

# The Psychological Science Agenda



A PUBLICATION OF THE AMERICAN PSYCHOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION SCIENCE DIRECTORATE  
VOLUME 19, NUMBER 9 \* OCTOBER 2005  
<http://www.apa.org/science/psa/homepage.html>



## Can a Science of Social Influence Be Used to Stop Economic Fraud Crimes?

by Anthony R. Pratkanis

### TABLE OF CONTENTS

Science Briefs: Can a Science of Social Influence Be Used to Stop Economic Fraud Crimes? 1

Executive Director's Column: The Importance of Disciplines 3

Psychologist James Swanson to Head National Children's Study Vanguard Center 5

Quantitative Training in Psychology is Deteriorating: Traditional Methodologists, Mathematical Psychologists, and Psychology Face a Challenge 6

Cosmides Wins NIH Pioneer Award 7

Every year Americans lose over \$100 billion in telemarketing, investment, and charity fraud. While this dollar figure is staggering, it doesn't capture the true costs of this crime. Fraud not only impoverishes victims financially, but it can also impoverish them emotionally and drive a wedge between victims and family members. Economic fraud crimes have societal consequences as well, resulting in a loss of trust that impacts the business community and erodes the very fabric of life in American society.

For the last 50 plus years, researchers have been investigating experimentally the nature of social influence (Cialdini, 2001; Pratkanis, in press; Pratkanis & Aronson, 2001). Can this research be put to use to prevent economic fraud? Fortunately, the answer is a resounding yes.

Eight years ago, I was asked to by Doug Shadel – State Director of AARP Washington – to share my expertise on social influence and to join a team of fraud fighters consisting of himself, Bridget Small (Director of Consumer Protection for AARP), and Melodye Kleinman (of WISE Senior Services). Our team has applied the core findings of research on social influence to understanding economic fraud, conducted surveys of victims, carried out experiments investigating the effectiveness of intervention strategies,



developed educational materials (see AARP, 1997;2001), trained volunteers to fight this crime, and warned over a quarter million potential victims about fraud crimes. As a result of our work, we have developed an understanding of the nature of the crime and some strategies for preventing it.

### What We Have Learned from Our Research on Economic Fraud Crimes

First, we have learned that the weapon that is used in fraud crimes is social influence. No one knowingly gives their hard earned cash to a con criminal – they think that they are making an investment, winning a prize, providing for charity, or some similar positive goal. The con criminal is a master at using one high-powered influence tactic after another to sell a deception. Given that the weapon in a fraud crime is an invisible one – social

*Continued on page 2...*



Anthony Pratkanis is an experimental social psychologist. His research program has investigated such topics as the delayed effects of persuasion, attitudes and memory, groupthink, affirmative action, subliminal influence, persuasion and democracy, and influence tactics such as the pique technique, phantoms, the projection tactic, the 1-in-5 prize tactic, expert snare, and altercasting. He has served as an expert witness in numerous litigations including Oregon's case against Publisher's Clearing House and California's cases against MCI/Worldcom and against Cingular Wireless and currently serves as an expert on marketing for the National Association of Attorneys General's Tobacco Litigation Group. A fellow of APA, he is the founding editor of a new academic journal, *Social Influence*, scheduled to appear in Spring of 2006 from Psychology Press.

2

influence as opposed to a gun or a knife – there is a tendency by both victims and observers not to recognize economic fraud for what it really is – a crime.

Recently, Doug Shadel and I analyzed over 600 undercover tapes used in fraud investigations (see Pratkanis & Shadel, 2005). In these tapes, law enforcement officials took over a victim's phone line and then tape recorded the con criminal's pitch. In listening to these tapes, we found that con criminals would play different roles – authorities, friends, even dependents – to create a platform of trust. They would then use many well-established social influence tactics to sell the crime – tactics that are well-known to social influence researchers such as foot-in-the-door, social consensus, expert snare, self-generated persuasion, and norm of reciprocity. These pitches were social influence cocktails, placing enormous pressure on the target to go along with the scam.

A second thing we have learned is that just about anyone can fall prey to this crime; it impacts a large cross-section of our society (AARP 1996; 2003). Con criminals go where the money is and thus older Americans with their nest eggs are a prime target of this crime. The stereotype of the frail or lonely victim does not stand up in our surveys of victims. While some victims are indeed lonely,

others are active leaders in their communities. Indeed, we find that con criminals profile their victim's psychological and other characteristics to find their Achilles' heel (and we all probably have one) to construct the exact pitch that is likely to be most effective with each victim. For example, in one of our surveys (AARP, 2003), we found that victims of lottery fraud (which emphasizes luck) believed that the world controls them (a psychological trait known as external locus of control) whereas victims of investment fraud (which emphasizes mastery of one's fate) believed that they control the world (or a trait of internal locus of control). The con pitched the exact scam to take advantage of the person's psychological characteristics.

Third, we have identified effective strategies for preventing this crime. At WISE Senior Services, we have developed a reverse boiler room approach where senior volunteers contact potential victims with a warning message. The volunteers call potential victims whose names appear on criminal call or mooch lists that have been recently seized by the FBI and other law enforcement agencies. The volunteers talk with these potential victims, explain the nature of the crime, and help develop strategies for preventing the crime. In a series of experiments we tested the effectiveness of this intervention

strategy. We first had our volunteers contact the victim with a prevention message and then, a few days later, professional telemarketers attempted to "take" the victim in a simulated scam. We found that our interventions were effective in reducing victimization rates by 50%. Peer counseling is an effective tool in our fight against economic fraud crimes (see AARP, 2003).

Finally, as a result of our research and work with victims, we have identified components of a prevention message that are most effective. Successful prevention messages are ones that provide the potential victim with (a) a specific warning about the crime and, (b) most importantly, coping strategies for dealing with the crime that build a feeling of self-efficacy – a feeling that "I can take charge of the situation and hang up." We encourage everyone to develop their plan for getting off the phone and to have it ready to go when the need arises. On the other hand, messages that increase fear and defensiveness not only do not work but may actually boomerang and increase victimization rates (see AARP, 2003).

continued on page 8.....

## Psychologist James Swanson to Head National Children's Study Vanguard Center

by KAREN STUDWELL

3 For the past five years, scientists from the biomedical, behavioral and social sciences have been working with the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) to design the National Children's Study (NCS), a longitudinal study authorized by Congress in 2000. The goal of the NCS is to improve the health and well-being of children by examining how genetic and environmental factors interact with each other and what effect they might have on children's health, whether harmful or helpful. Investigators plan to enroll 100,000 children over the next few years in what would be the largest long-term study of children's health and development ever conducted in the United States. Since its authorization in the Child Health Act of 2000, the term "environment" has been defined broadly to include the social and behavioral environment and psychologists have played a role in developing both the study design and the many hypotheses that are to be studied.

Some of the topics to be examined in the NCS include the impact of stress during pregnancy on fetal development, birth defects and pregnancy-related problems, injuries, asthma, obesity and diabetes, and behavior, school readiness, learning, and mental health disorders. In addition, the tremendous amount of data collected by the NCS study centers will provide a rich resource for future researchers to use to answer their own questions about the relationship between environmental exposures and child health or developmental outcomes.

While future funding for the study remains uncertain, initial steps to implement the study continue. In September, the NCS program office announced that the initial Vanguard Center contracts had been awarded to six centers across the country. Vanguard



Center will begin recruiting participants and pilot testing the NCS protocol. Psychologist James Swanson is one of the six principal investigators awarded a contract for the Vanguard Center located at the University of California-Irvine with the Children's Hospital of Orange County for Orange County, CA. Swanson worked with a group of nearly fifty scientists to put together the proposal and has established a steering committee that will work on the next phase of recruiting participants and data collection. Initial results should be available around 2010, under the current timeline. The NCS program office has selected a total of 105 communities across the country to participate in the study, but further competitions may be delayed until additional funds are provided to the study.

Swanson, a developmental psychologist who specializes in research and treatment of children with attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD), sees the NCS as an extraordinary opportunity for psychologists and other scientists to answer research questions with much more statistical clarity than traditionally permitted with smaller studies. Having spent years focused on treatment, Swanson is excited to get to the root causes of conditions such as ADHD and diseases

that could lead to cost-saving prevention strategies. "If we could identify the factors involved in prematurity and could decrease the rate prematurity by even two percent, we would save \$2 billion in one year in health care costs," says Swanson.

Swanson encourages other psychologists, particularly young investigators, to get involved in the study by first reviewing the proposed list of possible future sites for the study and collaborating with other researchers to work on a proposal. While the NCS could provide scientists with a wealth of information and a large database for future research questions, the price tag for the study is currently forecasted at nearly \$3 billion over the next 20 years. With meager increases in funding for the NIH in the coming years, it is uncertain how the NCS program office can sustain the momentum needed to fully implement the NCS without risking the long-term health of the investigator-initiated research programs, particularly at the NICHD. For now, scientists are hopeful that preliminary data may generate enough excitement about the feasibility and results of the NCS to draw support from places other than NIH to ensure that the study moves forward as planned.

To learn more about the National Children's Study, please go to:

[www.nationalchildrensstudy.gov](http://www.nationalchildrensstudy.gov)

The full list of proposed locations is available at:

[www.nationalchildrensstudy.gov/about/locations/](http://www.nationalchildrensstudy.gov/about/locations/)

## EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S COLUMN

STEVEN BRECKLER, Executive Director for Science

## The Importance of Disciplines

Science has always been defined by its disciplines – by its areas of focus, study, training, specialties, and subject matters. Just like physics, biology, or chemistry, psychology is a scientific discipline. Nearly every college and university supports a department of psychology, students are trained in psychology, and research is classified as psychology. The concept of a scientific discipline is an important and enduring one. It implies that there is a body of knowledge to master and skills to be acquired before one can proclaim disciplinary expertise.



them, if they cease to exist as distinct and separable entities.

The value of bringing together multiple disciplines, or of working at the intersections of disciplines, is that each brings to the table a unique and distinct set of tools and approaches. Disciplines remain important because, as we realized long ago, training people as renaissance scientists – as individuals who know it all and can do it all – is not viable. Too much needs to be known and maintained within any area of science for an individual to achieve a high degree of skill in more than one (or perhaps two).

The challenge, I think, is in training solid disciplinary scientists so that they are capable of working with colleagues in other fields. When problems demand working across, between, and beyond disciplines, scientists should be ready, willing, and able. I know this adds to the training burden, but teaching ourselves how to play in a larger sandbox will be important to the future of our discipline.

Yet, we must always keep at the center of our attention the distinct disciplines. We need to recognize them, nurture them, support them, and celebrate them. Our future may indeed depend on getting along with others, but we will get nowhere if we lose the capacity for individuals to become expert in their chosen disciplines.

As a scientific discipline grows and matures, sub-disciplines emerge. Over the past century, many important sub-disciplines of psychology have blossomed – social, cognitive, developmental, biological, comparative, industrial/organizational, and others. The emergence of specialties within a discipline is a healthy sign – it reflects an expansion of knowledge. It also carries with it the need for ever-increasing focus in training and research. This can sometimes create a challenge within the discipline, as the specialty areas acquire their own unique theories and methods and begin to look less and less like each other.

If the challenge in managing diversity within a discipline is not hard enough, consider the direction that science appears to be heading as we begin the 21<sup>st</sup> century. We hear a lot about disciplines, but almost always with a prefix attached: multidisciplinary, interdisciplinary, and even transdisciplinary science is all the rage. This is the emphasis of the major funding agencies, and the subject of considerable discussion at the National Academy of Science. As we struggle to keep up and communicate with colleagues within our own discipline, the

future of science is demanding that we also make deep connections with other disciplines.

A positive interpretation of multi/inter/trans-disciplinary mania is that science has finally evolved to a point where the most difficult and challenging problems require ambitious partnerships and the pooling of disciplinary knowledge and expertise – that the synergy gained at our intersections is where the action is and what it will take to move to the next level.

A less flattering interpretation is that we are in the midst of a fad – that the funding agencies and observers of science are celebrating multi/inter/trans discipline work because it sounds good and represents a direction that appears to be new, innovative, and forward-moving.

I'm not sure where the truth lies – probably somewhere in between these two characterizations. What troubles me, however, is the potential devaluing of the core scientific disciplines that are called upon as participants in multidisciplinary or interdisciplinary work, and that are presumably transcended in transdisciplinary work. We can't bring disciplines together, or even transcend

# Social Science Research and Hurricanes Katrina and Rita

by Clare Porac

5

The community of social science advocates here in Washington is very aware of the relevance of social science research in the areas of disaster preparedness and recovery. This research can be used to inform public policy as legislators and other groups deal with the aftermath of hurricanes Katrina and Rita. The psychological sciences have provided broad and significant findings that are relevant to public policy formation on issues such as disaster preparation, prediction and mitigation. In the past, the Science Directorate has responded to requests from various sources to provide brief summaries of psychological research relevant to disaster preparedness and recovery. Examples of such summaries related to issues surrounding the September 11, 2001 attacks on the United States can be found on the APA website at:

<http://www.apa.org/ppo/issues/svignetteterror2.html>

Most recently, Mark Weiss, Assistant Director for Social and Behavioral Sciences in the White House Office of Science and Technology Policy has asked members of the Science Directorate staff to develop one-or two- page vignettes or case studies explaining specific areas of psychological research that pertain to various aspects of disaster preparedness and recovery. These are to be written for the non-psychologist and they should explain why this research may help inform policy. The vignettes should also provide a summary of data and a brief history of the scientific work on the topic with a few references for further information.

The APA Science Directorate has also received a request from Paul Price at the Social Science Research Council. SSRC has asked experts in various fields to comment on issues related to the hurricane Katrina disaster. The existing essays that have been collected can be found at

<http://understandingkatrina.ssrc.org/>.

Mr. Price is interested in obtaining 2000-3000 word essays from psychologists that

bridge the tone of an op-ed piece and an article for an academic journal. He is particularly interested in essays that deal with psychological factors that structure coping mechanisms and/or mediate responses to problems, tragedies or disasters with specific reference to the hurricane Katrina events.

In response to these requests, the Science Directorate has sent out a call to APA members through the APA division presidents for contributions regarding psychological research pertaining to hurricane Katrina and Rita events. These contributions can fit either the vignette or the essay format. The contact person for these contributions is Clare Porac, Senior Scientist in the Science Directorate. Please consider writing a piece that can be used either by the Office

of Science and Technology Policy or by the Social Science Research Council. Both of these organizations want to highlight the relevance of social science research as events surrounding the recent hurricanes are examined and future public policy formulated.

If you have any questions or want to discuss whether or not your idea is relevant to these requests for psychological research summaries and perspectives on disaster preparedness and recovery, please contact Clare Porac at [cporac@apa.org](mailto:cporac@apa.org). This is an important opportunity for psychologists to contribute their expertise to matters of current national concern and to have potential impact on the formation of future policy surrounding disaster prevention, preparedness and recovery.

## CALL FOR APPLICATIONS FOR POSITIVE PSYCHOLOGY FELLOWS PROGRAM

Are you interested in collaborating with leading Positive Psychology scholars? The Positive Psychology Templeton Fellows Program will gather together the best and brightest scholars by creating and funding collaborations with senior scholars.

We encourage applications from early to mid-career scholars with a doctoral degree and graduate students pursuing a doctoral degree, from the disciplines of Psychology, Sociology, Philosophy, Anthropology, Theology, Neuroscience, Economics, History, Public Health and Medicine. Applicants can be from any country and there is no age limit.

The deadline to apply is December 15, 2005. Selected Fellows will be expected to live in Philadelphia for 6 to 8 weeks from May 15 to July 15, 2006. Stipends and living expenses are available. For details, visit:

[www.positivepsychology.org/ppfellows.pdf](http://www.positivepsychology.org/ppfellows.pdf)

## Quantitative Training in Psychology is Deteriorating: Traditional Methodologists, Mathematical Psychologists, and Psychology Face a Challenge

by James T. Townsend, President Emeritus, Society for Mathematical Psychology,  
Richard Golden, Secretary Treasurer, Society for Mathematical Psychology  
Thomas Wallsten, Editor Emeritus, Journal of Mathematical Psychology

The scientific community of APA, and psychology in general, are growing increasingly concerned about the shortage of quantitatively trained psychologists. For instance, the September issue of the *APA Monitor* included a convincing documentation of this disheartening trend. Training in statistics and related methodologies such as experimental design has formed a foundation for rigorous experimentation, drawing of inferences, and theory building since the inception of psychology as a science in the nineteenth century. Virtually every department of psychology with a reputation for solid research has retained sufficient staff for the edification of budding psychologists in quantitative methods. Now, this tradition is at risk.

The modal interpretation of “quantitative psychologist” still tends to connote someone with extended training in statistics (at the least, and sometimes advanced degrees in mathematical statistics). This is natural because the roots of quantitative measurement in psychology were intertwined with the very birth of modern statistics in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, and especially in Great Britain. However, it is important in modern psychology to include the field of mathematical psychology when confronting issues in quantitative training. The bulk of this article focuses on this discipline and its place in instruction of scientific psychologists. Although mathematical psychology plays a vital role in scientific psychology, as we will demonstrate below, many psychologists are less familiar with the field since training programs, and even courses in that subject, are unfortunately quite rare. Hence, we take a little space to outline some of its history and features.

The use of mathematics to represent and interpret psychological theory appeared quite early in psychophysics and only

slightly later in learning theory. Nonetheless, it was not until the 1950's that mathematical psychology became a legitimate field of study in its own right. The first regions of major developments were signal detection theory and methodology, and mathematical learning theory. Since its inception, mathematical modeling has arguably entered, or influenced most of the areas of study in psychology.

Mathematical psychology and traditional quantitative psychology differ in their emphasis on statistics (somewhat more in the traditional sector) and emphasis on a substantive theoretical model of the psychological processes or phenomena (somewhat more in mathematical psychology). Nevertheless, they share many tools, mathematical contents, and philosophy. We can't say how many traditional methodologists learn mathematical modeling, but virtually all mathematical psychologists receive training in psychological and mathematical statistics.

We assert that mathematical psychology has advanced not only empirical data analysis but fundamental theory in psychological science as well. Furthermore, the Society for Mathematical Psychology (whose official journal is the *Journal of Mathematical Psychology*) continues to actively develop and support training programs in the field of quantitative psychology.

Thus, mathematical psychology now plays a vital role in psychological theorizing and fruitfully interacts with psychological statistics and methodology in many, if not all, content areas. Some of the most

influential leaders in advancing psychological science through quantitatively deep theoretical approaches over the past several decades were originally trained in or interacted strongly with the field of mathematical psychology. For example, the National Medal of Science has been awarded for mathematical psychology contributions to the Social and Behavioral Sciences to Duncan Luce, William Estes, Patrick Suppes, and Roger Shepard, all of whom have been active members of the Mathematical Psychology Community. The annual \$100,000 David E. Rumelhart Prize is awarded annually to an individual or collaborative team making a significant contemporary contribution to the theoretical foundations of human cognition. Many of the past recipients have been awarded the prize based upon their contributions to mathematical models of cognition (e.g., Roger Shepard (2006), John Anderson (2005), Paul Smolensky (2005), and Richard Shiffrin (2002)) of the David E. Rumelhart Prize (as well as David Rumelhart) are or have been active members of the Society for Mathematical Psychology or were strongly influenced by mentors and colleagues who are or were active participants in the Society. These specific examples illustrate that mathematical modeling in psychology has indeed evolved to be a ‘respectable’ profession from its origin in the 1950's.

Paradoxically, even as mathematical modeling has become ‘respectable’ in recent years, there arguably exist fewer formal training programs than was true twenty or thirty years ago. Just as in the case of psychological statistics, this is a frightening development.

The Society for Mathematical Psychology is the main professional body for the profession in the United States. Its counterpart in Europe is the European Mathematical Psychology Group. Both hold annual

*continued on page 7...*

## Cosmides Wins NIH Pioneer Award

by Pat Kobor



7

**L**eda Cosmides, Professor of Psychology, and co-chair of the Center for Evolutionary Psychology at the University of California Santa Barbara, was one of thirteen scientists honored with Pioneer Awards at a symposium at the National Institutes of Health in late September. Elias Zerhouni, Director of NIH, presented the award.

According to NIH, “the Pioneer Award supports exceptionally creative scientists who take innovative approaches to major challenges in biomedical research. The award gives recipients the intellectual freedom to pursue groundbreaking new research directions that could have significant impact if successful but that, due to their novelty or other factors, also have inherently high risks of failure.” The generous awards consist of \$500,000 per year for five years.

Dr. Cosmides applies evolutionary psychology to discover the design of the human mind and brain. She and her collaborator, John Tooby, will use the award to develop evolutionary and computational approaches to the study of motivation and developmental neuroscience. She was an APA Early Career Scientific Contribution award winner, and a finalist for the 2004 NIH Pioneer awards.

Multiple layers of review led to the selection of the 2005 Pioneer Award recipients. From an original pool of 840 self-nominated scientists, a group of outside evaluators narrowed the field to 285. A second set of outside experts evaluated these applicants, focusing on their innovativeness and creativity, the importance of the scientific problem to be addressed, and the likelihood that the project’s success would have a high impact on biomedical research. The evaluators also considered the appropriateness of the project for the Pioneer Award mechanism, including the requirement that it be distinct from other research by the investigator. These evaluators identified 20 scientists who were then interviewed at NIH by the third group of outside experts.

... continued from page 6

conferences and support many innovations aimed at encouraging young psychologists to enter the field or to acquire elementary and advanced training in modeling and mathematics. For instance, Indiana University currently offers an NIMH supported training program in cognitive modeling which supports both pre-doctoral and post-doctoral training in mathematical and computational modeling in perception, cognition and sensory-motor processing. The Society for Mathematical Psychology presents an annual New Investigator Award for exceptional published research in the field of mathematical psychology by a recent Ph.D. The new investigator is provided with an honorary plaque, an honorarium, and an invitation to present their research as a plenary talk at the annual meeting of the Society for Mathematical Psychology. The Society for Mathematical Psychology also sponsors Student Travel Awards and special Tutorial Workshops for training mathematical psychologists.

Although this article cannot engage in detailed solutions to the stark dilemma posed by the diminution of training programs and personnel, it is certainly apparent that both the traditional psychometric as well as the mathematical psychology approaches to quantitative education of psychologists represent powerful, and mutually supportive, strategies. Those groups, in liaison with other scientifically oriented psychological societies, should stand shoulder-to-shoulder and actively seek and deploy structural and functional solutions to this rather dire challenge. More information regarding the Society for Mathematical Psychology and resources for providing quantitative training to new psychologists may be found on the web site: <http://www.cogs.indiana.edu/socmathpsych/>.

More information on the 2005 NIH Director’s Pioneer Award recipients is at

<http://nihroadmap.nih.gov/pioneer/Recipients05.aspx>.

Details on the Pioneer Award program, including the names of the outside evaluators for the 2005 awards, are at

<http://nihroadmap.nih.gov/pioneer>.

...continued from page 2

### Three Opportunities and Challenges in the Fight against Economic Fraud Crimes

Our research also suggests three opportunities and challenges for those interested in preventing this crime.

First, it is important to remember that economic fraud is a crime. There is a tendency to blame the victims in this crime and to believe that “there must be something about them” that led to victimization. Instead our research shows the power of the fraud criminal’s weapon of influence. Victim blaming is harmful to victims and hinders law enforcement’s ability to obtain accurate and timely information about the crime. The victims of economic fraud should be included in any Victim’s Bill of Rights. Sentencing for economic fraud should match the magnitude of the crime and not the charm of the con. We need continuing federal efforts in investigating and enforcing fraud laws.

Second, we now have tools, knowledge, and strategies which have proven to be effective in preventing economic fraud. This information needs to be disseminated to fraud fighters. For example, Doug Shadel in collaboration with the Attorney General in Washington State has trained over 2,500 volunteer fraud fighters since October of 2003 who in turn have educated close to 100,000 people in their communities about fraud. We have now begun a series of peer counseling events to reach those whose names have been stolen by identity thieves. We need more of this sort of intervention. I would like to see the tools for effectively dealing with this crime in the hands of every victim’s advocate in local and state prosecutor’s offices, the efforts of Washington State duplicated in other states, and the creation of regional centers to fight economic fraud patterned after the remarkably successful program at WISE Senior Services.

Finally, we need research that focuses on the chronic victim – the 50% or so of victims that we did not successfully help.

in our call center research. Our research shows that chronic, repeat victims find themselves in a rationalization trap of being confronted with two discrepant thoughts: “I am a good and capable person” but yet, “I just sent my hard-earned money to a scammer.” In such a situation, it is difficult to admit that one has been taken in a fraud without damaging self-esteem. We are currently investigating strategies for resolving this rationalization trap in the hopes of finding effective interventions for use with the chronic victim.

### References

- AARP. (1996). *Telemarketing fraud victimization of older Americans: An AARP survey*. Washington, D.C: AARP.
- AARP. (1997). *Don't fall for a telephone line*. [Video]. Washington D.C.: AARP.

...references continued on next page

## Minority Investigators Workshop on Behavioral Methodologies

March 20-21, 2006  
San Francisco, California

**Sponsored by:**  
National Cancer Institute  
Office of Behavioral and Social Science Research

**Co-Chairs:**  
Karen Emmons, Ph.D., Harvard School of Public Health  
Eliseo Perez-Stable, M.D., University of California at San Francisco

### Topics to be Covered:

- Behavioral Intervention Design
- Mixed Research Methods
- Longitudinal Research Designs
- Multi-Level Research Methods
- Behavioral Genetics Methods
- Measurement of Race/Ethnicity and SES

### To be eligible to participate, you must:

- Be a minority investigator at early or mid-career levels (e.g., post-doctoral fellows, research associates, assistant professors, associate professors),
- Have an interest in Behavioral Science,
- Have not been a PI on a National Institutes of Health R01 funded grant, and
- Submit an application with supporting documents

**Note:** Travel, lodging, and per diem will be sponsored by NCI only for participants who live and work 50 miles outside of San Francisco, California.

For additional information, contact:  
Audie Atienza, Ph.D., NCI  
[atiensaa@mail.nih.gov](mailto:atiensaa@mail.nih.gov)  
301-402-8426

## CHRISTINE MIRZAYAN SCIENCE AND TECHNOLOGY POLICY GRADUATE FELLOWSHIP PROGRAM, WASHINGTON, D.C.

This Graduate Fellowship Program of the National Academies-consisting of the National Academy of Sciences, National Academy of Engineering, Institute of Medicine, and National Research Council-is designed to engage graduate and postdoctoral students in science and technology policy and to familiarize them with the interactions among science, technology, and government. As a result, students in the fields of science, engineering, medicine, veterinary medicine, business, and law develop essential skills different from those attained in academia, which will help them make the transition from being a graduate student to a professional.

We are pleased to announce that applications are now being accepted for the 2006 sessions. The program will comprise three 10-week sessions:

# Winter: January 9-March 17

# Summer: June 5-August 11

# Fall: September 11-November 17

9 To apply, candidates should submit an application and request that a mentor/adviser fill out a reference form. Both forms are available on the Web at <<http://nationalacademies.org/policyfellows>>.

The deadline for receipt of application material is November 1 for the winter program, March 1 for the summer program, and June 1 for the fall program. Candidates may apply to all three programs concurrently.

Additional details about the program and a link to join the mailing list are available on the Web site. Questions should be directed to: [policyfellows@nas.edu](mailto:policyfellows@nas.edu).

Here is a sampling of comments from program alumni:

"Just ten weeks in the S&T policy world in DC substantially broadened my perspective on how I can use my engineering background to positively impact our society. I return to graduate school recharged about the value of advanced education, and more confident about my decisions to pursue studies that blend the boundaries of engineering and the humanities. I feel like I have much new knowledge and understanding to share with my fellow graduate students as well as my professors. No matter what field of study you are pursuing, there is no reason not to apply for a policy fellowship. By seeing the connections between your academic field and the public policy arena, you will find many new opportunities for future studies or careers. You will be enriched as a person, as a public citizen, and as a member of an academic community."

"This program will open your mind to a world rarely envisioned from the confines of laboratory bench work. I learned an immeasurable amount about the policy and politics behind science and after the program opens your mind, it opens career doors."

...continued from page 8

- |   |   |   |
|---|---|---|
| <p>AARP (2001). <i>Weapons of fraud</i>. [Video]. Washington D.C.: AARP.</p> <p>AARP. (2003). <i>Off the hook: Reducing participation in telemarketing fraud</i>. Washington, D.C.: AARP. [Available on the web at: <a href="http://www.aarp.org/research/frauds-scams/telemarketing/a-research-import-179-D17812.html">http://www.aarp.org/research/frauds-scams/telemarketing/a-research-import-179-D17812.html</a>].</p> | <p>Cialdini, R. B. (2001). <i>Influence</i>. Boston: Allyn &amp; Bacon.</p> <p>Pratkanis, A. R. (in press). Social influence analysis: An index of tactics. In A. R. Pratkanis (Ed.), <i>The science of social influence: Advances and future progress</i>. Philadelphia: Psychology Press.</p> | <p>Pratkanis, A. R. &amp; Aronson, E. (2001). <i>Age of propaganda: The everyday use and abuse of persuasion</i>. (Revised edition). New York: W. H. Freeman/Holt.</p> <p>Pratkanis, A. R., &amp; Shadel, D. (2005). <i>Weapons of fraud: A source book for fraud fighters</i>. Seattle, WA: AARP Washington. Available at: <a href="http://www.aarp.org/states/wa/">http://www.aarp.org/states/wa/</a></p> |
|---|---|---|

**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 for 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, *Science Programs Associate*  
 Kymberly Thornton, *Administrative Assistant*  
 Suzanne S. Wandersman, *Director for Governance Affairs*  
 Jennifer Webb, *Special Programs Assistant*

**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**

Roberta Klatzky, (Chair)  
 Marilyn E. Carroll (Vice Chair)

Ronald T. Brown  
 Sandra Graham  
 Jo-Ida Hansen  
 Hazel R. Markus  
 Liora P. Schmelkin  
 Norman E. Spears  
 John R. Weisz

**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)