

# The Psychological Science Agenda



A PUBLICATION OF THE AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION SCIENCE DIRECTORATE  
 VOLUME 20, NUMBER 2, FEBRUARY 2006  
<http://www.apa.org/science/psa/homepage.html>



## Bush Administration's Proposed Budget May Well Leave Some Scientists Behind

by Karen Studwell

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

Executive Director's Column: Growth for Science	3
Science Brief: Enhancing Motivation in Sports	4
Taking Human Effectiveness Research to New Heights: APA Science Visits Nellis Air Force Base	7
Friends of NIDA meet with Scientific Advisory Board	8
APA Recruits New Science Advocates at SPSP	8
Distinguished Scientist Lecturers to Speak at 2006 Regional Meetings	9
NIH Looks to the Future and Unveils Program to Support New Scientists	13

On February 6<sup>th</sup>, the Bush Administration released its budget for Fiscal Year 2007 (FY07), which called for level funding or budget cuts for most agencies responsible for funding scientific research. Reflecting the President's priorities for the coming year, including boosting the nation's investment in basic science, the budget also includes some modest increases for a few science agencies in FY07.

Following on the heels of the first budget cut for the National Institutes of Health (NIH) in nearly 35 years, the President's budget provides for no increase for NIH in FY07 and its budget would remain flat at \$28.6 billion. When inflation is factored in, as measured by the Biomedical Research and Development Price Index (BRDPI), the result is close to a 4.1 percent cut for FY 2007. Every institute except the National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases (NIAID), which received additional resources to fund avian flu and bioterrorism research, would receive slight budget cuts, including \$9 million from National Institute of Mental Health, \$5 million from the National Institute on Drug Abuse, \$7 million from the National Institute on Child Health and Human Development (NICHD), and \$40 million from the National Cancer Institute (NCI).

Another casualty in the President's budget is the proposed National Children's Study (NCS), which has been



in the planning stages for five years. NICHD is the lead agency for the study, but language accompanying its budget indicated that there were no funds in the FY07 budget to continue to pursue implementation of the full study. While planning will continue throughout FY06, an additional \$57 million is needed for the study to begin implementation in FY07.

Striking a positive note for basic science, the National Science Foundation (NSF), which received a small increase in its FY06 funding level, fared uncommonly well in the President's FY07 proposed budget (a 7.9% increase for a total of \$6.02 billion). This is in part because of its physical sciences portfolio, an area of science singled out for increased support by the Administration this year. The increase would be spread across the NSF directorates in terms of percentage increases, resulting in a 6.9% increase (to \$213.7 million) for the Social, Behavioral and Economic Sciences

*Continued on next page...*

Directorate, the primary source of NSF funding for psychological research.

Within the Department of Defense (DoD), the President proposed \$11.08 billion in total support for basic and applied research within the FY07 science and technology account, approximately \$2 billion and 16.3% less than the amount appropriated in FY06. At this point, it is unclear how much support psychological research is slated to receive within this overall account.

2 After years of basically flat budgets, the Department of Veterans Affairs' (VA) FY06 medical and prosthetic research account finally got an increase to \$412 million. Congress went further and dictated that the mental health research budget be doubled within that larger account. Disappointingly, the President's proposed budget for FY07 included only \$399 million for VA research.

Within the Department of Homeland Security, funding for research and development increased by 3.1 percent for FY06. The Center for the Study of High Consequence Event Preparedness and Response, the fifth University-based Center of Excellence, was awarded to Johns Hopkins University. One hundred twenty-nine new Scholars and Fellows were named, thirty percent of who were psychology or other social science majors. But new leadership for the department brings a new set of priorities, and while Secretary Chertoff is focused on border security and Weapons of Mass Destruction, new behavioral science staff are committed to involving psychologists at many levels in the implementation of the DHS R&D portfolio. Having said that, the recent resignation of Charles McQueary, head of the Science and Technology Directorate, and a proposed 5.6% cut in R&D at the DHS for FY '07 suggest an uncertain future for research in the department.

Within the Department of Education, the proposed budget for research, development and dissemination at the

Institute of Education Sciences is equal to its FY 2006 appropriation of \$162.6 million. Likewise, the National Center on Special Education Research would receive level funding of \$71 million. The Administration proposed a slight increase of \$3 million for the National Center for Education Statistics (NCES), which would allow it to begin a new secondary longitudinal study of the educational experiences of middle and high school students. Also within the Department of Education, the National Institute on Disability and Rehabilitation Research (NIDRR) is slated to receive level funding of \$106.5 million.

The President's Budget is only the first step in a year long process to fund the federal government. In the coming weeks, the House and Senate will each develop their own congressional budget resolutions, which will serve as

blueprints for the appropriations committees that fund these agencies. As the process moves forward, APA's Science Policy Office will work with Congress to enhance federal support for behavioral research and to educate Members about the importance of these critical research programs.

To view the President's budget, please go to:  
<http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/budget/fy2007/>

To read the National Institutes of Health budget, please go to:  
<http://officeofbudget.od.nih.gov/pdf/Press%20info%20final.pdf>

## Chun, Rieke Selected for Troland Award

The prestigious Troland Awards, granted annually by the National Academy of Sciences, will be presented on April 23 to Marvin M. Chun and Frederick M. Rieke. Chun and Rieke will receive their awards at the 143rd Annual Meeting of the Academies.

Chun and Rieke, each recognized for their unusual achievement within the broad spectrum of experimental psychology, will receive research grants of \$50,000 to further their research.

Chun is professor of psychology, interdepartmental neuroscience program and cognitive science program, Yale University. Chun was chosen "for creative use of behavioral, brain-imaging, and neuropsychological evidence to elucidate the interplay of conscious and unconscious processes in perception, memory, and learning."

Rieke is a Howard Hughes Medical Institute investigator and associate professor, department of physiology and biophysics, University of Washington. Rieke was selected "for experimental and theoretical analyses of information coding in the central nervous system and its relation to perception."

The Troland Research Awards were established by a bequest from Leonard T. Troland and have been presented since 1984. Visit [http://www.nasonline.org/site/PageServer?pagename=AWARDS\\_troland](http://www.nasonline.org/site/PageServer?pagename=AWARDS_troland) for a complete listing of recipients.

## EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S COLUMN

STEVEN BRECKLER, Executive Director for Science

## Growth for Science

In his State of the Union Address, President Bush last month proposed a new "American Competitiveness Initiative" aimed at increasing investments in basic physical science and engineering research. As part of this initiative, the NSF budget would double over the next 10 years.

It is always good news when the White House and congressional leaders talk about spending more money for science. President Bush got it right when he said that "our greatest advantage in the world has always been our educated, hardworking, ambitious people..." It was on this premise that he proposed the new initiative "to encourage innovation throughout our economy and to give our nation's children a firm grounding in math and science."

Most of us agree with the President that our best (perhaps our only) hope for cleaner energy sources and lowered dependence on oil depends on a significant investment in science and technology. Generally, it is true that much of the nation's economic strength derives from scientific advances of the past century.

Yet, as important as the President's new initiative is, I fear that it is too narrowly conceived. In many respects, it misses the boat entirely. For example, in a February 8 editorial, the Washington Post comments that "Mr. Bush's reasonable enthusiasm for the physical sciences should not come at the expense of the biological sciences." The Washington Post points out that trading an increased investment in some fields of science by cutting the investment in others is "a dumb trade-off."



Indeed it is. And it is not just the biological sciences that could suffer. Funding for research in the social, behavioral, and economic sciences could also be diverted to basic physical science and engineering research. This would be a tragedy – not because "our" fields of science would suffer, but because the science our nation needs most urgently would suffer.

We do face an energy crisis, along with a myriad of other challenges for which the physical sciences and engineering may offer the solutions. We also face other crises – crises for which the physical sciences and engineering will never provide insight: Understanding the dynamics of drug use and addiction, getting at the underpinnings of cultural and interpersonal conflict, designing new technologies with the human user in mind, and learning how to promote positive mental health and treat mental illness. These challenges (among others) will not be resolved if we invest all of our resources in physical science, engineering, or biology. Our only hope relies on also ramping up the investment in social, behavioral, and cognitive science.

Even the President recognizes the challenge. He said that "we need to encourage children to take more math and science..." To do that is going to require a better understanding of human motivation, emotion, cognition, and generally how people learn. We will not succeed if our education policy fails to incorporate what social, behavioral, and cognitive science can teach us in these areas. To succeed, the President's own initiative will depend on fields of science that reach beyond physical science and engineering.

The numbers we are seeing in the President's 2007 fiscal year budget, at least for NSF, appear to reflect a deeper appreciation for all fields of science. The budget for social, behavioral, and economic sciences would increase in roughly the same proportion as that for physical sciences. Let's hope that this is the real path the President intends to follow as the NSF budget is doubled over the next 10 years. If it is, then we all win.

## SCIENCE BRIEFS

# Enhancing Motivation in Sports

by: David E. Conroy



David E. Conroy is an Associate Professor of Kinesiology at The Pennsylvania State University. He earned his PhD from the University of Utah. His research focuses on interpersonal and intrapersonal influences on achievement motivation and has been supported by the National Institute of Mental Health and the National Institute of Child Health & Human Development. Conroy received the Prince de Merode Prize for Behavioral Research from the International Olympic Committee in 2002, and the Association for the Advancement of Applied Sport Psychology's Dorothy V. Harris Memorial Award for early career excellence in sport psychology research in 2004.

With the Torino Olympic Games underway, the sports world will be in the spotlight for much of this month. Psychologists have been supporting the U.S. Olympic mission formally since the 1980s and a team of sport psychologists will be on-hand in Italy this month to continue the work they have been doing for the past 4 years with some of the country's finest athletes.<sup>1</sup> As important as performance enhancement can be for elite athletes, it is only a small piece of how psychologists are contributing to the world of sport. Millions of youth participate in organized sports annually in the United States (Ewing & Seefeldt, 2002) and another interesting line of inquiry in sport psychology focuses on how organized sport experiences can be used to foster optimal motivation. Enhancing motivation can lead to the sustained, high-quality engagement in sport that is required for the development of Olympic-level expertise (Ericsson, Krampe, Tesch-Römer, 1993) and it may also contribute to healthy youth development which will be the focus of this essay.<sup>2</sup>

## The Value of Youth Sport Participation

One of the most powerful rationales for promoting youth sport participation draws from the documented

benefits of physical activity. The United States Surgeon General (USDHHS, 1996) and the American College of Sports Medicine (2000) endorse regular physical activity to reduce long-term risk for disease (e.g., diabetes, cardiovascular disease, some forms of cancer). Strikingly, the prevalence of diseases such as type-II diabetes recently increased dramatically in children and youth (Ludwig & Ebbeling, 2001). This increase is widely attributed to concurrent increases in childhood obesity (Ebbeling, Pawlak, & Ludwig, 2002). Overweight status among children and adolescents in the United States has more than tripled in the past 25 years (Baskin, Ard, Franklin, & Allison, 2005; Flegal, 2005).

Given the nature of energy balance (i.e., caloric intake vs. energy expenditure), increasing youth physical activity will surely be one part of the solution to the current childhood obesity crisis. Unfortunately, daily physical activity is being cut out of school curricula across the country (Jago & Baranowski, 2004). The greatest single source of organized youth sport participation appears to be recreational sport programs, such as those sponsored by community

recreation departments (Ewing & Seefeldt, 2002); but it is well-established that youth sport participation rates experience a steady decline starting between ages 10-13 years (Brustad, Babkes, & Smith, 2001). Getting and keeping youth involved in organized sport programs outside of school is a motivation problem of great importance for public health. Of course, physical activity and its benefits for physical health represent only one class of youth sport outcomes.

Sport is also a powerful context for youth psychosocial development. Youths' subjective experience during organized sports and other structured voluntary activities is unique because they report greater concentration than they do when playing with friends in unstructured settings, and greater enjoyment than they do in structured activities such as school (Cziksenti-mihalyi & Larson, 1984; Kirshnit, Ham, & Richards, 1989). These conditions are ideally-suited for social learning and internalizing environmental characteristics.

Notwithstanding a few undesirable correlates (e.g., reported alcohol use, getting drunk, perceiving aggressive behavior to be more legitimate; Barber, Eccles, & Stone,

continued on next page...

...continued from previous page

2001; Conroy, Silva, Newcomer, Walker, & Johnson, 2001; Eccles & Barber, 1999), the available evidence suggests a generally positive profile of correlates associated with youth sport participation. Compared to non-athletes, high school athletes report greater liking of school, are less likely to dropout, have higher grade point averages, are more likely to attend college, are less socially-isolated, attain greater occupational success, and have greater increases in self-esteem through high school (Barber, Eccles, & Stone, 2001; Eccles & Barber, 1999; Mahoney & Cairns, 1997; Marsh & Kleitman, 2003).

On balance, youth sport participation seems to be a positive developmental experience; however, it seems apparent that not all youth sport programs are equal with respect to their developmental yield for youth. Many factors are likely to play a role in determining the quality of a youth sport experience (cf., National Research Council and Institute of Medicine, 2002). My colleagues and I are among a group of scientists who focus on the role that coaches play in determining the developmental yield of youth sport participation (for a broader model of youth development in sport, see Petitpas, Cornelius, Van Raalte, & Jones, 2005).

### The Importance of Youth Sport Coaches

Behavior observation research has provided compelling evidence that coaching behaviors influence the quality of youth sport experiences. In one study, youth reported greater liking for basketball when their coaches exhibited high levels of mistake-contingent technical instruction, and low levels of keeping control and general encouragement (Smith, Zane, Smoll, & Coppel, 1983). Similarly, youth evaluated their coaches more positively when the coaches exhibited high levels of instructive (e.g., general

and mistake-contingent technical instruction) and supportive (e.g., reinforcement, mistake-contingent encouragement) behaviors, and low



levels of punishment (Smith et al., 1983; Smith & Smoll, 1990). Interestingly, Smith and Smoll (1990) also found that youth self-esteem at the beginning of the season moderated the effects of coach behavior on youth evaluations – low self-esteem athletes' evaluations of coaches seem to be especially influenced by the coaches use of the desirable coaching behaviors described above. Clearly, what coaches do impacts how youth evaluate those coaches and the activities that are organized by those coaches.

Beyond a specific behavioral repertoire, coaches are able to create motivational climates by the way they choose to structure the setting. To illustrate the role of coaching climates on young athletes' sport experience, consider a recent study of female and male recreational swim league participants aged 8 – 18 years (Conroy, Kaye, & Coatsworth, in press). In this study, we were interested in whether and how the perceived coaching climate predicted changes in youths' reasons for swimming. Youth completed measures of their situational motivation (i.e., their reasons for swimming) at the beginning, middle, and end of the season. At the beginning and end of season, youth also rated their achievement goals. Achievement goals represent the purpose or aim of their achievement behavior. We employed Elliot's (1999)

2×2 model of achievement goals that distinguishes four goals based on their *definition of competence* (i.e., task- or self-referenced criteria vs. normatively-referenced criteria) and the *valence of the goal* (i.e., approaching competence vs. avoiding incompetence). At the end of the swim season, youth rated their perceptions of the coaching climate – that is, the degree to which youth perceived the coaches as emphasizing each of the four achievement goals when evaluating the youths' competence.

Results indicated that youth perceptions of avoidance coaching climates positively predicted approximately 40% of the change in youths' corresponding avoidance achievement goals during the season. Additionally, to the extent that youth increased their focus on avoiding self-referenced incompetence (e.g., not performing worse than they previously performed), they described their reasons for swimming as being more externally regulated (i.e., done to satisfy external demands, such as parents' directives) and more amotivated (i.e., done without a clear purpose in mind). Thus, avoidance coaching climates in swimming appear to be linked with deterioration in the self-determination of young swimmers' motivation.

The studies described above illustrate the emerging conclusion from this literature – coaches may influence youth motivation both through their observed behaviors and the motivational climate they create. Similar to the literature on developmental correlates of youth sport participation, evidence for coaching effects on youth sport motivation is based largely on non-experimental research that does not permit strong causal inferences. For this reason, a number of researchers in this area have turned to experimental designs to test their hypotheses about the critical factors for optimizing youth sport experiences.

continued on next page...

The seminal coach training efficacy trials involved Coach Effectiveness Training (CET; Smith, Smoll, & Curtis, 1979). This program focused on teaching coaches a behavioral repertoire and philosophy of winning based on some of the behavioral research reviewed above (for additional details, see Smoll & Smith, 2002). This behavioral repertoire is designed to enhance youth perceptions and recall of coaches, and ultimately youth evaluative reactions in the sport setting (Smoll & Smith, 2002). To accommodate recent theoretical developments and emerging research findings, my collaborator and I have posited that coach training programs may influence youth motivation (and ultimately some important indicators of youth development) via a sequence of cascading changes in (a) coaches observed behaviors and activity structures, (b) youth perceptions of coaches behaviors and the coaching climate, and (c) youth self-perceptions (Conroy & Coatsworth, 2006). This model provides a framework for evaluating the experimental coach training literature (unless otherwise specified, this brief review includes studies employing various psychosocially-based coach training programs).

First, it appears that some coach behaviors may be modified by brief training programs. Specifically, coaches' use of reinforcement following desirable behaviors appears to be the behavior most amenable to change following training (Conroy & Coatsworth, 2004; Rushall & Smith, 1979; Smith et al., 1979). Other theoretically-important behaviors may be sufficiently well-engrained that they are resistant to modification or infrequent enough to escape detection of modest changes in their base rates. Second, athletes evaluate CET-trained coaches more positively than non-CET-trained coaches (Smith et al., 1979; Smith et al., 1995; Smoll et al., 1993). These findings are based on post-training differences in youth perceptions of coach behaviors; it will be important to determine whether randomly-assigned coach training

programs can account for *changes* in youth perceptions of coaches.

One of the most consistent findings from this literature concerns the effects of coach training on youth self-perceptions. Psychosocial coach training programs have led to increases in self-esteem for low self-esteem youth (Coatsworth & Conroy, 2006; Smoll et al., 1993). It is worth noting that these self-esteem enhancement effects for low self-esteem youth are significantly larger when coaches and youth are homogeneous as opposed to heterogeneous with respect to biological sex. Finally, experimental investigations of the effects of coach training on youth motivation are scarce in the literature. The most compelling evidence for the motivational benefits of coach training was provided by Barnett, Smoll, & Smith (1992) who found that 95% of youth who played for CET-trained coaches returned the following year whereas only 74% of youth who played for non-CET-trained coaches returned the following year.

### Conclusions

Scientific understanding of the factors that make youth sport a motivationally-rich and developmentally-productive experience is in its infancy. The available evidence suggests more developmental benefits than costs to youth sport participation; however, rigorous experimental studies that manipulate characteristics of the youth sport context and isolate change in causal mechanisms are needed to strengthen conclusions from this literature. In light of the public health crisis and persisting social problems confronting youth in the United States, psychologists will make a positive impact on society by enhancing understanding of the factors that motivate youth to participate in organized sport. This knowledge also may help to explain why some individuals persist in their deliberate practice and reach the most elite levels of athletic competition whereas others drop out of sport altogether.

### Footnotes

<sup>1</sup> Based on the Torino experience, a group of USOC sport psychologists will be presenting a symposium entitled,

“Olympic Sport Psychology Service Provision: Perspectives on Preparation for the 2006 Games” at the 2006 APA Convention in New Orleans.

<sup>2</sup> For the purpose of this essay, optimizing motivation is assumed to be a central mechanism involved in the physical health and psychosocial benefits of youth sport participation because it can promote physical activity and foster developmental competence and initiative among participants.

### Acknowledgement

*I am extremely grateful to my research collaborators for their contributions to our work, especially Doug Coatsworth (Penn State), Andy Elliot (University of Rochester), Aaron Pincus (Penn State), and all of the graduate and undergraduate students in my lab. I also wish to express my appreciation to Chris Janelle (University of Florida) for his thoughtful feedback on an earlier draft of this essay.*

### References

- American College of Sports Medicine (2000). *ACSM's guidelines for exercise testing and prescription* (6th ed.). Philadelphia, PA: Lippincott, Williams, & Wilkins.
- Barber, B. L., Eccles, J. S., & Stone, M. R. (2001). Whatever happened to the jock, the brain, and the princess? Young adult pathways linked to adolescent activity involvement and social identity. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 16*, 429-455.
- Barnett, N. P., Smoll, F. L., & Smith, R. E. (1992). Effects of enhancing coach-athlete relationships on youth sport attrition. *The Sport Psychologist, 6*, 111-127.
- Baskin, M. L., Ard, J., Franklin, F., & Allison, D. B. (2005). Prevalence of obesity in the United States. *Obesity Reviews, 6*, 5-7.

continued on page 13...

## Upcoming Nomination Deadline: Biennial Frank J. McGuigan Young Investigator Prize

Is there a promising new faculty member in your psychology department who studies the human mind from a psychophysiological perspective? Is she or he nine or fewer years post PhD? Would recognition and funding provide a deserved boost to his or her promising research? *Nominate your new colleague for the F. J. McGuigan Prize today!*

**Nomination packages are due by March 1, 2006.** For more information, visit the website ([www.apa.org/science](http://www.apa.org/science)) or contact the APA Science Directorate at [science@apa.org](mailto:science@apa.org).

## Taking Human Effectiveness Research to New Heights: APA Science Visits Nellis Air Force Base

by: Heather O'Beirne Kelly

APA's Science Policy Office staff find their Capitol Hill advocacy efforts improve dramatically when they can present legislative staff with clear examples of psychological research's impact on real-world problems. At the end of January, Executive Director for Science Steve Breckler and Science Policy staff Heather Kelly and Karen Studwell visited Nellis Air Force Base in Nevada to get a first-hand look at human effectiveness research and its value to the Air Force mission.

The Air Force Research Laboratory (AFRL), headquartered at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base in Ohio, conducts and supports research related to Air Force mission priorities and advises senior Air Force leaders about scientific capabilities. Psychologist Hendrick Ruck heads up the Human Effectiveness Directorate within AFRL (AFRL-HE), which focuses on basic research and enabling technologies in the areas of warfighter training, crew system interface, bioeffects and protection, and deployment and sustainment. AFRL-HE has sent Col. Jim Davis, an engineer and retired Air Force fighter pilot, to Nellis Air Force base in the Nevada desert to link the laboratory behavioral researchers with operational Air Force personnel.

Nellis is the home for the Air Force's operational testing on aircraft (e.g., how well they perform in simulated combat environments), resulting tactics development, and combat

training exercises. Col. Davis' on-site presence has been key in bringing together researchers and operational personnel early in the concept exploration phase for new systems and technologies, thereby increasing the relevance of research programs to current and future Air Force needs and better educating the military chain of command about how human-centered research can improve performance in the operational arenas. As one example, Col. Davis points to the area of human-systems interfaces, noting that human factors research has informed the design of cockpits over many decades, improving pilot decision-making through better visual and aural display design. He points out that one of the current significant challenges being addressed at Nellis with help from AFRL behavioral scientists involves assessing and improving integration in air and space operations centers, where operators interact with enormous information loads and sophisticated technologies to control large-scale air operation plans in simulations and actual battlespace settings.

Col. Davis also described another military operation that benefited directly from consultation with psychological scientists. Many of the unmanned aerial vehicles (UAVs) conducting critical missions in Iraq right now are operated by Air Force personnel here in the U.S. Not surprisingly, given the visual



AFRL's Col. Jim Davis (USAF, RET.), APA's Heather Kelly and Steve Breckler

monitoring issues and length of shifts for these personnel, they were experiencing problems with fatigue. Experts were brought in to establish new behavioral routines based on results of research in this area, and Col. Davis says that the Air Force has seen dramatic improvements in performance as a result.

As Science Policy staff hit Capitol Hill this spring to advocate for behavioral research funding within the Department of Defense, this model partnership between active duty military personnel and psychological scientists is a powerful argument for our science and its role in national security, particularly in an era of tight budgets and sustained military engagements. For more information on APA's advocacy efforts in this area, please contact Heather Kelly at [hkelly@apa.org](mailto:hkelly@apa.org).

## Friends of NIDA meet with Scientific Advisory Board

by Geoff Mumford

There's no doubt that the National Institute on Drug Abuse (NIDA) has long been a friend to psychology and last year topped the other Institutes by funding more behavioral research than any other at NIH. Psychologists have returned the favor by producing some of the most robust findings in prevention and treatment research in any of the mental health fields. But we've become even better acquainted with the Institute and its senior staff this past year via the formation of the Friends of NIDA coalition, co-chaired by Bill Dewey and Charles O'Keefe, both of Virginia Commonwealth University. We hope that PSA readers have followed the efforts of Science Policy staff, working on behalf of the coalition, to develop an educational briefing series on Capitol Hill. Perhaps the coalition's most visible effort, each briefing has featured NIDA Director Nora Volkow, a prominent psychological researcher, and a patient perspective.

As we've tried to raise NIDA's visibility on Capitol Hill over the last year, our co-chairs have been hard at

work assembling an august Board of Scientific Advisors (BSA). On February 1, the Friends of NIDA Executive Committee met with the BSA for the first time to consider what we might do next. The BSA consists of two retired Congressmen, all the former NIDA Directors, and several former Directors of what is now the White House Office of National Drug Control Policy.

The BSA suggested a number of ways the Friends of NIDA might expand its outreach and work to advance NIDA's mission within the constraints of a very tight budget. One especially timely idea was a recommendation to keep Congress and the Administration mindful of the impact substance abuse has on the economy due to lost worker productivity. Given that this was the day after the President announced his American Competitiveness Initiative, any opportunity to enhance workplace productivity ought to be greeted warmly and we expect the Employees Assistance Professionals Association to be a welcome partner in that effort.



Former NIDA Director Bob Dupont (left) chats with General Barry McCaffrey (right) at the Board of Scientific Advisors meeting.

Science Policy staff will continue to coordinate the educational briefing series on Capitol Hill in cooperation with the leadership of the Congressional Caucus on Addiction, Treatment and Recovery.

The next briefing (2/23) will focus on the epidemic of prescription drug abuse: <http://www.apa.org/ppo/pdabriefing22306.pdf>

## APA Recruits New Science Advocates at SPSP

by Karen Studwell

Karen Studwell and Heather Kelly of APA's Science Policy staff attended the annual meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology (SPSP) to lead an advocacy training workshop for scientists. They provided an overview of the legislative and appropriations process and prepared participants to become more effective advocates for psychological research. Given the flattening of funding for scientific research across multiple federal agencies and criticisms from some Congressional members about behavioral research, it is more critical than ever that scientists make

their voice heard on issues affecting research. After participating in the workshop, attendees were ready to engage their own Representatives and Senators in a discussion about the relevance and value of psychological research and the need for continued federal support. In the spring, some of these social and personality psychologists will meet with their Members of Congress in their home districts during a series of coordinated advocacy visits in which they will educate them about the importance of basic social and personality research within the

National Institutes of Health and the National Science Foundation. APA's Science Policy Office covers a broad array of federal agencies and policy issues that impact psychological research.

To learn more about our efforts, please go to: <http://www.apa.org/ppo/science/>.

# Distinguished Scientist Lecturers to Speak at 2006 Regional Meetings

by Jeanie Kelleher

Psychologists Jeffrey R. Alberts, Alan E. Kazdin, and Shigehiro Oishi have been selected to participate in the 2006 APA Distinguished Scientist Lecture Program. Through the program, sponsored by APA's Science Directorate, each psychologist will give a featured address at a regional psychological association annual meeting.



Jeffrey Alberts

Jeffrey Alberts will speak on "Anatomy of a Super-Organism" at the Southwestern Psychological Association meeting in Austin, TX, April 13-15. Alberts is a professor at Indiana University. His research is dedicated to describing and elucidating functional and mechanistic aspects of the development of species-typical behavior in rodents. He studies sensory and motor capabilities in fetal rats as a means of understanding adaptation to prenatal life as well as anticipation of the postnatal environment. His research reflects the combined behavioral and physiological approach often used in his laboratory. Alberts' lab is also devoted to novel analyses of parental behavior, including biparental care and parent-offspring interactions.

Alan Kazdin will speak on "Child Adolescent Psychotherapy: Needed Changes in Clinical Research and Practice" at the Eastern Psychological Association meeting in Baltimore, MD, March 16-19. Kazdin is Director and Chairman of the Child Study Center and



Alan Kazdin

John M. Musser Professor of Psychology and Child Psychiatry at Yale University School of Medicine and Director of Child Psychiatric Services, Yale-New Haven Hospital. Kazdin's research focuses primarily on the development, treatment, and clinical course of aggressive and antisocial behavior in children and adolescents; child, parent, family, and contextual influences that contribute to child dysfunction; and critical processes within and outside of treatment that contribute to therapeutic changes in children, parents, and families.



Shigehiro Oishi

Shigehiro Oishi will speak on "Cultural Differences in the Self-concept and Subjective Well-being" at the Midwestern Psychological Association

meeting in Chicago, IL, May 4-6. Oishi is Assistant Professor of Psychology at the University of Virginia. Oishi's research has explored individual and cultural differences in well-being, self, and values. Early in his career, he developed an interest in the link between "subjective" and "societal" well-being, which led to collaborative projects on pro-community behavior. He is currently interested in feelings of understanding and misunderstanding in cross-cultural interactions and in the effect of residential mobility on morality, self-concept, and well-being.

The Board of Scientific Affairs, with support of the regional association presidents, developed the Distinguished Scientist Lecture Program 16 years ago as part of its ongoing mission to promote scientific psychology. The Distinguished Scientist Lecturers, together with APA's G. Stanley Hall Lectures, sponsored by APA's Education Directorate, allow APA to support invited talks at each regional meeting.

For more information on psychology's regional meetings, visit <http://www.apa.org/organizations/regionals.html>

# NIH Looks to the Future and Unveils Program to Support New Scientists

by Sara Robinson

**O**n January 27, National Institutes of Health Director Elias Zerhouni announced the NIH Pathway to Independence Award Program, offering the opportunity for new investigators to receive both mentored and independent research support from the same award.

December a working group of the Advisory Committee to the Director was formed to come up with strategies for helping talented young scientists make the transition to an independent research career. In a report issued early in 2005, "Bridges to Independence", the National Academy of Sciences found that postdoctoral scientists were working in labs for years without the opportunity to apply for their own grants. As a result, the average age of investigators receiving their first R01 grants has increased over the past several decades – today, the average is 42.

For the program's first year, NIH will issue between 150 and 200 awards beginning in Fall 2006. Over the next five years, the NIH will provide almost \$400 million in support of the program, which boasts the participation of all NIH Institutes and Centers. During the initial 1-2 year mentored phase of the awards, investigators can complete their supervised research work, publish results, and search for an independent

research position. The following phase, or years 3-5, will allow awardees who secure an assistant professorship, or equivalent position, to establish their own research program and successfully apply for an R01 grant.

"This award program is a major step toward fostering the early independence of new investigators, a key to innovation and creativity," Dr. Zerhouni said. "We must take action now to maintain the tremendous momentum that we've experienced in science. Talented people with new ideas are at the core of our success—we must support them all the way. Nothing is more important, especially in times of tight budgets."

10

"Encouraging independent inquiry by promising new investigators is a major goal for NIH," Dr. Zerhouni said. "We must invest in the future of our new scientists today if we expect to meet the nation's health challenges of tomorrow. New investigators who successfully cross the bridge from research dependence to research independence bring fresh ideas and innovative perspectives to the research enterprise, which are critical to sustaining our ability to push forward the frontiers of medical research."

There has been growing concern in the research community that young investigators are not being properly trained for independent careers, and in

## Student Travel Award Competition Deadline Nears

Graduate students: Are you looking for a little extra cash to get you to the APA Convention in New Orleans? If you are a student affiliate and are first author of your paper or poster accepted by an APA Division, you could be the recipient of a cool \$300 travel grant!

The Student Travel Award competition is sponsored by the Science Directorate, and is intended to encourage predoctoral research by providing funds toward presentation travel. **Applications are due by April 3, 2006.** For more information visit the Science Directorate website at <http://www.apa.org/science/travinfo.html> or contact the Science Directorate at 202-336-6000.

All students presenting first-authored papers or posters at the Convention are also eligible for waivers of their Convention registration fees. For more information about this waiver, contact the APA Convention Office at [convention@apa.org](mailto:convention@apa.org) before registering.

## The American Psychological Association Invites Applications for the Special 2006 APA Summer Research Fellowships in DoD Counterintelligence

**Program:** Fellows will spend eight weeks in the summer of 2006 as Research Fellows in the Department of Defense's (DoD's) Counterintelligence Field Activity Office (CIFA), headquartered in the Washington, D.C. area.

**Purpose:** To provide one research psychologist and one senior graduate student in scientific psychology with invaluable learning experiences in psychological research and policy related to counterintelligence, to contribute to more effective use of psychological knowledge within federal counterintelligence research programs, and to broaden the awareness about the value of the psychology-government interaction among psychologists and within the federal government in general, and the Department of Defense in particular. The focus of the research will be on topics relevant to countering terrorist activity, reducing "insider threat" and developing counterintelligence threat trend analysis. Fellows will be expected to make internal presentations on research issues and to complete a brief paper summarizing any relevant research results compiled during the fellowship.

**Criteria:** Prospective Fellows must demonstrate competence in scientific psychology, and show demonstrated interest and, preferably, experience in counterintelligence issues. Due to the short duration of the Fellowship, Fellows will not need to obtain a security clearance, but a preliminary security screening will be required. Applicants must be able to work quickly and communicate effectively, and be able to work cooperatively with multidisciplinary teams. An applicant must be either a psychologist with a doctorate in psychology or a related field, or a senior graduate student, preferably ABD, working towards a PhD in psychology or related field. Applicants must be U.S. citizens and Members of APA or APAGS.

**Awards:** APA will sponsor two Fellows for summer appointments running from approximately June 5, 2005 – July 31, 2006 (specific dates may be negotiated). The Fellowship stipend for research psychologists is \$8,000 and for graduate students the stipend is \$6,000. Fellows also are expected to attend APA's convention in New Orleans (August 10-13, 2006) and will receive funds to cover travel, hotel and registration. Final selection of the Fellow will be made in the spring, 2006.

**Application:** Interested psychologists should submit the following materials, to be received by **March 15, 2006**:

- ~a detailed vita providing information about educational background, professional employment and activities, professional publications and presentations, public policy and legislative experience, and committee and advisory group appointments;
- ~a statement of approximately 1000 words addressing the applicant's interests in the counterintelligence Fellowship and career goals, contributions the applicant believes he or she can make as a psychologist or graduate student, and what the applicant wants to learn from the experience; and three letters of reference specifically addressing the applicant's ability to work as a research Fellow in the Department of Defense.

**Applications should be sent to:** APA Summer Research Fellowship in DoD Counterintelligence, Public Policy Office, American Psychological Association, 750 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20002-4242. Attention: Heather Kelly. For additional information about the application process, please contact Heather Kelly by email: [hkelly@apa.org](mailto:hkelly@apa.org) or at (202) 336-5932.

## 2007 APA SCIENTIFIC AWARDS PROGRAM: CALL FOR NOMINATIONS

The APA Board of Scientific Affairs (BSA) invites nominations for its 2007 scientific awards program. The **Distinguished Scientific Contribution Award** honors psychologists who have made distinguished theoretical or empirical contributions to basic research in psychology. The **Distinguished Scientific Award for the Applications of Psychology** honors psychologists who have made distinguished theoretical or empirical advances in psychology leading to the understanding or amelioration of important practical problems.

12

To submit a nomination for the Distinguished Scientific Contribution Award and the Distinguished Scientific Contribution Award for the Applications of Psychology, you should provide a letter of nomination; the nominee's current vita with list of publications; the names and addresses of several scientists who are familiar with the nominee's work; a list of ten most significant and representative publications; and at least five reprints representative of the nominee's contribution (preferably in electronic form).

The **Distinguished Scientific Award for Early Career Contribution to Psychology** recognizes excellent young psychologists. For the 2007 program, nominations of persons who received doctoral degrees during and since 1997 are being sought in the areas of:

- applied research (e.g., treatment and prevention research, industrial/organizational research, educational research)
- behavioral and cognitive neuroscience
- individual differences (e.g., personality, psychometrics, mental ability, behavioral genetics)
- perception, motor performance
- social

To submit a nomination for the Distinguished Scientific Award for Early Career Contribution to Psychology, you should provide a letter of nomination, the nominee's current vita with list of publications, and up to five representative reprints (preferably in electronic form).

To obtain nomination forms and more information, you can go to the Science Directorate web page ([www.apa.org/science/sciaward.html](http://www.apa.org/science/sciaward.html)) or you can contact Jennifer Webb, Science Directorate, American Psychological Association, 750 First Street, NE, Washington, DC 20002-4242; by phone, (202) 336-6000; by fax, (202) 336-5953; or by E-mail, [jwebb@apa.org](mailto:jwebb@apa.org).

**The deadline for all award nominations is June 1, 2006.**

...continued from page 6

- 13 Brustad, R. J., Babkes, M. L., & Smith, A. L. (2001). Youth in sport: Psychological considerations. In R. N. Singer, H. A. Hausenblas, & C. M. Janelle (Eds.), *Handbook of sport psychology* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed., pp. 604-635). New York: Wiley.
- Coatsworth, J. D., & Conroy, D. E. (2006). Enhancing the self-esteem of youth swimmers through coach training: Gender and age effects. *Psychology of Sport & Exercise*, *7*, 173-192.
- Conroy, D. E., & Coatsworth, J. D. (2004). The effects of coach training on fear of failure in youth swimmers: A latent growth curve analysis from a randomized, controlled trial. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *25*, 193-214
- Conroy, D. E., & Coatsworth, J. D. (2006). *Coach training as a strategy for promoting youth social development*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Conroy, D. E., Kaye, M. P., & Coatsworth, J. D. (in press). Coaching climates and the destructive effects of mastery-avoidance achievement goals on situational motivation. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*.
- Conroy, D. E., Silva, J. M., Newcomer, R. R., Walker, B. W., & Johnson, M. S. (2001). Personal and participatory socializers of the perceived legitimacy of aggressive sport behavior. *Aggressive Behavior*, *27*, 405-418.
- Czikszentmihalyi, M., & Larson, R. W. (1984). *Being adolescent*. New York: Basic Books.
- Ebbeling, C. B., Pawlak, D. B., & Ludwig, D. S. (2002). Childhood obesity: Public health crisis, common sense cure. *Lancet*, *360*, 473-482.
- Eccles, J. S., & Barber, B. L. (1999). Student council, volunteering, basketball, or marching band: What kind of extracurricular involvement matters? *Journal of Adolescent Research*, *14*, 10-43.
- Elliot, A. J. (1999). Approach and avoidance motivation and achievement goals. *Educational Psychologist*, *34*, 169-189.
- Ericsson, K. A., Krampe, R. T., Tesch-Römer, C. (1993). The role of deliberate practice in the acquisition of expert performance. *Psychological Review*, *100*, 363-406.
- Ewing, M. E., & Seefeldt, V. (2002). Patterns of participation in American agency-sponsored youth sports. In F. L. Smoll & R. E. Smith (Eds.), *Children and youth in sport: A biopsychosocial perspective* (pp. 39-59). Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Flegal, K. M. (2005). Epidemiologic aspects of overweight and obesity in the United States. *Physiology and Behavior*, *86*, 599-602.
- Jago, R., & Baranowski, T. (2004). Non-curricular approaches for increasing physical activity in youth: A review. *Preventive Medicine*, *39*, 157-163.
- Kirshnit, C. E., Ham, M., & Richards, M. H. (1989). The sporting life: Athletic activities during early adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, *18*, 601-615.
- Ludwig, D. S., Ebbeling, C. B. (2001). Type 2 diabetes mellitus in children: Primary care and public health considerations. *Journal of the American Medical Association*, *286*, 1427-30
- Mahoney, J. L., & Cairns, R. B. (1997). Do extracurricular activities protect against early school dropout? *Developmental Psychology*, *33*, 241-253.
- Marsh, H. W., & Kleitman, S. (2003). School athletic participation: Mostly gain with little pain. *Journal of Sport & Exercise Psychology*, *25*, 205-228.
- National Research Council and Institute of Medicine (2002). *Community programs to promote youth development*. Washington, DC: National Academy Press.
- Petitpas, A. J., Cornelius, A. E., Van Raalte, J. L., & Jones, T. (2005). A framework for planning youth sport programs that foster psychosocial development. *The Sport Psychologist*, *19*, 63-80.
- Rushall, B. S., & Smith, K. C. (1979). The modification of the quality and quantity of behavior categories in a swimming coach. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, *1*, 138-150.
- Smith, R. E., & Smoll, F. L. (1990). Self-esteem and children's reactions to youth sport coaching: A field study of self-enhancement processes. *Developmental Psychology*, *26*, 987-993.
- Smith, R. E., Smoll, F. L., & Curtis, B. (1979). Coach effectiveness training: A cognitive-behavioral approach to enhancing relationship skills in youth sport coaches. *Journal of Sport Psychology*, *1*, 59-75.
- Smith, R. E., Zane, N. W. S., Smoll, F. L., & Coppel, D. B. (1983). Behavioral assessment in youth sports: Coaching behaviors and children's attitudes. *Medicine and Science in Sports and Exercise*, *15*, 208-214.
- Smoll, F. L., & Smith, R. E. (2002). Coaching behavior research and intervention in youth sports. In F. L. Smoll, & R. E. Smith (Eds.), *Children and youth in sport: A biopsychosocial perspective* (pp. 211-233). Dubuque, IA: Kendall-Hunt.
- United States Department of Health and Human Services (1996). *Physical activity and health: A report of the Surgeon General*. Atlanta, GA: U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, National Center for Chronic Disease Prevention and Health Promotion.

**SCIENCE DIRECTORATE STAFF**

Steven Breckler, *Executive Director for Science*  
 Virginia E. Holt, *Assistant Executive Director for Science*  
 Geoffrey Mumford, *Assistant Executive Director for Science*  
 Stephanie Cox, *Outreach and Development Coordinator*  
 Marianne Ernesto, *Director, Testing & Assessment*  
 Halah Gordon, *Administration Manager*  
 Jeanie Kelleher, *Special Programs Associate*  
 Heather Kelly, *Senior Legislative & Federal Affairs Officer*  
 Patricia Kobor, *Senior Science Policy Analyst*  
 Deborah McCall, *Science Programs Manager*  
 Sangeeta Panicker, *Director, Research Ethics Office*  
 Clare Porac, *Senior Scientist*  
 Sara Robinson, *Legislative Assistant*  
 Karen Studwell, *Senior Legislative & Federal Affairs Officer*  
 Amy Test, *Special Programs Assistant*  
 Kymberly Thornton, *Administrative Assistant*  
 Suzanne S. Wandersman, *Director, Governance Affairs*  
 Jennifer Webb, *Science Programs Associate*

**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**

Ronald T. Brown, (Chair)

Sandra Graham  
 Barbara Landau  
 Hazel R. Markus  
 Liora P. Schmelkin  
 Norman E. Spears  
 Lois Tetrick  
 John R. Weisz  
 Alice Young

**EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR FOR SCIENCE**

Steven Breckler

**EXECUTIVE EDITOR**

Virginia E. Holt

**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)