



## A Rallying Cry for Psychological Science

by Geoff Mumford, Director of Science Policy

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>Executive Director's Column: The Mosaic of Scientific Psychology</b>	3
<b>Cognition to Primate Genetics: What to Expect From the Master Lecturers in Honolulu</b>	4
<b>Science Briefs Resolving Conflict in Mind and Brain</b>	5
<b>The Benefits of Winning an APF-COGDOP Award</b>	8
<b>APA Member Advocates for Research at Senate Appearance</b>	9

Periodically a phenomenon emerges in Washington, D.C., and the surrounding mid-Atlantic states in the form of the 17-year cicada. A few days of loud partying is the reward for a lonely grub that's spent most of its life underground sucking on root sap. Soon we'll be sweeping up exoskeletons and sleeping with earplugs, marveling (or complaining) about the surprising cycles of science and nature. Hopefully, we'll also see the demise of a phase of another, perhaps not so natural, cycle—that of lawmakers periodically politicizing science and threatening the integrity of the peer-review process. We could certainly more likely realize that goal if psychologists sign a new Web petition endorsing a set of time-honored scientific principles.



Indeed, much about science and science policy is cyclical, if less predictable than cicadas. Ever since George Washington appointed a commission to investigate the cause of the Whiskey Rebellion of 1794, questions have been raised about how presidents get their advice and what they do with it. During the 19th and 20th centuries, as the United States became a leader in science and technology, that advice became more scientific and technical in

nature, as a matter of course. Controversy was bound to follow, and while concerns about the politicization of science are not unique to the current administration, we are once again in an era where such ethical questions are being raised.

The most recent example of concerns about such politicization comes in a report from the Union of Concerned Scientists (UCS), a pro-environmental non-profit headquartered in Cambridge, Mass., with a title that leaves little to the imagination: "Scientific Integrity in Policymaking: An Investigation into the Bush Administration's Misuse of Science" ([http://www.ucsusa.org/documents/RSI\\_final\\_fullreport.pdf](http://www.ucsusa.org/documents/RSI_final_fullreport.pdf)). The report includes a range of issues that have received wide

coverage in both the scientific and lay press, from public health (e.g., the relationship between abortion and breast cancer) to climate change (e.g., Environmental Protection Agency data on global warming). Other issues of concern cited are abstinence-only education, lead poisoning prevention and workplace safety. In a nod to APA's vanguard coverage of the issue, the UCS report also references the Monitor's coverage of William Miller's plight while being vetted for the

*Continued on next page...*

...Continued from previous page

National Advisory Council on Drug Abuse.

Accompanying the report is a statement ([http://www.ucsusa.org/global\\_environment/rsi/page.cfm?pageID=1320](http://www.ucsusa.org/global_environment/rsi/page.cfm?pageID=1320)) calling for the restoration of scientific integrity, endorsed by 20 Nobel laureates, 19 recipients of the National Medal of Science and other leaders within the research community. The UCS website encouraged other scientists to endorse the statement as well. However, although many psychological scientists agreed with the report and wanted to sign-on, initially those who self-identified as psychologists were told their discipline wasn't being counted. While this is not the first time psychology has been marginalized, it stings a little more coming on the heels of Dr. Daniel Kahneman's recent Nobel award "for having integrated insights from psychological research into economic science." However, when science policy staff were alerted to this situation, we immediately contacted UCS urging them to reconsider. After some back and forth discussions that referenced classification schemes developed by the National Science Foundation (which naturally recognize psychology and its many sub disciplines as science), UCS acquiesced and realized its obligation to include psychologists. Meanwhile though your thick-skinned colleagues rallied in a number of ways. For example, the Psychologists for Social Responsibility developed their own statement (<http://www.psyr.org/science.htm>) about government threats to research integrity, and initiated a separate web-based petition drive.

It all began because scientific integrity was also threatened in 2003, when five peer-reviewed grants funded by the National Institutes of Health (NIH) were targeted by an amendment offered by Rep. Pat Toomey (R-Pa.) on the House floor that sought to eliminate their funding. Following an uncomfortably close vote on what has been popularly referred to as the "Toomey Amendment," APA Senior Legislative and Federal Affairs Officer Karen Studwell, J.D. and Angela Sharpe, deputy director of health policy

at the Consortium of Social Science Associations, launched a new partnership, the Coalition to Protect Research (CPR) (<http://www.cossa.org/CPR/cpr.html>).

As PSA readers know CPR has been very busy on Capitol Hill, having already sponsored a congressional briefing (<http://www.apa.org/science/psa/mar4briefing.html>) on the public health implications of sexual health research, featuring psychological researchers Thomas Coates and Janet Shibley Hyde. In addition, CPR members are continuing to meet with congressional staff to convey the importance of the peer-review process and a comprehensive NIH research portfolio.

While these efforts to educate members of Congress about the importance of the peer review process generally and sexual behavior research, in particular, appear to be having the intended effect, there is no guarantee similar amendments won't be offered on appropriations bills later this year. However, any future efforts will require a new champion as Pat Toomey lost his bid to unseat Senator Arlen Specter in the Pennsylvania primary race and decided not to run for re-election to the House of Representatives. Whether or not congress takes up the issue again in this session, CPR members wanted to provide a broader opportunity for scientists, both within and outside the beltway, to register their concern on this issue. So CPR, working with APA's Management Information Systems group, developed its own Web-based petition. The "Petition to the U.S. Congress to Support Scientific Integrity" (<http://www.apa.org/ppo/issues/cprpetition04.html>) highlights the value of the current biomedical and behavioral research enterprise and urges Congress to support: merit review of research proposals; a comprehensive research portfolio; using sound science to inform policy; and public participation in setting research priorities.

Importantly, the petition records signatories' zip codes to allow sorting of the database by voting district so that we can demonstrate support for these basic principles to your key elected officials.

As this issue goes to press, the petition had garnered nearly 3000 signatures and we urge the PSA readership to join in endorsing it, too.

Soon there will be an additional chapter to this story. A Government Accounting Office investigation undertaken to examine the procedures used to vet the nominations of scientific advisers was scheduled for release by May 19. The 140-page draft has been described by a congressional staffer as more a compendium of best practices for the nomination and selection of scientific advisers than a compilation of failures. In any case, it will serve as a valuable reference by which this and future administrations can be judged and will be mounted at <http://www.apa.org/ppo/gao.pdf>.

The report will be used as a primary source document in a broader study to be conducted by the National Academy of Sciences beginning this summer. That study, "Science and Technology in the National Interest: Ensuring the Best Presidential and Advisory Committee Appointments" at <http://www.apa.org/ppo/issues/cosepupppt.pdf> (Third edition), will be carried out by the Committee on Science, Engineering and Public Policy (COSEPUP) and will be chaired by former Congressman John Porter (R-Ill.), a revered advocate for biomedical and behavioral research on Capitol Hill.

This is a rewarding follow-up to APA's early leadership on this issue: In February of last year, APA Chief Executive Officer Norman Anderson--in his testimony (<http://www.apa.org/ppo/issues/snbacosepup.html>) before COSEPUP--joined former advisers to Presidents Richard M. Nixon, George Bush and Bill Clinton in calling for just such a study. Through efforts such as this one, we hope that the threats to science will enter dormancy along with the cicadas--and stay buried for even longer than 17 years.

APA's science policy staff will continue to monitor and report on these issues as warranted here and in our monthly e-newsletter SPIN, available at: [www.apa.org/ppo/spin](http://www.apa.org/ppo/spin). ■

## EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S COLUMN

STEVEN BRECKLER, Executive Director for Science

### The Mosaic of Scientific Psychology

Last month, I suggested that professional societies are important because they are able to mobilize the full force of their disciplines. I even claimed that APA is among the very best at doing it. I made the claim with confidence. Let me tell you why.

A scientific discipline thrives when several components operate in synchrony. Let's start with education – the teaching and training of people. We all know that psychology is one of the most heavily subscribed college majors in North America, and increasingly we find psychology being included in K-12 curricula. The scientists and practitioners of psychology ultimately find their way to graduate school, and still additional years of intensive training. Psychology thrives in large part because of the active role that APA plays in education – in providing curriculum resources, training and accreditation standards, continuing education courses, networking opportunities for psychology educators, and advocacy on behalf of psychology education. Most aspiring psychology graduate students spend hours studying the APA publication *Graduate Study in Psychology*. Education is a fundamental part of the discipline, and APA supports it ([www.apa.org/ed](http://www.apa.org/ed)).

Science also depends on communication and publication. One of APA's greatest strengths is a vigorous program for publishing books ([www.apa.org/books](http://www.apa.org/books)) and journals ([www.apa.org/journals](http://www.apa.org/journals)). This is a Herculean effort, including the management of a review process and a production apparatus. Most professional societies are fortunate if they can manage the publication of just a few journals and an occasional book. APA publishes dozens of books and journals every year, including the most prestigious and widely



subscribed publication outlets for scientific psychology – *Psychological Review*, *Psychological Bulletin*, *American Psychologist*, *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *Developmental Psychology*, *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, and the list goes on. Publication is a fundamental part of the discipline, and APA does it extremely well.

One of the true values of scientific psychology is the contribution it makes to human welfare. More than any other scientific discipline, psychology connects to people. Psychology celebrates the diversity of humanity, and seeks to understand it. When the National Science Foundation insists that every funded project demonstrate its contribution to society, psychology never has a problem. Broader impact is our middle name. What may surprise many scientists, however, is the enormous investment that APA makes in promoting psychology in the public interest ([www.apa.org/pi](http://www.apa.org/pi)). It makes me proud to be a psychologist when I ponder all of the many ways that psychology matters, and APA is very adept at raising social awareness.

I know that many people perceive a schism between the science and the practice of psychology. Yet, neither can exist without the other. Much of psychological science is inspired by the need to solve human problems in learning, action, perception, social relationships, and health. The practice of psychology,

in turn, owes much of its success and credibility to the scientific foundation on which it is built. It is hard work keeping the science ([www.apa.org/science](http://www.apa.org/science)) and the practice ([www.apa.org/practice](http://www.apa.org/practice)) of psychology on the same page, but it is important work and APA accepts the challenge of doing it.

Many scientific voices demand attention and resources, in a world that seems to be running short on both. What's a scientific discipline to do? In a word, it is advocacy. We need to be organized and persistent in making sure that legislators, funders, and the general public understand and appreciate the importance of psychological science. This is really hard work. It requires an incredible knowledge of politics at the federal, state, and local levels. It depends on organizing people, and on penetrating the often bureaucratic infrastructure of funding agencies. It takes many hours and many people, and sometimes quick action. APA devotes an entire staff to cultivating public policy and advocacy in support of scientific psychology ([www.apa.org/ppo](http://www.apa.org/ppo)).

The science of psychology is one part of a large mosaic. The big picture includes education, communication, publication, public interest, practice, advocacy, and science – all working in synchrony. APA embraces the entire mosaic. Out of the synergy created, science at APA derives its great strength. The science of psychology is ready to meet the opportunities and the challenges of the 21st Century, and APA is unique in its ability to help. ■

## Cognition to Primate Genetics: What to Expect From the Master Lecturers in Honolulu

by Jeanie Kelleher, Special Programs Associate

4

Each year, five distinguished scientists are selected by the Board of Scientific Affairs (BSA) to give Master Lectures at the APA Convention. This year's speakers will present the best of psychological science on a range of topics from methodological innovation to learning and inhibition to biases and prejudice to psychopathology to primate behavior. The Master Lecture program is designed to present talks on cutting edge topics across ten broad areas, half of which are highlighted each year. Speakers, selected by BSA, and their topics are listed below.

**Leona S. Aiken and Stephen G. West** (methodology) will present a joint lecture on "Extending Multiple Regression Analysis to Novel Forms of Psychological Data." Leona S. Aiken is Professor of Psychology at Arizona State University and chairs the PhD Concentration in Quantitative Methods in Psychology. Her research interests are in the development of models of health protective behavior and the implementation and evaluation of theory-based interventions in health promotion, with particular application to women's health. She has been recognized for her teaching of quantitative methods with the 2001 Jacob Cohen Distinguished Teaching and Mentoring Award from APA's Division 5 and the 2000 Arizona State University Arts and Sciences Distinguished Teaching Award. Aiken is a Fellow of the American Psychological Association and the American Psychological Society.

**Stephen G. West** is Professor of Psychology at Arizona State University. His primary research interests are in the design and statistical analysis of field research, personality research, and the development and evaluation of theory-based preventive interventions. West received the 2000 Henry A. Murray award from the Society for Personality and Social Psychology for "distinguished contributions to the study of lives". He also received the 1997 outstanding graduate

faculty mentor of the year award from Arizona State University. West is a Fellow of the American Psychological Association.

**Mark E. Bouton** (learning, behavior, and action) will discuss "Learning, Extinction, and Emotion in the Context of Time." Bouton is Professor of Psychology at the University of Vermont. His research investigates the relationships between context, conditioning, and memory, with a special emphasis on inhibitory processes (e.g., extinction). Some of his recent writing has focused on the connections between modern learning theory, neuroscience, and issues in cognitive behavioral therapy. Bouton is a Fellow of the American Psychological Association and the American Psychological Society. He has been a Fulbright Scholar, a James McKeen Cattell Scholar, a University Scholar at the University of Vermont, and a Fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences (Stanford University).

**Susan T. Fiske** (social and cultural psychology) will speak on "The Perils of Prejudice: Emotional Biases in the Brain, Mind and Behavior." Fiske is Professor of Psychology at Princeton University. Her federally funded social cognition research has focused on how people choose between category-based and individuating impressions of other people. Her current research shows that social structure predicts distinct kinds of bias against different groups in society, focusing on disrespecting versus disliking. Fiske won the American Psychological Association's 1991 Early Career Award for Distinguished Contributions to Psychology in the Public Interest. In 1995, she and Peter Glick won the Gordon Allport Intergroup Relations Award from the Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues. Fiske is a Fellow of the American Psychological Association and the American Psychological Society.

**Ian H. Gotlib** (psychopathology and treatment) will present a lecture on "Interpersonal, Cognitive, and Biological Aspects of Depression: Toward an Integration." Gotlib is Professor of Psychology at Stanford University and is also the Director of the Stanford Mood and Anxiety Disorders Laboratory. His research examines psychological and biological factors that place individuals at increased risk for depression, as well as processes that are involved in recovery from this disorder. Gotlib is a Fellow of the American Psychological Association, the American Psychological Society, and the American Psychopathological Association, and is the President of the Society for Research in Psychopathology.

**Stephen J. Suomi** (developmental psychology) will speak on "How Specific Gene-Environment Interactions Can Shape Biobehavioral Development in Primates." Suomi is Chief of the Laboratory of Comparative Ethology at the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development, National Institutes of Health in Bethesda, MD. Suomi has received international recognition for his extensive research on biobehavioral development in rhesus monkeys. His present research focuses on three (3) general issues: the interaction between genetic and environmental factors in shaping individual developmental trajectories, the issue of continuity vs. change and the relative stability of individual differences throughout development, and the degree to which findings from monkeys studied in captivity generalize not only to monkeys living in the wild but also to humans living in different cultures. Suomi is a Fellow of the American Psychological Association, the American Psychological Society, and the American Association for the Advancement of Science. ■

## SCIENCE BRIEFS

## Resolving Conflict in Mind and Brain

by John Jonides and Derek Evan Nee



**John Jonides** earned his PhD from the University of Pennsylvania in 1975. He is currently Professor of Psychology and Neuroscience at the University of Michigan, as well as co-Director of the Functional MRI Laboratory there and editor of the journal, *Cognitive, Affective, and Behavioral Neuroscience*. For over twenty years, his research has focused on understanding psychological and brain mechanisms of working memory. Included in this program is research on the storage of verbal and spatial information as well as research on the executive mechanisms that are involved in switching attention from one task to another and resolving interference among competing sources of information. Professor Jonides has published over 100 scientific articles and book chapters.



**Derek Evan Nee** received his B.A. in Cognitive Science and Computer Science from Dartmouth College and is currently a doctoral student in Psychology at the University of Michigan. His research focuses on executive processes and working memory through the use of behavioral and neuroimaging techniques. Recently, he has been studying mechanisms of conflict-resolution.

There is a common theme that threads its way through a number of phenomena. Consider just three examples.

- A one-year old child is shown an attractive toy in location A and then the toy is moved to location B in plain view of the child. The child, wanting the toy, reaches for it...but in location A, not B (Diamond, 1988).
- A patient with a lesion to the lateral part of frontal cortex is confronted with a task in which he has to produce as many words as possible beginning with the letter "S." He begins the task successfully, but then he keeps on repeating the same words over and over rather than producing new ones (Banich, 1997).
- Many depressed or dysphoric patients engage in rumination about negative self-referenced thoughts such that this rumination becomes a "habit of thought" (Hertel, 2004). Rumination is sufficiently powerful that it impairs the abil-

ity to engage in many tasks of daily life because of its consuming nature.

What these phenomena share in common is that they all represent cases in which conflict has to be resolved between a prepotent thought or response and one that is appropriate for the current occasion. In the case of the child, the conflict is between the recent salient location of the toy and its new location. In the case of the patient, it is between the high familiarity of recent responses and the need to search memory for new responses. In the case of depressed patients, it is between the recurring negative thoughts and the thoughts that they should focus on to engage in daily activities. Even brief consideration of these and other phenomena makes clear that they are ubiquitous. We are constantly faced with situations in which we have to resolve conflict in order to behave appropriately. What are the mechanisms that help us resolve conflict? Is there but one, or are there many? What regions of the brain are recruited in the service of

conflict-resolution? We have devoted some energy to addressing these questions using various techniques all focusing on a small set of tasks that model conflict-resolution in well-controlled experimental environments. Of course, what we learn from these contrived tasks only begins to tell us about conflict-resolution mechanisms; what we learn must then be applied to the sorts of situations that normal individuals and brain-compromised individuals face. But we are making a start.

At first glance, it may seem quite unlikely that there is any single common mechanism that could underlie all cases of interference resolution. For example, we know that generally, the correlations among performance in various interference-resolution tasks are quite low (Kramer et al., 1994; Stoltzfus et al., 1993; Fan et al., 2003). Also, there is evidence from brain-imaging data that appear to suggest no coherence among interference-resolution mechanisms

Continued on next page...

...Science Briefs, continued  
from page 5

6

(Fan et al., 2003). We have conducted a meta-analysis of brain-imaging results from 41 published papers using various interference-resolution tasks, and the gross data are shown in Figure 1a (Nee, Jonides, and Wager, 2004). Each of the points in the figure represents a region of reliable activation from one or another study of the go/no-go task, the Stroop task, the flanker task, the stop-signal task, the Simon task, and tasks that require incompatible responses to stimuli. In each case, the activations reported are from contrasts comparing an interference condition with a non-interference control. The most impressive feature of the figure is that the activations are spread throughout the brain with seemingly little systematicity.

Despite this seeming heterogeneity, is there any evidence that there are some common mechanisms involved in the resolution of conflict? A closer look indicates that there may be. On the behavioral front, Friedman and Miyake (2004) have shown that there is some orderliness among some interference-resolution tasks, with tasks involving inhibition of responses being related to tasks involving resistance to distractors, and both of these being distinct from resistance to proactive interference. On the brain-imaging front, the apparent chaos in Figure 1a (see <http://www.apa.org/science/psa/sb-jonides.html>) is, in fact, orderly when one conducts a clustering analysis on the points in the figure. Such a clustering analysis reveals that the anterior cingulate cortex, dorsolateral prefrontal cortex, inferior frontal gyrus, insula, and posterior parietal cortex are common sites of activation in the six interference-resolution tasks that were analyzed. This is shown in Figure 1b in which the common sites are shown on superior and frontal views of a brain.

Beyond this, we have also explicitly compared brain activations that arise from three tasks that require interference-resolution: the flanker task, the go/no-go task, and the stimulus-response compatibility task (Sylvester et al., 2003). In a single experiment, a group of

participants completed all of these tasks while they underwent scanning using functional MRI. In each case, we compared a version of the task that demanded a good deal of interference-resolution with one that required less. For the flanker task, this required comparing the effects of incongruent versus congruent flankers; for the go-no/go task it required examining trials in which a response had to be withheld after a series of trials in which a response was executed; for the stimulus-response task, it required comparing trials in which there was an incompatible mapping between stimuli and responses versus a compatible mapping. We then examined the brain activations to see whether there were regions of overlap among the tasks. Indeed, there were; and many overlapped with those found in the meta-analysis described above. Again, insula cortex, dorsolateral prefrontal cortex, and parietal cortex were featured prominently. In addition, there was common activation in anterior prefrontal and premotor cortices.

What these analyses reveal is that there are some common mechanisms among various tasks of interference resolution. This is not the complete story, however. It is important to note that there are also brain activations that are unique to one interference task or another. What might cause these differences? One possibility is that interference-resolution mechanisms are tailored to the stage of processing at which they apply. We have entertained the hypothesis that there may be identifiably different processes of interference resolution that operate at the time of encoding material versus storing material in working memory versus responding. Hasher and Zacks (1988; see also Hasher, Zacks and May, 1999) proposed this hypothesis some years ago, but evidence about it has previously come from very different tasks in different contexts.

We have taken a different approach to this issue. Our strategy is to study processes of interference-resolution in a single task to see if they are dissociable. In one such study, we have found a dissociation between resolution processes

that operate on responses versus those that operate on working memory processes (Nelson et al., 2003). Participants were given a set of four target letters to hold in memory followed after a 3-second retention interval by a probe letter. The probe either matched one of the letters of the target-set or it did not. The interesting feature of the experiment concerned those trials on which there was not a match. On some of these trials, the mismatching letter had not appeared recently in the experiment. On others, although it did not match the current target-set, it did match one of the letters of the previous target-set. On these trials, then, the probe had a high familiarity because of its recent appearance, and this was intended to produce conflict among representations in working memory. That is, there was conflict between the high activation of an item based on its recent presentation and the demand to recognize that this item was not present in the current target-set.

On yet other trials, not only did the probe letter match one of the letters of the previous target-set, the letter that it matched had in fact been the probe for the previous target-set as well, so that it had resulted in a positive response. So, these trials had not only the high familiarity due to the recent appearance of a probe, they also had a competition for responses as well: On the previous trial, participants had properly responded positively to this item while on the current trial, they had to respond negatively. The comparison among these two types of negative trials on which there was competition, one due to high familiarity and one due to response disagreement, revealed two different patterns of brain activation. The conflict due to familiarity led to activation in inferior frontal gyrus in the left hemisphere, a result that we have found previously in a task of this sort (Jonides et al., 1998). The conflict due to response competition led to activation in the anterior cingulate cortex, a result that has been found by others for tasks in which there is response conflict (Botvinick et al., 2001). These two regions of activation

*continued on page 7...*

...continued from page 6

were doubly dissociated leading to the conclusion that response competition and competition in working memory are mediated at least in part by different processes.

More recently, we have been examining potential differences between mechanisms involved in suppressing irrelevant information during encoding versus when it is already in working memory and must be removed. The experiment also used an item-recognition task and participants had to either ignore stimuli presented for encoding or they had to remove encoded stimuli from working memory. We have found evidence suggesting two separable processes (Nee and Jonides, 2004). One keeps information from entering working memory if that information is irrelevant to the current task. The other is responsible for getting information that has entered working memory out when that information is no longer relevant to the task. Although previous research has suggested two such processes (Hasher et al., 1999), demonstrating them in the context of a single task is an important step to documenting their separability.

Study of model experimental paradigms of this sort has revealed that there are separable mechanisms involved in suppressing prepotent responses or memories, but that these mechanisms share some common properties as well. The heavy lifting that is now required will involve specifying what the processing characteristics are of each mechanism and how these are implemented in the brain.

## References

- Banich, M.T. (1997). Breakdown of executive function and goal-directed behavior. In M.T. Banich (Eds.), *Neuropsychology: The neural bases of mental function* (pp. 369-390). Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Botvinick, M.M., Braver, T.S., Barch, D.M., Carter, C.S., and Cohen, J.D. (2001). Conflict monitoring and cognitive control. *Psychological Review*, 108:3, 624-652.
- Diamond, A. (1988). Abilities and neural mechanisms underlying A not-B performance. *Child Development*, 59, 523-527.
- Hasher, L., Zacks, R.T., and May, C.P. (1999). Inhibitory control, circadian arousal, and age. In D. Gopher and A. Koriat (Eds.), *Attention and Performance* (pp. 653-675). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Hertel, P.T. (2004). Memory for emotional and nonemotional events in depression: A question of habit? In D. Reisberg and P. Hertel (Eds.), *Memory and Emotion* (pp. 186-216). New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kramer, A.F., Humphrey, D.G., Larish, J.F., Logan, G.D., and Strayer, D.L. (1994). Aging and inhibition: Beyond a unitary view of inhibitory processing in attention. *Psychology and Aging*, 9, 491-512.
- Friedman, N.P., and Miyake, A. (2004). The relations among inhibition and interference control functions: A latent variable analysis. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 133, 101-135.
- Jonides, J., Smith, E.E., Marshuetz, C., and Koeppel, R.A. (1998). Inhibition in verbal working memory revealed by brain activation. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 95, 8410-8413.
- Nee, D.E., Jonides, J., and Wager, T. D. (2004). A meta-analysis of interference-resolution tasks. 2004 Meeting of Cognitive Neuroscience Society.
- Nee, D.E., and Jonides, J. (2004). Dissociating information-suppression during encoding versus working memory. Paper to be presented at the Meeting of the Psychonomic Society.
- Nelson, J.K., Reuter-Lorenz, P.A., Sylvester, C-Y. C., Jonides, J., and Smith, E.E. (2003). Dissociable neural mechanisms underlying response-based and familiarity-based conflict in working memory. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 100, 11171-11175.
- Stoltzfus, E.R., Hasher, L., Zacks, R.T., Ulivi, M., and Goldstein, D. (1993). Investigations of inhibition and interference in younger and older adults. *Journal of Gerontology*, 48, 179-188.
- Sylvester, C.C., Wager, T.D., Jonides, J., Lacey, S.C., Cheshin, A., and Nichols, T.E. (2003). Processes of interference resolution as revealed by functional magnetic resonance imaging. 2003 Meeting of Cognitive Neuroscience Society.
- Wager, T.D., Phan, K.L., Liberzon, I., and Taylor, S.F. (2003). Valence, gender, and lateralization of functional brain anatomy in emotion: a meta-analysis of findings from neuroimaging. *Neuroimage*, 19, 513-531. ■

## Science Policy Insider News

### What is SPIN?

APA's Science Policy staff wants you to know about the important policy issues that affect psychological science and psychological scientists at the national level. The Science Policy staff advocates for psychological science not just with members of Congress, but also the Departments of Defense, Health and Human Services, Transportation, Veterans Affairs, Education and with the National Aeronautics and Space Administration and National Science Foundation. To keep you aware of science policy within these agencies and on Capitol Hill, we have created APA's Science Policy Insider News (SPIN), a monthly email newsletter that will take you inside the Administration and Congress for timely information from your APA staff. Visit SPIN at <http://www.apa.org/ppo/spin/homepage.html>.

# The Benefits of Winning an APF-COGDOP Award

by Amena Hassan, Science Communications Officer

Since 1996, the American Psychological Foundation (APF), in association with the Council of Graduate Departments of Psychology (COGDOP), has sponsored scholarship funding for outstanding research by a graduate student in psychology. The scholarships embody APF's continuing commitment to promoting awards and other activities to advance the science and practice of psychology for understanding behavior and its benefits to human welfare.

8

Two of the major awards within the program are the \$3,000 Ruth G. and Joseph D. Matarazzo Scholarship and the \$2,000 Clarence J. Rosecrans Scholarship. In addition to this, the foundation also gives out several \$1,000 awards and has given out 92 awards, in total, since its inception.

As the winner of the 2003 Matarazzo award, **Dana Byrd** (University of Florida) felt the scholarship was vital for the completion of her dissertation study. "Because of this funding I was able to recruit and test an understudied, but theoretically important group for my dissertation: adults currently diagnosed with ADD/ADHD," said Byrd. "The inclusion of this group allows for the examination of the brain basis of ADD/ADHD within a developmental context. I can now compare children who have ADD/ADHD, a proportion of which will outgrow some of the symptoms and are still developing neurologically, to adults who still maintained a clinically significant proportion of their symptoms even after the majority of the neurological development is complete."

Byrd hopes the study of the developmental disorder will spur more longitudinal examinations of the interaction between neurological development and dysfunction in ADD/ADHD. She will join the Sackler Institute for Developmental Psychobiology with a postdoctoral position, after graduating in August 2004.

**Stewart Shankman** (State University of New York at Stony Brook) was the 2003 winner of the Clarence J. Rosecrans Scholarship. "Receiving any kind of recognition for your research feels good but this feels particularly great because it is from an organization made up of chairs and heads of psychology departments," stated Shankman, whose dissertation on depression required a large recruitment of human participants. Although he received funds from other sources he felt the \$2,000 sum from his Rosecrans Scholarship was essential in helping him cover the total expenses for his research, which included paying participants for their time.

**Jessica Tracy** (University of California, Davis) used one of the APF/COGDOP awards to help pay for a research trip to Burkina Faso, Africa. Along with her advisor Rick Robins, and several assistants, the group arrived in December 2003 to meet with African collaborators and begin a series of studies testing the universality of the pride expression.

"It was an amazing experience to meet these people, get an insider's view to their lives, and do experimental research in that setting," said Tracy. "I was very excited to win the award because it was a huge help to my continued research on the nonverbal expression of pride." The studies examined whether non-literate individuals who lived in villages in Burkina, with almost no exposure to the Western world, could recognize the pride expression. Tracy is presently writing a grant proposal to fund more studies in Burkina Faso and will soon complete her dissertation.

Another recipient of the COGDOP award, **Elizabeth Podnieszinski** (Boston University), used the funds in her research on children. Currently a psychology intern at the NYU/Bellevue Hospital Clinical Psychology Internship, she works with children, adolescents and adults providing therapy and clinical evaluations for individuals seeking political asylum through the NYU-Bellevue Survivors of Torture Program.

"When I heard about the award I felt honored that APF and COGDOP acknowledged my dissertation research on the effects September 11th had on children in New York City," Podnieszinski stated. "The men who hijacked airplanes and drove them into the World Trade Center, the Pentagon, and a field in Pennsylvania wanted Americans to feel scared, helpless, and alone. The work that has come out of this project, with the help of the APF/COGDOP Award, is a testament to their inability to achieve this goal."

In her studies on body image disturbance, **Sherrie Selwyn Delinsky** (Rutgers, State University of New Jersey) used her award funds to reimburse 45 women for their participation in her treatment outcome study. The APF/COGDOP award facilitated the completion of Delinsky's project, and she recently presented her findings in Orlando, FL at the 2004 International Conference on Eating Disorders. The study will be also submitted for publication after she defends her dissertation in May.

"I was thrilled to hear I had won an APF/COGDOP award," Delinsky commented. "My study evaluated the effectiveness of Mirror Exposure (ME) therapy in comparison with a non-directive (ND) body image therapy for women with extreme weight and shape concerns. As hypothesized, Mirror Exposure therapy was significantly better than the ND on many of the outcome measures, although the ND group showed a number of improvements, suggesting that it was a relatively strong comparison treatment." Delinsky hopes to conduct a larger scale study of Mirror Exposure therapy, in the near future, especially in the context of Bulimia Nervosa.

The APF/COGDOP awards are administered by the APA Science Directorate. This year's deadline is May 28, 2004. Applications can be accessed online at <http://www.apa.org/science/apf-cogdop.html>. ■

## APA Member Advocates Research at Senate Appearance

by Heather Kelly, Senior Legislative and Federal Affairs Officer

**O**n May 5th, Christopher Sager delivered APA's oral testimony before the Senate Appropriations Subcommittee on Defense. Sager is an APA member and Principal Staff Scientist at the Human Resources Research Organization (HumRRO) in Alexandria,



**Senators Daniel Inouye (D-HI) and Ted Stevens (R-AK) hear testimony from Christopher Sager, on behalf of APA.**

Virginia. In his remarks he expressed APA's support for psychological research funded by the Department of De-

fense (DoD) and our concern over deep cuts to DoD human-centered research programs proposed in the President's FY05 budget.

Citing DoD's own report to Congress several years ago, which stated that "the requirements for maintaining strong DoD support for behavioral, cognitive and social science research capability are compelling," Sager urged the Senate Committee to (at a minimum) restore funding for this research to the FY04 level. Following Sager's presentation, Committee Chairman Ted Stevens (R-AK) promised that he and his staff would look into the proposed cuts. Ranking Democrat Daniel Inouye (D-HI) posed a question based on the morning's headlines, asking Sager if more attention to human-centered research within DoD could have prevented the abuse of Iraqi prisoners by U.S. military personnel.



**Sager urges the Senate to restore cuts to human-centered research in the President's proposed FY05 budget.**

Sager was careful to reply that the issue is complex, but that certainly DoD-sponsored research programs in leadership and personnel selection and training could be important sources of information. See <http://www.apa.org/ppo/issues/sdodwritten04.html> for the full text of APA's written statement to the Senate Subcommittee, and <http://www.apa.org/ppo/issues/sdodoral04.html> for Sager's oral testimony. ■

## National Academies of Sciences and American Academy of Arts and Sciences Elects New Members in Psychology

**T**he National Academy of Sciences recently announced the 2004 election of its 72 new members and 18 foreign associates from 13 countries in recognition of their distinguished and continuing achievements in original research. Three members elected in the area of psychology were Elizabeth Loftus, Walter Mischel, and Elissa Newport. Elizabeth Loftus is a distinguished professor in the department of psychology and social behavior and department of criminology, law, and society at the University of California, Irvine. Her studies over the years have been deeply involved with human memory and how facts, ideas, suggestions and other forms of information told after an event can modify memories.

Walter Mischel is a Robert Johnson Niven Professor of Humane Letters in Psychology at Columbia University. His research concentrates on personality structure, processes and development;

self-control and personality inferences.

Elissa Newport's primary research interest is in the acquisition of language, and in the relationship between language acquisition and language structure. She is a George Eastman Professor of Brain and Cognitive Sciences and Linguistics and chair, department of brain and cognitive sciences at the University of Rochester. Additional information about the institution is available on the Internet at <http://national-academies.org>. A full directory of NAS members can be found online at <http://national-academies.org/nas>.

Psychologists elected to the American Academy of Arts and Sciences are Marilyn B. Brewer, Professor of Psychology, Ohio State University; Dedre Gentner, Professor of Psychology and of Education and Social Policy, Northwestern University; Mark R. Lepper, Professor and Chair of Psychology, Stanford University; and Norbert

Schwarz, Professor of Psychology, Institute for Social Research, University of Michigan. Elected to the Academy (under Class V -Public Affairs, Business, and Administration, Section 3, Educational, Scientific, Cultural, and Philanthropic Administration) was Frances D. Horowitz, President of the Graduate School and University Center, City University of New York.

Huda Akil, Gardner C. Quarten Professor of Neurosciences, University of Michigan; Thomas James Carew, Bren Professor & Chair of Neurobiology and Behavior, University of California, Irvine; and Ned J. Block, Professor of Philosophy and Psychology, New York University, were also elected. The current membership of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences is over 4,500 and includes more than 150 Nobel laureates and 50 Pulitzer Prize winners. For a full list of newly elected members, please visit: <http://www.amacad.org/news/new2004.htm>. ■

## Two Former APA Award Recipients Receive Honors for Work in the Brain Sciences

**R**obert Wurtz, 1997 APA Distinguished Scientific Contribution Award recipient, William Newsome, 2002 APA Distinguished Scientific Contribution Award recipient, and Amiram Grinvald have won the Dan David Prize for their contributions toward mapping the connections between neural processes and behavior. They share a \$1 million prize.

10

Wurtz does research in behavioral neurophysiology of the visual system and he is currently at the National Eye Institute. Newsome, is a leading researcher in

the fields of sensory and cognitive neuroscience, at Stanford University. They were honored for investigating neural processes that underlie visual perception and visually guided behaviors. Grinvald, a neuroscientist at the Weizmann Institute of Science, was honored for his work on information processing in the mammalian cortex and for designing optical methods for imaging neuronal activity in the living brain.

The Dan David Prize is a joint international enterprise endowed by the Dan David Foundation and headquartered at

Tel Aviv University. Three prizes of \$1 million each are granted annually for achievements having an outstanding scientific, technological, cultural or social impact on our world. Each year fields are chosen within the three Time Dimensions — Past, Present and Future. The laureates for a given year are chosen from these fields.

The Dan David Prize is unique in its flexible definition of dynamically changing fields of human knowledge and in its process of fostering the next generation of scholars. The laureates annually donate 20 scholarships of \$15,000 each to outstanding doctoral students throughout the world, in the chosen fields. ■

## Grants Available for Scientific Conferences, Proposals Invited

**T**he Science Directorate is currently seeking proposals for research conferences in psychology. The purpose of this program is to promote the exchange of important new contributions and approaches in scientific psychology. The next deadline for applications is June 1, 2004.

Grant money ranging from \$500 to \$20,000 is available for the scientific conference. Proposals will be considered using such formats as “add-a-day” conferences (\$500-\$3,000 available), “stand alone” conferences (\$5,000-\$20,000 available), and festschrifts (\$5,000-\$20,000 available). The conference must be additionally supported by the host institution with direct funds, in-kind support, or a combination of the two. Conference proposals must meet the following eligibility requirements:

One of the primary organizers must be a member of APA. Only academic institutions accredited by a regional body may apply. Independent research institutions must provide evidence of affiliation with an accredited institution. Joint proposals from cooperating institutions are encouraged. Conferences may be held only in the United States, its possessions, or Canada.

APA governance groups, APA Divisions and other related entities are not eligible for funding under this program.

Conference manuscripts shall be submitted to APA after the conference is held for publication in PsycEXTRA, a companion database to the scholarly PsycINFO. PsycEXTRA is designed to link researchers, academics, clinicians, librarians, consumers, and policy-makers to a variety of information sources covering psychology, behavioral science, and health; PsycEXTRA provides the readership with original documents. Please note that the publication component of this program has changed.

Conference review committee members are: Anita Davis, Michael Domjan, Irene Frieze, Keith Humphreys, John Kihlstrom, Kevin Murphy, and Sheldon Zedeck.

For more information on review criteria, proposal contents, and budget guidelines, please refer to the APA website at <http://www.apa.org/science/confer2.html> or contact Deborah McCall, Science Program Manager, at (202) 218-3590. ■

### APF/COGDOP Graduate Research Scholarships in Psychology

The American Psychological Foundation (APF) and the Council of Graduate Departments of Psychology (COGDOP) are jointly offering graduate research scholarships, including the \$2,000 Clarence J. Rosecrans Scholarship, the \$3,000 Ruth G. and Joseph D. Matarazzo Scholarship, as well as a number of \$1,000 scholarships.

The scholarships will be given directly to the individual graduate students enrolled in an interim master's program or doctoral program.

**DEADLINE FOR APPLICATION:  
MAY 28, 2004.**

For more information, visit <http://www.apa.org/science/apf-cogdop.html>.

**SCIENCE DIRECTORATE STAFF**

Steven Breckler, *Executive Director for Science*  
 Merry Bullock, *Associate Executive Director for Science*  
 Virginia E. Holt, *Assistant Executive Director for Science*  
 Jason Bennett, *Science Communications Associate*  
 Francis Beylotte, *Science Affairs Program Assistant*  
 Jessica Bryant, *Special Projects Associate*  
 Marianne Ernesto, *Director for Testing & Assessment*  
 Halah Gordon, *Administration Manager*  
 Amena S. Hassan, *Science Communications Officer*  
 Jeanie Kelleher, *Special Programs Associate*  
 Dianne Brown Maranto, *Dir. for Psychology in the Workplace*  
 Deborah McCall, *Science Programs Manager*  
 Sangeeta Panicker, *Director, Research Ethics Office*  
 Brett Pelham, *Senior Scientist*  
 Jonathan Tin, *Science Programs Associate*  
 Kymberly Thornton, *Receptionist*  
 Suzanne S. Wandersman, *Director for Governance Affairs*

**SCIENCE POLICY**

Geoffrey Mumford, *Director for Science Policy*  
 Patricia Kobor, *Senior Science Policy Analyst*  
 Heather Kelly, *Senior Legislative & Federal Affairs Officer*  
 Sara Robinson, *Legislative Assistant*  
 Karen Studwell, *Senior Legislative & Federal Affairs Officer*

**APA SCIENCE DIRECTORATE WEBSITE:**  
**[www.apa.org/science](http://www.apa.org/science)**

Science Directorate Email Address: [science@apa.org](mailto:science@apa.org)

**PSYCHOLOGICAL SCIENCE AGENDA**

*Psychological Science Agenda* is published monthly by APA's Science Directorate. Dedicated to promoting and serving scientific psychology, *Psychological Science Agenda* provides news about national scientific policy developments, examines policy issues affecting and affected by the behavioral research community, and highlights the advocacy efforts of the Science Directorate on behalf of research and academic psychologists. *Psychological Science Agenda* also features news of APA's governance and program initiatives relating to scientific and academic psychology, and provides valuable, timely information about funding opportunities for research psychologists.

*Psychological Science Agenda* is distributed free to 30,000 psychologists, members of Congress and their staffs, key officials in federal agencies that fund behavioral research and use its findings, institutional libraries, and science writers in the national media.

To obtain a subscription to *Psychological Science Agenda*, contact the Science Directorate at: American Psychological Association, Science Directorate, 750 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20002-4242.

Phone: (202) 336-6000 Fax: (202) 336-5953.  
 TDD: (202) 336-6123. E-mail: [science@apa.org](mailto:science@apa.org).

**BOARD OF SCIENTIFIC AFFAIRS**

Suzanne B. Johnson, (Chair)  
 Linda M. Bartoshuk

Gwyneth M. Boodoo  
 Marilyn E. Carroll  
 Sandra Graham  
 Jo-Ida Hansen  
 Roberta L. Klatzky  
 Hazel R. Markus  
 John R. Weisz

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR SCIENCE**

Steven Breckler

**CHIEF SCIENCE ADVISOR**

Gordon H. Bower

**EXECUTIVE EDITOR**

Virginia E. Holt

**EDITOR,****PSYCHOLOGICAL SCIENCE AGENDA**

Amena S. Hassan

**PSYCHOLOGICAL SCIENCE AGENDA WEBSITE:**  
**[www.apa.org/science/psa/homepage.html](http://www.apa.org/science/psa/homepage.html)**

PSA Email Address: [psa@apa.org](mailto:psa@apa.org)