

# PSYCHOLOGICAL SCIENCE AGENDA

SCIENCE DIRECTORATE of the AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

2000-2010  
DECADE  
of BEHAVIOR

NOVEMBER 2003  
VOLUME 17 NUMBER 1



## Science Advocacy Weekend Workshop and Congressional Briefing Focus on Military Psychology

by Heather O'Beirne Kelly and Sara Robinson, Public Policy Office

Sexual Health  
Grants Targeted by  
Conservative Group 2

Executive  
Director's Column:  
Humpty Dumpty is  
Alive and Well, Living  
in the Psychological  
Literature 3

Interesting Careers:  
A Technology  
Consultant in the  
Telecommunication  
Industry 4

Ranking Graduate  
Programs in Psychology:  
APA Works for You  
Behind the Scenes 5

Veteran Psychologists  
and Clinical Science  
in the 1950s 6

APA's Public Policy Office convened its 11th annual Science Advocacy Training Workshop September 27 - 29, bringing in fourteen distinguished researchers to focus on the topic of "Psychological Science and the Military." Following intensive training in the federal legislative process and effective communication with Congress and the media, the psychologists talked with Susan Chipman, from the Office of Naval Research (ONR). Chipman gave an overview of the cognitive research program at ONR and outlined some of the areas in which she'd like to see more investigation. The group then developed a briefing sheet on behavioral science funding within the Department of Defense, highlighting the likely impact of substantial cuts made to this program in Fiscal Year 2004. The following day, workshop participants used these briefing sheets to advocate for increased support in Fiscal Year 2005 during meetings with their Congressional delegations on Capitol Hill. Psychologists reported that a number of the Congressional staffers were dismayed by the cuts and asked to meet with our researchers again for input early in 2004 when the new defense funding bill will be drafted.

The weekend workshop brought together a strong group of scientists with wide-ranging expertise, including human factors, psychobiology, and industrial/organizational psychology. The group included: James Callan (Pacific Science & Engineering, Inc.), Janis Cannon-Bowers (University of Central Florida),



Gerald Krueger speaks at the briefing

Nancy Cooke (Arizona State University), William Howell (Arizona State and Rice Universities), Dennis Kowal (IDA), Gerald Krueger (Wexford Group International), Sandra Marshall (San Diego State University), Kevin Murphy (The Pennsylvania State University), Michael Paley (Aptima, Inc.), Elaine Pulakos (Personnel Decisions Research Institutes, Inc.), Karlene Roberts (University of California, Berkeley), William Strickland (Human Resources Research Organization), Jennifer Vendemia (University of South Carolina), and Stephen Zaccaro (George Mason University).

In conjunction with this year's advocacy workshop, APA also co-sponsored a Congressional briefing on September 29th with the office of Senator John McCain (R-AZ) titled "Psychological Science in Support of the Soldier." In his roles as Chairman of the Senate's Commerce, Science and Transportation Committee, Member of the Armed Services Committee, and former

...continued on next page

# Sexual Health Grants Targeted by Conservative Group

by Karen Studwell, Public Policy Office

2 **A**PA staff recently learned that an apparent “hit list” of sexual health grants was sent to the National Institutes of Health (NIH) following the October 2 testimony of NIH Director Elias Zerhouni. At a joint hearing of the House Energy and Commerce Committee and Senate Health, Education, Labor and Pensions Committee, several Members of Congress asked the NIH Director for an explanation of the medical benefits of a list of ten sexual health research projects. The list included studies of the sexual behaviors of older men, risk behaviors of prostitutes and a conference on sexual arousal. This line of inquiry followed on the heels of a House amendment proposed by Rep. Pat Toomey (R-PA) in July that would have rescinded funding for five of these same grants at NIH. That amendment was defeated by a slim vote of 212-210.

When NIH officials asked for a copy of the original list mentioned during the hearing, a much longer list of over 150 grants was sent that addressed several issues related to HIV/AIDS, high-risk sexual behaviors, stigmatization of homosexual populations, and substance abuse. The list, compiled by the Traditional Values Coalition (TVC), also contained the names of a number of researchers who received no federal funds, but who, in the past, had studied issues related to homosexuality. While staff of the House Energy and Commerce Committee denied having made any formal inquiries into these grants, there is still concern that Congress might take steps in the future to stifle research on HIV/AIDS, adolescent sexual behavior, drug use, and homosexual populations.

APA Public Policy staff contacted psychologists who were included on the list to inform them that NIH may be collecting information about their grants in order to respond to questions from Congress. APA also encouraged psychologists to contact their Members of Congress to inform them of the importance of this research to the public health. While there is no current congressional

action to restrict funding for these grants, there is a high probability that the House Republican Study Committee, which assembled the smaller list, will continue to issue statements denouncing these and other sexual health research projects.

Zerhouni, addressing the November 3 annual meeting of the Consortium of Social Science Associations (COSSA), urged the behavioral sciences community to educate Congress about the need for sexual health research, especially those offices that had not previously been supportive of this research. Responding to claims from the Traditional Values Coalition that NIH is run like the National Endowment for the Arts, Zerhouni stated, “Bad paintings do not destroy families. AIDS Kills. Art has never killed anyone.”

In an APA statement in support of the NIH peer review process and sexual behavior research, APA CEO Norman Anderson, asserted, “Without studying those populations linked to the widespread transmission of disease, there is little hope that we will ever defeat this public health epidemic. Outside scientific experts from many of America’s most respected universities, rather than NIH officials, evaluate the scientific relevance and validity of this research. This scientific process alone must be allowed to determine the value of all research.”

In addition to its efforts to defeat the Toomey amendment, APA is working with other societies to create a new coalition -- the National Alliance to Support Sexual Health Research and Policy. The Alliance will hold its first meeting in December and will focus its efforts on educating Congress about the necessity for additional research on sexual health and development.

If you would like to contact your member of Congress, please go to [www.apa.org/ppo](http://www.apa.org/ppo) and find out how you can inform your Member of Congress

about the importance of protecting the NIH peer review process from political interference, as well as the need for research into normal adult sexual development, HIV/AIDS prevention, high risk sexual behaviors, addiction and sexual abuse. ■

...*Military, continued from page 1*

Naval Officer and POW, Sen. McCain has been a strong supporter of defense research on Capitol Hill. His staff provided the Commerce Committee hearing room for the briefing, which was designed to educate Congressional defense staffers on the vital contributions of psychological research to our military and national defense. Three APA members, Gerald Krueger, Robert Roland (Industrial College of the Armed Forces, National Defense University), and Howard Weiss (Purdue University's Military Family Research Institute) presented research on human factors issues in designing infantry suits, operational research on Prisoners of War, and military family issues related to service member recruitment and retention. William Howell (Arizona State and Rice Universities, former Chief Scientist for Human Resources for the U.S. Air Force, and former APA Executive Director for Science) moderated the panel and offered a vision for future human-centered research within the military.

PPO staff will continue to advocate both for appropriate funding of psychological research within the Department of Defense and for the translation of relevant research into more effective technology, operations and personnel/family programs within the military. Bringing our members’ research expertise to bear on the federal policy process is our most effective tool, and we expect this group of military psychologists to play a critical role. ■

## EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S COLUMN

KURT SALZINGER, Executive Director for Science

### Humpty Dumpty is Alive and Well, Living in the Psychological Literature

Since the beginning of my time in the Science Directorate at the APA, I have been urging psychologists to communicate our findings and to explicate the principles of behavior that we have validated. Now that we are communicating, I realize that I forgot to mention that we have to communicate clearly. We often take words with everyday meaning and assign them specific, that is, limited meaning, overlooking the fact that laypeople respond to the surplus and not the restricted meaning. Although not slavishly adhering to Bridgman's concept of the operational definition, we nevertheless communicate in our own (let's face it) idiosyncratic manner whether we do so with our colleagues or the public at large.

Thus we use everyday words, following the Humpty Dumpty prescription in which he contends that the meaning of a given word is a question of "which is to be master . . . When I use a word, it means just what I choose it to mean -- neither more nor less." The problem is that while this approach may be amusing in a children's book, it does not help in communicating with the wide world outside. There is another problem, of course, with common words. Lay people have well ingrained associations that often differ from those of the particular scientist employing the word in question. Thus, when we say "psychological analysis," the public assumes that we are talking about Freud, psychopathology and symptoms, when we are try-



ing to describe the psychological motivation of an individual or individuals having a common behavioral trait or belonging to a particular group. Such problems are multiplied in effect when we encourage press releases that translate our findings into less technical language than the guarded statistically defended statements of our articles. Sometimes, when we discuss our findings in response to criticisms that we receive in our journals, we leave our precise words even there, to make a point more dramatically, assuming that our colleagues will better understand. We assume they will realize that we are exaggerating only to bring the point home, not that we literally mean what we say in our less than scientifically exact statement. In sum, as a result of succeeding to make public our work, we court the danger of arousing the ire of columnists and members of Congress who take a less than sympathetic view of our nonscientific statements.

When a physicist talks about quarks, nobody is offended because the associations of the laypersons do not impinge on their understanding of physics or perhaps more importantly most people do

not believe that their associations to that term bear any relationship to physics. On the other hand, when psychologists use words such as "conservative" or "closed minded" every layperson "knows" their meaning no matter what nuanced meaning we have assigned to it. I suspect that I am a member of an ever-smaller number of psychologists who continues to eschew such four-letter words as "mind" even though I do understand (I think) what general area of functioning psychologists are referring to when they employ that word.

I continue to believe that the use of such vague words pose a danger to our science but this may not be the place to argue that point. The now recognized greater danger is the fact that laypeople understand such words in ways that we psychologists often do not mean. As those of you who have been reading my columns know, I have been urging our members to write op ed pieces. (Go to [www.apa.org/science](http://www.apa.org/science) for more information on preparing them and to see other op ed pieces.) It's just that I now wish to caution us when interacting with the public that we do so as carefully as when we prepare our papers for a scientific audience. ■

3

Visit our Op-Ed Page at  
[www.apa.org/science/editorial.html](http://www.apa.org/science/editorial.html)

# An Interesting Career in Psychology: A Technology Consultant in the Telecommunication Industry

by Yihsiu Chen, AT&T Labs

4 **O**ne of the hardest questions that I ever had to answer was, "What's a Psychology PhD like you doing in AT&T Labs?" The question may be easy for many of my colleagues who specialize in Human Computer Interaction (HCI), a field in which I also proclaim to have a good deal of knowledge and experience. HCI happens to be the favorite part of my job description, although system engineering, market research, and even advertising share the crowded space of my daily work as a technology consultant. As much as I draw upon my academic training to do my job, the corporate wonderland never ceases to amaze me with what I need to do on my next assignment.

I would like to say that the whole transition was made when I took this job after graduate school, but a part of me wonders if I always liked to cross the line and play outside the box. Growing up in Taiwan, a society rooted in Chinese culture but also infused with Japanese and Western influence, I watched Three's Company (farewell, John Ritter) and read Manga while I was not studying Confucius. It was an easy decision for me to come to the U.S. to pursue a post-graduate education. I completed my degree at Columbia University, studying social psychology of human communications. Where else but New York City could satiate my appetite for multicultural fulfillment?

Throughout my education, I always enjoyed teaching and research, and believed that I would one day become a professor who writes journal articles rather than multimedia simulation programs (which I did as a graduate student just to put the experiment together). Little did I know that I was preparing myself for an alternative line of work. When I started to look beyond my dissertation and into the job market, a friend of mine invited me to visit her lab of HCI at Bellcore (now Telcordia). I fell in love with the multidisciplinary

field immediately and accepted an offer from AT&T Labs to be a user interface engineer. My first project was a multimedia CD ROM, not that different from the program I did for my dissertation experiment, and it came with a real salary too. The only hard part was that I had to leave academia. The decision had an impact on my identity, and my career objective that was once as clear as daylight suddenly became dim and fuzzy - where was the tenure?

Come to think of it, defining a career objective was the most challenging thing that I have ever had to do for myself. In my effort to do so, I had the pleasure to observe the careers of many colleagues. Many were able to maintain their identity and academic interests as a psychologist with an expertise in HCI; others had redefined their careers into one of a system engineer, a project manager, or even a director of large organizations. The common theme behind all of their experiences is that it really is a balancing act; in a non-academic environment, there are non-academic considerations.

The fact of the matter is: today's R&D environment in the telecomm industry is tightly aligned with the corporate business, and I was able to align my skills and contributions tightly with my job requirements. Surprisingly, there never seemed to be a shortage of what a Psychology PhD could do to make a contribution. My career started as a user experience engineer who designed and evaluated user interfaces (UI) of software applications. My knowledge in cognitive psychology and scientific training made it easy for me to identify potential problems in UI and to conduct field experiments and usability testing. A year later I became a member of a small team dedicated to prototype innovative communication services. I got to design the "out-of-package" customer experience for trial users who test our services, which involves software, web and system designs. The size of the team al-

lowed it to move fast and turn around features in short time frames; it also demanded multiple skills from each member, as there were more tasks to perform than team members to perform them. I became the interface to our customers through many PR activities such as producing demo videos. On top of my academic training, I learned new skills and knowledge on every assignment.

In recent years my work has shifted toward market research and something I call "market intelligence". As the technological landscape shifts, many of our customers are trying to understand the new technologies we need to understand the marketplace of technological innovations. My training in psychology comes in handy. I have designed and conducted large-scale surveys, focus groups, and in-depth interviews to understand business customers' view on Voice-over-IP technologies and their future infrastructure. My ability to analyze these findings along with secondary market research reports has helped me 'gist' this information into knowledge that helps other team members. In the meantime, part of my job continues to be UI design and usability. Talk about a multicultural environment.

I wish I could say that I've got this game all figured out, but truth be told, my career path has not fully unfolded, and my next job may really surprise me. Although the academic in me doesn't always make it easy to be in a corporate environment, it is a defining element of who I am and what I do. Even Alice could use a campus in wonderland. ■

## Ranking Graduate Programs in Psychology: APA Works for You Behind the Scenes...

by Merry Bullock, Associate Executive Director for Science

**Y**ou hear a lot about APA's initiatives to advance science and education programs within psychology, and you hear a lot about APA's activities to advance psychological science's vital interests in the national agenda. You are less likely to hear about APA's "behind-the-scenes" efforts in science, education and advocacy arenas. Yet it is often these efforts that accomplish important and long term goals for the discipline. In this behind the scenes role, APA does many things – it monitors, provides information, serves as a conduit and catalyst, and sometimes as a friendly curmudgeon in attempting to be sure that psychology is well represented. One recent example is an upcoming activity to evaluate and rank graduate research programs, and APA's activities to ensure that how psychology graduate programs are counted and evaluated accurately captures and reflects the discipline.

The National Research Council (NRC) of the National Academy of Sciences publishes reports assessing research doctorate programs across the United States. The first, landmark report was in 1982 (Jones, Lindzey, Coggeshall, 1982), and has been followed with periodic surveys of factors contributing to graduate program quality. The most recent was completed nearly a decade ago (Goldberger, Maher, and Flatteau, 1995).

These surveys are important – although not as well known or popular as the US News and World Reports of college programs, they are used in much the same way – to rank and rate graduate programs across diverse science fields. When the last survey was done, many complained that Psychology was not well represented – because clinical programs and other applied programs were not included in the evaluations, nor were emerging programs such as cognitive science.

During the last year, the NRC has been

preparing for the next survey, to be conducted in 2005. The preparation has been carried out by a committee named "Committee to Examine the Methodology for the Assessment of Research Doctorate Programs" under the aegis of the NRC Board of Higher Education and Workforce. This committee has focused largely on issues of survey methodology, as its name implies, and on identifying the emerging fields and subfields of doctoral education and research (Brainard, 2003).

One of the issues before the committee was to come up with a list/taxonomy of fields and subfields that would be sampled in the survey. There was well-founded concern that psychology would not be appropriately represented. Psychology does, of course, present the committee with problem cases, and is somewhat of an anomaly among learned disciplines because of its breadth. Under the name "psychology" doctoral programs are distributed throughout many different university colleges or schools (e.g., arts and sciences, education, medicine, and engineering). In addition, there are both research (PhD) and professional (PsyD) doctoral degrees called "psychology". This means that identifying the rubric for finding all and only research programs is a complex task. There was concern that the committee would solve this task by adopting an overly restrictive definition of what programs would be assessed (e.g., largely omitting applied programs or programs in clinical psychology).

Late in 2002, APA staff (Merry Bullock, Science Directorate and Paul Nelson, Education Directorate) met with NRC senior staff to the committee responsible for developing the methodology and design of the 2005 survey, Charlotte Kuh and James Voytuk. One of the reasons for this meeting was to express APA's interest in the evaluation process and to address ways to identify psychology graduate research programs for their

committee's taxonomy of sub-fields across the various science disciplines. At this early stage in the process, the sub-fields of psychology selected for study were limited and not in keeping with developments in the discipline, including newer interdisciplinary subfields (e.g., cognitive science) or applied subfields (e.g., I/O, clinical). In fact, the early drafts of the taxonomy listed only three areas under psychology.

As one of the outcomes of this first meeting, APA staff suggested mechanisms for identifying research doctoral programs, and provided demographic information about numbers of new doctorates across major psychology sub-fields to assist the development of taxonomy categories. APA staff also facilitated discussion between the NRC staff and the Council of Graduate Departments of Psychology (COGDOP) at COGDOP's 2003 annual meeting. At that meeting the NRC staff presented an overview of the NRC survey plans and received feedback from the graduate department chairs. After considerable discussion (and vigilance from APA staff, APA members and others) the NRC committee now lists more of those fields recommended for inclusion as sub-fields. More importantly, the committee is actively soliciting feedback on their taxonomy. Please see the committee's website at [http://www7.nationalacademies.org/resdoc/Draft\\_Taxonomy.html](http://www7.nationalacademies.org/resdoc/Draft_Taxonomy.html) for a summary of activities and the draft taxonomy of disciplinary subfields. Some sub-fields are still not represented in the survey taxonomy. One reason for this is that the survey will not tap doctoral programs with small numbers of graduates or graduate programs that are not located in psychology departments within colleges of arts and sciences.

The survey itself will begin in 2005. APA will continue to monitor its

...continued on next page

...Ranking, continued from page 5

progress and provide input as necessary, often “behind the scenes” from staff to staff. We welcome your input and concerns. ■

## References

Brainard, J. (2003). Survey of doctoral programs needs major changes, panel suggests. *The Chronicle of Higher Education*, January 10, p. A-10).

Goldberger, M.L., Maher, B.A., and Flatteau, P.E. (Eds.) (1995). *Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States: Continuity and Change*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

Jones, L.V., Lindzey, G., and Coggeshall, P.E. (1982). *An Assessment of Research-Doctorate Programs in the United States*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.

## Veteran Psychologists and Clinical Science in the 1950s

by Wade E. Pickren, PhD. APA Historian and Director of Archives

Many WWII veterans were interested in psychology as a result of their wartime experiences and the GI Bill (Soldiers' Readjustment Act of 1944) provided financial subsistence for both undergraduate and graduate education of these veterans. Concurrently, the large number of World War II veterans who needed continued medical and psychological care after military discharge prompted the VA to initiate large scale training programs in four mental health disciplines: psychiatry, psychiatric nursing, clinical social work, and clinical psychology. The impact of this program on clinical psychology was enormous and can hardly be overstated. The VA, with consultation from prominent psychologists such as George A. Kelly and in agree-

ment with APA, made the doctorate the entry-level degree for clinical psychology. This decision, in conjunction with the desire of the recently created National Institute of Mental Health to foster mental health research and increase the number of mental health professionals, led to the adoption of the scientist-practitioner (Boulder) model of clinical psychology in 1949.

Of more immediate practical value to graduate students, the VA provided training stipends in return for a set number of work hours in a VA setting. The VA benefitted by having an increasingly well-trained professional work force that more nearly approximated its needs for patient care. Although the VA did not require clinical psychology trainees to commit to postdoctoral service, many trainees did remain with the VA. It is in this context that VA psychologists parlayed their training as scientists into meaningful clinical research.

I use 1953 as the reference year, because by this time the first wave of VA clinical psychology trainees had completed their training. In 1953, the VA had 109 general hospitals, 21 tuberculosis hospitals, 38 neuropsychiatric hospitals, and 63 mental hygiene clinics. In addition, the VA operated 17 domiciliaries, or old soldiers homes. The patient population was large, with neuropsychiatric cases taking approximately 60 percent of the hospital beds. Psychologists were expected to provide some aspects of patient care, especially group psychotherapy. More typically, psychologists provided diagnostic and assessment services. While their results were useful in sorting patients, psychologists also used the collected data as research resources. An example of this can be found in the extensive publication record of Maurice Lorr, then chief of neuropsychiatric research in the VA central office. Lorr was a sophisticated psychometrician who developed the POMS (Profile of Mood States), the IMPS (Inpatient Multidimensional Psychiatric Scale), the Multidimensional Scale for Rating Psychiatric Patients (MSRPP), and many others. Patient management was often the target of this kind of research.

One of the major research innovations of the VA was the “cooperative study”. In cooperative studies, a common research protocol was shared by as many hospitals as wished to collaborate. The advantages were a very large patient pool, huge data sets, and a fair amount of statistical power in the analysis. Like all large studies, there were problems, including some inconsistency in following the protocol. The first cooperative studies were among the tuberculosis hospitals. A chief medical concern was what was called, “irregular discharge,” which referred to patients leaving the hospital before they were completely well. Psychologists like Robert Barrell and Claire Vernier were among the leaders of this research. A cooperative study on prefrontal lobotomy was conducted in the 1950s among a small group of VA hospitals. The study was later transferred to the Central Neuropsychiatric Research Laboratory at Perry Point, Maryland.

It was at the Perry Point laboratory that the most ambitious of the cooperative studies was coordinated. Begun in 1956, the VA Cooperative Studies in Psychiatry were large scale studies of what was then called chemotherapy, now termed pharmacotherapy or psychopharmacology. Numerous projects on the psychological effects of various drug treatments were conducted, all using a common protocol devised by the study's Executive Committee. Psychologists Jack Lasky and James Klett were the early research directors and numerous psychologists at many VA hospitals were involved. Typically, the main research questions were devised by the Executive Committee, made up of psychiatrists and psychologists. The research design and methodology were the responsibility of the psychologists. Utilizing their scientific training in the Boulder model, psychologists were expert at these tasks and the statistics necessary to analyze the massive data sets.

The Psychiatric Evaluation Project, headed by psychologist Lee Gurel,

...continued on page 7

...*Veteran, continued from page 6*

evaluated the effects of different types of treatment settings on patient outcomes. The initial PEP project was to measure hospital effectiveness. Patients were followed for several years, with the intent that treatment outcomes would provide guidance on how to make VA hospitals more effective. This led to more complex cooperative studies over the years and evolved into an in-house evaluation program. In all of these cooperative studies, psychologists were allowed to pursue spin-off projects. The contributions of VA psychologists added greatly to the clinical science literature of the 1950s and 1960s. ■

## National Advisory Committee Meeting Held October 8-9 at the American Sociological Association

by Jessica Bryant,  
Special Projects Associate

The annual National Advisory Committee meeting was held on October 8-9 at the American Sociological Association. The committee is comprised of a panel of distinguished scientists spanning the behavioral and social science disciplines who guide the Decade, laying the basic framework for Decade programs and overseeing their progress. During the meeting the committee selected three individuals as the Decade of Behavior Distinguished Lecture Program awardees and two scientists to receive the 2004 Decade of Behavior Research Award for Health.

**Distinguished Lecture awardees are:** Jeffrey Sachs, nominated by the Association of American Geographers

Janet Norwood, nominated by the American Educational Research Association.

Amartya Sen, nominated by the American Political Science Association. These individuals were selected because their research stretches beyond the boundaries of traditional disciplinary focus and highlights the importance of a multidisciplinary approach to societal concerns.

### 2004 Research Award Recipients:

David Dinges, nominated by The Federation of Behavioral, Psychological, and Cognitive Sciences  
David Williams, nominated by the American Sociological Association  
This award recognizes excellence in the behavioral and social sciences for research that has impacted policy or has made other concrete contributions to solving social problems. ■

## APA Helps Bring Psychological Science to Education

APA recently won a grant to provide postdoctoral fellowships to encourage psychological science in education. The 2 million dollar award, from the Institute of Education Sciences, is to create the "American Psychological Association/Institute of Educational Sciences Postdoctoral Education Research Training Program (APA/IES PERT)." The goal of the program is to increase cutting edge psychological science research in school-based teaching, learning and achievement. To do this, the program will provide postdoctoral fellowships for psychology researchers to work with mentors who have substantial expertise and experience in school-based research. During the fellowship period, researchers will design and conduct school-based education research – including learning the pragmatics of conducting school-

based research, such as scaling up in size, matching research questions to curriculum issues, addressing



evaluation research on education interventions, and addressing issues in teacher recruitment, teacher preparation, and teacher development. Fellows will also participate activities focused on translating research into practice, promoting career socialization, building a community of APA/IES scholars, and developing interest in education sciences throughout the graduate education pipeline in psychology.

Gaining this award is a positive step in long-standing APA initiatives to bring psychological science to education and to equip psychology researchers to take the research into the school system. The fellowships will be awarded for up to 2 years with an annual stipend of \$55,000. In addition to research, fellows will attend a 2-day orientation conference and will participate in annual mini-institutes organized and conducted by the Education and Science Directorates that bring other APA/IES fellows, mentors, and advisory panel members together. For more information, please see [http://www.apa.org/ed/cpse/ies\\_pert\\_Info.html](http://www.apa.org/ed/cpse/ies_pert_Info.html). ■

**SCIENCE DIRECTORATE STAFF**

Kurt Salzinger, *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*  
 Dianne Brown Maranto, *Dir. for Psychology in the Workplace*  
 Deborah McCall, *Science Programs Manager*  
 Sangeeta Panicker, *Research Ethics Officer*  
 Brett Pelham, *Senior Scientist*  
 Wesley Pinkney, *Senior Secretary*  
 Oyana Stewart, *Administrative Assistant*  
 Jonathan Tin, *Science Programs Associate*  
 Kymberly Thornton, *Receptionist*  
 Suzanne S. Wandersman, *Director for Governance Affairs*

**PUBLIC POLICY OFFICE STAFF**

Ellen Garrison, *Director for Public Interest Policy*  
 Nina Gail Levitt, *Director for Education Policy*  
 Geoff Mumford, *Director for Science Policy*  
 Deborah Cotter, *Legislative Assistant for Public Interest Policy*  
 Daniel Dodgen, *Sen. Legislative and Fed. Aff. Officer*  
 Lori Valencia Greene, *Sen. Legislative and Fed. Aff. Officer*  
 Heather O'Beime Kelly, *Sen. Leg. and Fed. Aff. Officer*  
 Patricia C. Kobor, *Senior Science Policy Analyst*  
 Jeff J. McIntyre, *Legislative and Federal Affairs Officer*  
 Jennifer Beard Smulson, *Legislative and Federal Affairs Officer*  
 Karen Studwell, *Legislative and Federal Affairs Officer*  
 Eva C. Vega, *Executive Associate*  
 Alison Wilkins, *Administrative Assistant*

**APA WORLD WIDE WEBSITE:** [www.apa.org/science](http://www.apa.org/science)  
**GENERAL SCIENCE DIRECTORATE E-MAIL 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 23,000 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)  
 David Barlow  
 Linda M. Bartoshuk  
 Gwyneth M. Boodoo  
 Marilyn E. Carroll  
 Jacquelynne E. Eccles  
 Jo-Ida Hansen  
 Roberta Klatzky  
 Harry T. Rels

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR SCIENCE**  
 Kurt Salzinger

**CHIEF SCIENCE ADVISOR**  
 Gordon H. Bower

**EXECUTIVE EDITOR**  
 Virginia E. Holt

**EDITOR,**  
**PSYCHOLOGICAL SCIENCE AGENDA**  
 Amena S. Hassan



AMERICAN  
 PSYCHOLOGICAL  
 ASSOCIATION

**SCIENCE DIRECTORATE**  
 750 FIRST STREET NE  
 WASHINGTON, DC 20002-4242  
 (202) 336-6000  
 (202) 336-6123 TDD

NON-PROFIT  
 U.S. POSTAGE  
 PAID  
 WASHINGTON, DC  
 PERMIT #6348