Welcome to Washington, D.C.

DIVISION 6 EMAIL REFLECTOR

Division 6 maintains an email reflector to keep members up to date with the latest information on research funding, employment opportunities, and other items of general interest. If you have recently changed your email address, you may need to re-subscribe to the reflector. To update your current address or to join the list for the first time, follow these simple instructions:

Send precisely the following 4-word message:

SUBscribe div6 John Doe

Change John Doe to your first and last name; the computer will find the subscriber’s email address in the message automatically. Put nothing else in the message. Mail the 4-word message to the following address:

listserv@lists.apa.org

More info can be found at:

http://listserv.apa.org
The Behavioral Neuroscientist and Comparative Psychologist is the official newsletter of APA Division 6 — Behavioral Neuroscience and Comparative Psychology — and is published 3 times a year. Mailing addresses used are those appearing on the official APA roster and a separate Division roster. Corrections and changes of address should be sent directly to the APA Directory Office, 1400 North Uhle St., Arlington, VA 22201, and to the newsletter editor (see below).

As the official newsletter of Division 6, BNCP publishes official business, committee reports, news items, job announcements, information on technical issues, topics of current interest, and information about the professional activities of Division 6 members. News items and articles should be submitted to the Editor at the address below (preferably by email). Paid advertisements are not officially endorsed by Division 6.

The Editor welcomes comments and suggestions for ways in which BNCP can better serve the needs of the members. The preferred method of submission is by email. Send correspondence and submissions to Eric P. Wiertelak via e-mail at wiertelak@macalester.edu. Postal mail should be sent to Eric P. Wiertelak, Department of Psychology, Macalester College, Saint Paul, MN 55105. Other contact information: Phone: (651) 696-6111; FAX: (651) 696-6348.

Going to the convention in Washington DC?

Plan to attend APA Night at the National Museum of the American Indian

Friday, August 19th, 7:00 to 9:50 PM.
Visit the APA Special Events Desk in the APA Registration area to get tickets.
Let me begin my last essay as President of Division 6 with a question: How do you label your area of study? What are you? Thirty years ago, I believe that many within Division 6 would have answered, a physiological psychologist. The label suggested a particular relation to the field of psychology—that we saw ourselves as psychologists who study the neurobiological mechanisms that underlie the processes (learning, memory, motivation) studied by other psychologists. But today, ask this same question and the more likely response is that “I am a neuroscientist”, not a psychologist. This answer is especially likely from those trained within the last decade. It seems that many now see themselves as aligned with a different field of study.

On the off chance that someone outside of Division 6 reads this essay, let me say a few words about the field of neuroscience. Used without a qualifier (e.g., behavioral), the label refers to a very large, interdisciplinary, program of study. It is my impression that many within APA do not appreciate the magnitude of neuroscience. Let’s compare some numbers, limiting our discussion to individuals in (or affiliated with) academia. For APA, the number of members within academia is just under 30,000 and the American Psychological Society has about 12,000 members. The Society for Neuroscience has 36,000 members. The Web of Science lists just under 200 journals in the category of neuroscience (2004 JCR Science Edition). In this same edition, 60 are listed for psychology and biology has 64 journals. Neuroscience is not a small, specialty area. It is large field of study and it has been growing much faster than psychology. Most universities recognize neuroscience as an interdisciplinary faculty and some are developing undergraduate programs within the area. Indeed, our Newsletter Editor, Eric Wiertelak, has developed a model undergraduate program in neuroscience at Macalester College (see http://www.macalester.edu/~neurosci/) and has been working to help other schools develop programs in this area. At both the local and national level, forces are working to bring neuroscientists together. The lure of the young field has the potential to split neuroscience from psychology, ending what has been a troubled marriage.

What is the temptation? In part, it is fueled by petty frustrations. How often do we need to explain that neuroscientists adopt publication norms common in biology and chemistry, but counter to APA? We promote our students as lead authors and the senior scientist is normally last, in what many (within neuroscience) consider the second most prestigious position in the author list. We publish in odd places, like the Journal of Neurophysiology and Neuroscience that, although they have good impact scores, our colleagues view with skepticism because they have not heard of these journals (and, therefore, the journals must not be prestigious). Grant success may be negated by a view that it is “easy” to get grants in the area of neuroscience and we may see returned indirect channelled to areas that have little hope of funding. And then there are the continued arguments for resources—deans within liberal arts find it difficult to fathom half-million dollar start-up packages, dedicated laboratory space, and the cost of maintaining a large vivarium.

Of greater concern is a movement led by a minority within psychology. At issue are the animal models used to study the mechanisms that underlie phenomena of interest to psychologists. I have been lucky to be affiliated with departments and universities where this has never been a problem. But in recent years, attacks have occurred at other universities and some membership groups within APA appear to have an antivivisectionist agenda (see page 7). Yet, we must remember that APA (as an organization) (continued on page 4)
strongly supports animal research and the Science Directorate regularly sponsors programs that highlight the benefits of animal research. Indeed, I would argue that the Science Directorate has been our greatest champion, providing educational resources to high school students, lobbying Congress, and developing programs at the national convention that showcase discoveries based on animal research. Nevertheless, among the membership, some antagonism is apparent and this does little to foster enthusiasm for the organization or psychology.

Given the long-standing tension, why maintain the marriage? I will argue that, if neuroscience breaks from psychology, both areas will lose. Those in neuroscience may be perplexed by this statement because a Department of Neuroscience would seem to have considerable appeal—finally we would be surrounded by like-minded individuals who understand the importance of animal research and recognize that an ELISA is not a computer program or a psychological test. The potential problem is that we may be marrying our cousin, yielding a form of intellectual inbreeding that will retard the strength gained from a truly interdisciplinary program of study. As a department of neuroscience develops, training programs will be trimmed and content standardized. Within a couple decades, we would have a generation of neuroscientists with a shared knowledge base, but the unique expertise and perspective provided by training programs in biochemistry, anatomy, neurobiology, AND psychology would be lost.

What do neuroscience students trained within psychology gain? I believe that most have a much better appreciation of experimental design, statistical analyses, the importance of converging operations, and the difficulties associated with formulating and testing a linking hypothesis. Our students find postdoctoral positions where they are viewed as resources in these areas. Sure, they need to learn advanced techniques in other areas, but it helps that they have a unique area of expertise and my impression is that this aspect of our training is gaining, not losing, appreciation. Researchers seeking to characterize how genetic manipulations impact behavior, learning, and memory, need the expertise of behavioral neuroscientists. And then there are the mountains of data being generated using gene chip technology. Suddenly, those extra semesters of statistics are proving helpful. And because psychology programs do a great deal of undergraduate training, our students often have more opportunities to learn the skills needed to become a good teacher. The flip side of this is that there are more academic positions in psychology—every college has a psychology department. It will be decades before a similar claim can be made for neuroscience. Finally, before you abandon psychology, read the fine print in your new contract. If the neuroscience program is within a medical setting, you may find that a large portion of your salary is supposed to come from “soft” money (grant generated dollars). This is fine during rich funding periods, but this is a scary proposition as we enter a time when funding lines are stated in single digit percentiles.

Yet another reason to look before you leap concerns a transition that is occurring within other areas of psychology. Imaging techniques are allowing cognitive psychologists to link mental processes to particular brain regions, fueling an interest in neural systems—an area of neuroscience. Similarly, kits are allowing researchers in other areas to measure a variety of physiological processes (e.g., cortisol, hormones) and developmental psychologists have been paying greater attention to the parallels between cognitive and neural development. Your cognitive colleague may now tell you that her area is cognitive neuroscience, not cognitive psychology, and the same is true in development and even social. Similarly, health psychology and the move to obtain prescription privileges are leading clinical psychologists to a greater appreciation of neuroscience. Given these transitions, the core of neuroscience at many universities now lies within psychology and there is every reason to believe that this trend will increase over time.

My conclusion is that psychology provides a good home, that there are many unique aspects to the types of training we offer, and that we benefit from a shared interest in some of the most fundamental scientific problems (including the nature of consciousness, learning, and memory, the evolution of behavior, the determinants of species diversity, and how genetic variation affects health and contributes to the processes that make
us uniquely human [see the top 25 questions facing science in the next quarter-century at http://www.sciencemag.org/sciext/125th/]). But to maintain the marriage between neuroscience and psychology, we need to put some time into the relationship—to strengthen ties that have weakened from years of neglect. A forum is needed to convey new insights on the neurobiology of cognition, perception, affect and behavior, the physiological mechanisms that underlie psychological illness, and the benefits and risks of modern drug treatments. Further, we need outlets for behavioral neuroscientists, and comparative psychologists, to discuss the behavioral/psychological aspects of their work. Sadly, my impression is that this is still underappreciated at the Society for Neuroscience convention. The forum needed already exists—the APA provides a convention that allows us to develop top-level programs to serve our students and reach other psychological, behavioral/neuroscience and psychology to maintain the marriage between the two fields. The APA provides a convention that allows us to develop top-level programs to serve our students back to the APA hinges on one variable—a top-flight program at the annual convention. Consider the following: Why do students and faculty join the Society for Neuroscience? For most, the journal articles published by the Society for Neuroscience can be obtained electronically through their school library, so journal access provides little incentive (the same is now true for APA journals). The society does have some nice fliers, and a good e-mail distribution system, but these alone would not justify the cost of membership. We join the Society for Neuroscience for just one reason—to gain the right to present our research at the national convention. For many laboratories, attendance is practically mandatory. The implication is that rebuilding behavioral neuroscience, comparative, cognitive, and pharmacology within APA hinges largely on just one factor—the quality of the national convention. Faculty will attend for high quality content not available elsewhere—symposia by top faculty, with a behavioral/psychological/health slant. Once mentors are excited about the content, they will encourage their students to go, a process we could encourage through unique training opportunities. There are dozens of workshops at the convention for clinicians. It is not too difficult to imagine workshops that could be tailored for our trainees and serve as an enticement to become involved. Both students and faculty want to know more about developments in neuroimaging, biological assays, and genetics. APA could offer a forum to introduce these topics at a level accessible to those lacking an advanced degree in physics or biochemistry. So after being involved in Division 6 for close to 8 years, I have become convinced that the health of the division, and our continued integration within psychology, hinges on the quality of the national convention. My recommendation is that we join forces with like-minded divisions and establish standing committees with participants willing to serve for multi-year terms and with links across multiple divisions—all with the aim of building a first-rate scientific convention. APA could support this endeavor by re-invigorating the concept of a science weekend (a Friday-Sunday convention), increased support for invited speakers, yielding greater control over a segment of the program to a coalition of divisions (with a promise that the rules governing this portion of the convention will remain stable over time), the publication of conference abstracts, and supporting the distribution of materials advertising featured talks and symposia of the science weekend.

Recognizing the importance of the convention, I asked Molly Wagster to handle programming for the division in D.C. Molly’s position at NIH, her proximity to D.C., her knowledge of APA procedures (she previously served as our secretary-treasurer), were the perfect combination for developing a top-flight program (see page 10) and I would like to thank her for all the work she has done. Other recent program chairs have done a tremendous job in recent years. But variation in how the conference is structured and organized by APA across years has hampered our efforts. A long-term plan is needed, with increased coordination across science-oriented divisions, coupled with a commitment of support from APA.

As my term as President of Division 6 comes to a close, I would also like to thank all of the other

(continued on page 6)
people who have worked over the last year to keep things going. Those outside of the Executive Committee may not realize that a large portion of division business is handled by the Secretary-Treasurer, so I am especially indebted to Chana Akins who took on this responsibility last year and to Nancy Dess, our past Secretary-Treasurer, who helped ease the transition. Joe Steinmetz has done a wonderful job orchestrating the selection of our awardees and Mary Meagher has submitted a record number of individuals for Fellows status within the Division. Rob Drugan has continued to build our membership base, Stephanie Washburn has been working to build the graduate student involvement within the Division, and MaryLou Cheal has continued to represent the Division on Council.

Finally, special thanks are due to Eric Wiertelak who has kept the Newsletter going and moved us to electronic distribution. The Executive Committee also benefits from the collective wisdom of our President-Elect (Tom Zentall), Past President (Ed Wasserman), Historian (Donald Dewsbury), and our Members-at-Large (Mark Bouton and Melinda Novak).

A Special Message from the Executive Committee of Division 6

Support Science--

Vote for Overmier and Brehm for APA President

Why vote for APA president: The president of APA is the most influential individual in APA. This is the one person who can have the most influence on the things that you want APA to do for you and for members of your group/s. Often members who are not involved in APA governance think that they do not know the candidates and it does not matter if they vote. The next paragraph is for you.

How to vote for APA president: In this case it is really how to choose your candidates. First, one must decide which candidates on the ballot will support one's own goals and then to rank order those candidates. In APA one does not just vote for one candidate and think that is it. It is important to rank the candidates because of the Hare system that is used by APA. When the votes are received, the number of #1 ranked votes for each candidate is noted. The person with the fewest votes is dropped. At that point, the #2 ranked candidate for those voters is given their votes. Thus, if your #1 candidate is dropped, your vote still counts. This process continues until one candidate gets a majority of the votes cast. It is usually on at least the third or fourth count that the president is decided.

Who to rank first for APA president: Which candidates should you choose? Some find the best method, if you do not know the candidates, is to read what they have done. What they say they will do is less useful, because the president must be everything to all members; so, all say they support academia, practice, and science. But what have they done? If they have spent most of their career in academia, then they will likely support the things that academics want. The same can be said for practice activities, and for research activities. In other words, pay much more attention to what candidates have done than to what they say.

For Division 6 members, candidates who have a strong record for supporting science and academia and, thus, are likely to continue to support science and academia are Bruce Overmier and Sharon Brehm. Both have been very active in APA governance and have promoted science goals. In addition, Bruce is a fellow of Division 6, has been our Council representative, and has held other offices on the executive committee. Therefore, you are encouraged to rank Bruce as #1 and Sharon as #2 candidates.

The important thing to do is VOTE!
APA’s Committee on Animal Research and Ethics  
*by Mark Blumberg*

For psychologists who work with animals and who must regularly confront the issue of animal rights activism, this past year has been a rocky one. As chair of APA’s Committee on Animal Research and Ethics (CARE) this year, I expected to be involved—as all members of CARE are—with the professional, educational, and outreach activities that aim to promote our science and our values to colleagues as well as to the general public. But my involvement took a different turn when, last November, my colleagues and I at the University of Iowa became the latest targets of an attack by the Animal Liberation Front (ALF) in which laboratories and offices were ransacked and animals were stolen. There was little new in the tactics employed during the attack or the rhetoric that followed. What was new, however, was that such acts seem to be taken more seriously by federal law enforcement agencies within the context of our post-9/11 world. Whether we like it or not, U. S. scientists, like our brethren in the U. K., have entered the age of terrorism.

In the wake of such attacks, one’s mind focuses intently on a few select issues. For us, the first issue was security. As we soon discovered, our newly renovated multimillion dollar facility was wide open to infiltration. Our electronic key system was pretty good at identifying (after the fact) who entered the facility and when, but there were no restrictions on when rooms could be entered and no alarms even if doors were battered.

I have talked with many colleagues about security this past year and I have been impressed with how many, without having directly experienced an attack, possess a deep appreciation for the security issues involved. But I also discovered a laissez faire attitude among many others, voicing comments such as “They would never strike us here” or “The administration would never agree to pay for better security.” An attack in a rural state like Iowa should dispel the first notion. The fact that securing our entire facility cost under $10,000 should dispel the second. Security, it turns out, is cheap.

A second issue that grabbed our attention after the attack was our need to educate the public about what we, as animal researchers, actually do. CARE has been involved in this effort for some time. For example, CARE is now completing its third and fourth documentaries—on social behavior and rehabilitation—in which researchers describe their research and the critical role played by animal subjects. In our continuing effort to promote the ethical conduct of animal research, a book entitled, Laboratory Animal Research: Ethics, Care, and Methods, which is the product of a CARE-sponsored workshop, was published by APA Books earlier this year. We are also revamping the CARE website to provide a better resource to scientists, teachers, and students interested in learning more about animal research. This educational aspect of CARE’s mission is long-standing and will continue. But education, to borrow a phrase, begins at home. And it turns out that we—all of us—need to do a better job of educating our colleagues within APA.

The justification for this last claim concerns the effort to create a new division within APA concerning “human-animal studies.” The organizers of this effort included “attitudes towards, and the effectiveness of, animal research” in their agenda, and several steering committee members held or had held leadership roles in another organization described as “strongly abolitionist” by its executive director (also a steering committee member who was described by that organization as a “leading opponent of animal research.”) CARE was understandably concerned, and weighed in with APA’s Board of Directors and Council of Representatives. We were relieved when the proposed division was defeated in February by the Council of Representatives. But before we look for new issues to address, we must never forget that the proposal was only defeated because it required a two-thirds majority to pass. That is, a majority of representatives voted in favor of the proposal, and concern about the vitality of animal research may apparently not have been a chief reason for many of the “no” votes. This is an ominous outcome for the future of animal research under the umbrella of APA, because anti-animal research activists (continued on page 8)
have resolve and patience and will not see this outcome as a final defeat. We must remain vigilant and seek every opportunity to educate our colleagues within APA about the centrality of animal research to the past, present, and future of psychology and our deep commitment to the welfare of our non-human wards.

CARE will continue with its commitment to the humane care and use of laboratory animals. But we need your support and your ideas. Please let us know what else we can do to help all of us continue our work without fear and to preserve APA as a strong supportive voice for animal research.

Announcements

Call for Programs:
13th Biennial meeting of
The International Society for Comparative Psychology

Contact: Dr. Robert Hughes, Psychology Department, University of Canterbury, Christchurch, New Zealand, rob.hughes@canterbury.ac.nz
phone: +64 (0)3 3642879. Fax: +64 (0)3 364 2181

Call for Submissions:
Journal of Undergraduate Neuroscience Education (JUNE)

JUNE is an electronic journal that publishes peer-reviewed reports of innovations in any area of undergraduate neuroscience education related to the mission of advancing undergraduate neuroscience on topics such as novel pedagogy and original laboratory exercises. All articles should be written for an audience of college faculty and include references to relevant literature, supplies, and/or supplemental materials such as animations, websites, etc. Figures and qualitative or quantitative assessment of pedagogical outcomes are also encouraged wherever appropriate. JUNE also invites submissions as letters to the editor and reviews of textbook, curricular, equipment, or media.

JUNE is a publication of Faculty for Undergraduate Neuroscience (FUN) and is free to read and download. Visit JUNE today at [www.funjournal.org/default.asp] or follow the links from the FUN website, [funfaculty.org]. Inquiries regarding submissions should be directed to Barbara Lom at any stage in the writing process. balom@davidson.edu; 704-894-2338 (phone); 704-894-2512 (fax), Box 7118, Davidson College, Davidson NC, 28035-7118.

What Does An Animal Hear?

Mammals vary greatly in their hearing range and auditory sensitivity. In experiments involving auditory cues, it is important to know whether the species you are working with can readily hear the sounds being presented as a sound that is easily audible to humans may be inaudible to the animal, and vice versa. For example, a 500-Hz tone at 50 dB sound pressure level is easily audible to humans, but inaudible to laboratory rats. On the other hand, rats have their best sensitivity at 32 kHz, a frequency that is totally inaudible to humans. The audiograms of mammals are now available in summary form on the web. To find out what an animal hears, go to: http://psychology.utoledo.edu/lch
Announcements

David Washburn Appointed New IJCP Editor

According to the By-Laws of the International Society for Comparative Psychology, journal Editors are appointed for six years. The current term covered the period 2000-2005. After an open call for nominations, an ad-hoc Search Committee chaired by Jerry Hogan and with Gary Greenberg, Roger Mellgren, and Robert Murphey as members, appointed David Washburn as the new Editor of the International Journal of Comparative Psychology for the period 2006-2011.

After July 1st, 2005, please submit manuscripts to:

David Washburn   Editor, IJCP
Department of Psychology  Georgia State University
P.O. Box 5010  Atlanta, GA 30302-5010 U.S.A.
dwashburn@gsu.edu

Award for Distinguished Service to Psychological Science

The APA Board of Scientific Affairs (BSA) is soliciting nominations for the Award for Distinguished Service to Psychological Science. This Award recognizes individuals who have made outstanding contributions to psychological science through their commitment to a culture of service. Award recipients will receive an honorarium of $1,000. The deadline for nominations is August 25, 2005.

Nominees will have demonstrated their service to the discipline by aiding in association governance; serving on boards, committees and various psychological associations; editing journals; reviewing grant proposals; mentoring students and colleagues; advocating for psychological science’s best interests with state and federal lawmakers; and promoting the value of psychological science in the public eye. Nominees may be involved in one service area, many of the areas, or all of the service areas noted above. An individual’s service to the discipline and not a person’s scholarly achievements are the focus of this award.

Additional information and instructions on submitting applications can be found on the APA Science Directorate website:  http://www.apa.org/science/serv_award.html.

Congratulations to the new President-Elect of Division 6, Karen Hollis (Mount Holyoke), and newly-elected Counsel Representative, Bruce Overmier (UMinn).
Symposium

Successful Cognitive Aging I---Brain Change Can Be Good
10:00 AM - 11:50 AM, Washington Convention Center, Meeting Room 102B
John Disterhoft, PhD, Chair

Michela Gallagher, PhD Participant/1stAuthor
When Lab Rats Age Well, Their Brains Age Differently
Roberto Cabeza, PhD Participant/1stAuthor

Aging Gracefully: Compensatory Brain Activity in Older Adults
Randy L. Buckner, PhD Participant/1stAuthor

The Malleable Aging Brain

Symposium

Successful Cognitive Aging II---Maintaining Your Brain
2:00 PM - 3:50 PM, Washington Convention Center, Meeting Room 102B
Molly V. Wagster, PhD, Chair

Yaakov Stern, PhD Participant/1stAuthor
Cognitive Reserve: What Is It? How Do I Get It?
Arthur F. Kramer, PhD Participant/1stAuthor
Enhancing Cognitive Plasticity: Fitness and Cognitive Training
Symposium--continued
2:00 PM - 3:50 PM, Washington Convention Center, Meeting Room 102B

Marilyn S. Albert, PhD Participant/1stAuthor
Lifestyle Predictors of Maintenance of Cognitive Function

Social Hour-- Divisions 1, 3, & 6
5:00-5:50 PM Renaissance Washington DC Hotel, Sports Bar

A new concept for the social hour; please make plans to attend!

Division 6 Executive Committee Meeting
6:00 PM - 8:50 PM, Renaissance Washington DC Hotel, Meeting Room 6

Friday, August 19, 2005

Information Symposium
Meet the National Institutes of Health:
Research and Training for New Investigators
8:00 AM - 9:50 AM, Renaissance Washington DC Hotel, Ballroom West B
Held by representatives from CSR, NCCAM, NCI, NHLBI, NIA,
NIAAA, NIAMS, NICHD, NIDA, NIDCD, NIDCR, NIDDK,
NIMH, and OBSSR.

Fellow Address
Steve Reilly
Gustatory Thalamus and Incentive Relativity
2:00 PM - 2:50 PM, Washington Convention Center, Meeting Room 209C
**Friday, August 19, 2005-- continued**

*Poster Session*

**Behavioral Neuroscience and Comparative Psychology**

3:00 PM - 3:50 PM, Washington Convention Center, Halls D & E

Raquel Cumba, BA Participant/1stAuthor

**Performance of Depressed Patients on the Virtual Morris Water Task**

Kathleen Holmes, BS Co-Author
Carlos A. Zarate, MD Co-Author

Jeffrey W. Gilger, PhD Participant/1stAuthor

**Brain Morphology of Family Members With Superior PIQs and Dyslexia**

Julianna Sanchez-Bloom, PhD Co-Author
George Hynd, EdD Co-Author
Jason Craggs, PhD Co-Author

David H. Linkous, MA Participant/1stAuthor

**Zinc and Iron Have Different Effects on Transgenic Mouse Behavior**

Janice C. McMurray, MA Participant/1stAuthor

**Binaural Beats Enhance EEG Activity and Attention in ADHD Individuals**

Gary S. Katz, PhD Co-Author

Reuben N. Robbins, MA Participant/1stAuthor

**Individual Differences in the Effects of Emotional Arousal on Memory**

David P. Bernstein, PhD Co-Author
Dean McKay, PhD Co-Author
**Poster Session-- continued**

**Behavioral Neuroscience and Comparative Psychology**

3:00 PM - 3:50 PM, Washington Convention Center, Halls D & E

Kelly A. Schmidtke, AA Participant/1stAuthor

**Differential Outcomes Training Yields Evidence for Acquired Equivalence in Pigeons**

John Holden, PhD Co-Author
J. Bruce Overmier, PhD Co-Author

Laura N. Smith, MA Participant/1stAuthor

**Effects of Enhanced Zinc on Fear Conditioning and Extinction**

Jeanne M. Stahl, PhD Participant/1stAuthor

**Sharing Versus Competing Among Rats in a Food Competition Paradigm**

Fernando A. Gonzalez, PhD Co-Author
Alicia Askew, PhD Co-Author

Tao-Yiao J. Wu, PhD Participant/1stAuthor

**Estrogen Receptor Alpha Stimulation Prevents Post-Ovariectomy Weight Gain**

Iga Wegorszweska, BS Co-Author
Emily Ewell, BS Co-Author
Darwin O. Larco Co-Author
Trent Lund, PhD Co-Author
Robert Handa, PhD Co-Author
Martha M. Faraday, PhD Co-Author
Fellow Address

Mark S. Blumberg

Unraveling the Mystery of Infant Sleep

4:00 PM - 4:50 PM, Washington Convention Center, Meeting Room 203

Saturday, August 20, 2005

Invited Address

Pauline M. Maki

Remembrance of Things Past: Estrogen and the Aging Brain

9:00 AM - 9:50 AM, Washington Convention Center, Meeting Room 144C

Symposium

Intimate Interaction Between Sex and Cognition

10:00 AM - 11:50 AM, Washington Convention Center, Meeting Room 144C

Mary W. Meagher, PhD, Chair

Symposium-- continued

10:00 AM - 11:50 AM, Washington Convention Center, Meeting Room 144C

Michael Domjan, PhD Participant/1stAuthor

Pavlovian Conception

Gerianne M. Alexander, PhD Participant/1stAuthor

Boys, Toys, and the Brain

Presidential Address

James Grau

Evolving Perspectives on Learning: Implications for Treatment and Teaching

2:00 PM - 2:50 PM, Renaissance Washington DC Hotel, Meeting Room 15
Division 6 Business Meeting
3:00 PM - 3:50 PM, Renaissance Washington DC Hotel, Meeting Room 15

Sunday, August 21, 2005

Symposium

Sex Differences in Sensation and Perception
8:00 AM - 9:50 AM, Washington Convention Center, Meeting Room 140A
Leonard Sax, PhD, MD Chair

Richard L. Doty, PhD Participant/1stAuthor
Sex Differences in Sensation and Perception: Olfactory
Pamela H. Dalton, PhD Co-Author

Edwin D. Lephart, PhD Participant/1stAuthor
Sex Differences in Sensation and Perception: Visual
Janice M. Juraska, PhD Co-Author

Conversation Hour

Human, Animal, and Planetary Issues
10:00 AM - 10:50 AM, Washington Convention Center, Meeting Room 140A
Ethel Tobach, PhD Facilitator

BNCP back issues are available online at http://www.apa.org/divisions/div6/newsletter.html