Eventually, however, he comes to trust the speech therapist, and they begin to cultivate

a friendship while working together to improve his speech. In 1936, Albert's father, King George V, passes away, and Albert's brother David accedes to the throne. David's desire to marry an American divorcee, Wallis Simpson, ultimately fuels his decision to abdicate, and the title and responsibilities of king (the responsibility of public speaking in particular) are suddenly thrust upon a reluctant Albert.

"The people believe that when I speak, I speak for them," he tells Logue in frustration. "But I can't speak." In spite of his fears, with the help and support of his friendship with Logue, Albert (now King George VI) is able to rise to the challenge and discover his voice. The climax of the film occurs when Albert delivers the important radio address to his country—the declaration of war upon Germany.

The movie's portrayal of King George VI raises a variety of important questions in regard to psychology and the treatment of people who stutter in therapy. Stuttering and the origins of the disorder have an often inaccurate and misunderstood relationship to psychology. Previous psychological theories of stuttering, some of which are still represented in psychoanalytic journals, have asserted that stuttering is caused by childhood trauma (Glauber, 1968) or a personality defect. The latter has included the theory that people who stutter are anal retentive and/or anal sadistic in withholding their words (the opposite of the popular term *diarrhea of the mouth*; Wilkinson, 2001). In *The King's Speech*, a connection between Albert's stuttering and traumatic incidents from his childhood is suggested as well.

Although the true cause of stuttering remains unknown, many studies indicate that stuttering is genetically linked. In 2010, groundbreaking research emerged that found that susceptibility to stuttering is associated with a mutation on Chromosome 12, which governs lysosomal metabolism (Kang et al., 2010). Additionally, there are brain differences in people who stutter. The work of Gerald McGuire (Pollack, 2006) has focused on pharmacological research based on the finding that there is a part of the brain in people who stutter that is anatomically different from that of typically "fluent" speakers. The mechanism that facilitates fluent or nonfluent speech appears to be located near Broca's area, where expressive speech meets with motor coordination.

When a person who stutters is able to speak fluently, it is usually because overactivations in the right hemisphere of his or her brain are reduced and cortical activity becomes more lateralized to the left hemisphere. It is common for people who stutter to stutter less when talking to dogs, singing, whispering, or engaging in choral reading (reading aloud with a group of others). Temporary fluency can be induced by using these approaches, as they activate the speech motor areas of the left hemisphere as well as the primary auditory cortex and auditory association cortex—areas that are usually active when nonstuttering individuals speak (Guitar, 2006). The unorthodox speech therapy treatments of Lionel Logue in *The King's Speech* included reading while listening to music on headphones, swearing, and singing. These techniques allow the stutterer to use a different area of his or her brain to speak.

Many of these techniques are also used by actors and actresses who stutter. For example, Marilyn Monroe's sexy and whispery voice came from her own struggle with stuttering. These techniques do not cure stuttering but instead mask it. Additionally, people who use these techniques may become dependent on them to avoid or conceal their stuttering. This experience is often referred to as *covert stuttering*. Although the outside world may view covert stuttering as the stutterer transcending his or her speech impediment, it can also come at an emotional and psychological cost because the person who stutters may not be expressing him- or herself in the way and with the words that he or she desires.

Current cutting-edge techniques in speech therapy focus on self-acceptance, disclosing the fact that one stutters to others, and becoming comfortable stuttering through the use of voluntary stuttering. Techniques included in these interventions are to "avoid avoidance" (Jackson, 2006, p. 115), in which the individual does not avoid stuttering and as a result becomes more comfortable with speaking.

A common way of thinking about stuttering in psychological terms is the *iceberg analogy*, which holds that only a small fraction of a person's stuttering (i.e., "the tip of the iceberg") is visible, obvious, and observable to others above the surface of the water. Beneath the surface, however, exists a variety of negative psychological processes, including feelings of fear, shame, guilt, anxiety, hopelessness, isolation, and denial. It is believed that one can gradually improve his or her self-esteem, self-acceptance, and communication with others in confronting what lies beneath the surface (Sheehan, 2005).

Additionally, there are stuttering communities that provide people who stutter with validation and support. These communities include the National Stuttering Association, which holds an annual conference with hundreds of attendees; local support groups with monthly meetings; and online support in the way of

social networks and forums. These kinds of interventions can help people who stutter overcome the effects of the social stigma of stuttering and its impact on self-esteem.

In treatment for stuttering, the focus should be on effective communication—the goal is not necessarily to achieve fluency but to find one's voice. One of the most insightful moments of *The King's Speech* occurs at the end, after Albert has delivered his radio address. Once the speech has been delivered and the microphones are turned off, Logue congratulates the king: "That was very good, Bertie," he says. "You still stammered on the *W*." Albert replies: "I had to throw in a few [stutters] so they would know it was me."

Although stuttering is often regarded as a speech disorder that must be overcome and avoided, one must also remember that it is still a component of a person's identity that, like any other facet of the self, should not only be acknowledged but should also be appreciated. Despite the incongruencies between *The King's Speech* and what we now know about the origins of stuttering and its treatment, it is clear from a sociological point of view that the film has provided a positive role model for the stuttering community, as well as a solid base from which to educate others about stuttering.

References

American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th ed., text rev.). Washington, DC: Author.

Glauber, I. P. (1968). Dysautomatization: A disorder of preconscious ego functioning. *The International Journal of Psycho-Analysis*, *49*, 89–99.

Guitar, B. (2006). *Stuttering: An integrated approach to its nature and treatment.* Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott, Williams & Wilkins.

Jackson, E. (2006). A stutterer's perspective: A stutterer's challenge. *Journal of Stuttering Therapy, Advocacy and Research*, *1*, 114–118.

Kang, C., Riazuddin, S., Mundorff, J., Krasnewich, D., Friedman, P., Mullikin, J. C., & Drayna, D. (2010). Mutations in the lysosomal enzyme-targeting pathway and persistent stuttering. *The New England Journal of Medicine*, *362*, 677–685. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa0902630

National Stuttering Association. (2009). *Stuttering info*. Retrieved from http://www.westutter.org/stutteringInformation/index.html

Pollack, A. (2006, September 12). To fight stuttering, doctors look at the brain. *The New York Times*. Retrieved from http://www.nytimes.com

Sheehan, V. (2005). *Easy stuttering: Avoidance reduction therapy*. Santa Monica, CA: Sheehan Stuttering Center.

Wilkinson, M. (2001). His mother-tongue: From stuttering to separation, a case history. *The Journal of Analytical Psychology*, *46*, 257–273. doi:10.1111/1465-5922.00236

(1,526 words, excluding references)

Example Abstract for *PsycINFO*®

(Adapted from published *PsycINFO*® abstract to reflect current guidelines.)

Reviews the film, *The King's Speech* (2010) directed by Tom Hooper. This is one of the first films to portray a person who stutters in a sympathetic and heroic light. It portrays the triumph of King George VI of England (played by Colin Firth), who, with the help of his speech therapist Lionel Logue (Geoffrey Rush), is able to overcome stuttering and deliver the important "call to action" radio address in 1939 marking England's declaration of war upon Germany. The movie's portrayal of King George VI raises a variety of important questions in regard to psychology and the treatment of people who stutter in therapy. Despite the incongruencies between *The King's Speech* and what we now know about the origins of stuttering and its treatment, it is clear from a sociological point of view that the film has provided a positive role model for the stuttering community, as well as a solid base from which to educate others about stuttering.

(160 words)