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President’s Message

A Brief History of Experimental Psychology, 1850 - 2125

Nelson Cowan

Let me begin this essay on the history of experimental psychology with a small personal note. There was another Nelson Cowan who was President of the Experimental Psychology Division of the American Psychological Association in the year 2009, though I am no relation to him. This division of the APA was one of several precursors of the North American division of the World Psychometric Association. It existed in the United States of America before that formerly powerful but reckless nation joined the Pan-American United States out of economic necessity in 2032, and then became part of the World Democratic Republic in 2060.

A post-quantum physicist friend of mine has expressed concern that this essay could be inadvertently teleported back to the APA Division 3 electronic journal of 2009 because of a serious security flaw in their primitive and makeshift computer operating system of the era, and because of the electronic pull generated by a readership vacuum for their journal; but I think that possibility is too remote to be of serious concern. Let me then proceed.

Experimental psychology, the use of experimental manipulation to examine behavior, is said to have begun with the establishment of the first experimental psychology laboratory by Wilhelm Wundt in 1875. Almost certainly, the preparatory scholarly work making that laboratory possible began at least a quarter century earlier. In broad strokes, one can view the history of experimental psychology as divided into 50-year periods involving, in turn, thesis, antithesis, and synthesis.

The period 1850-1900 was one dominated by a thesis of looking inward. Although elaborate and thoughtful experimental methods were used, they were combined with methods of trained introspection, in which, for example, highly trained observers attempted to describe sensations separately from the perceptions they produced. The era was one largely geared toward attempting to understand the nature of consciousness and its elements: perceptions, thoughts, feelings, and so on.

The period 1900-1950 was then dominated by the antithesis of the earlier period. Looking outward rather than inward, it was the period of behaviorism. According to the more severe forms of that school of thought, it was not even considered legitimate to theorize about the inner working of the mind; only stimuli and responses were to be discussed, with the aim of discovering the laws that related stimuli to responses. This change came about because the methods of introspection were impossible to replicate and behaviorists found that unacceptable.

The period 1900-1950 was then dominated by the antithesis of the earlier period. Looking outward rather than inward, it was the period of behaviorism. According to the more severe forms of that school of thought, it was not even considered legitimate to theorize about the inner working of the mind; only stimuli and responses were to be discussed, with the aim of discovering the laws that related stimuli to responses. This change came about because the methods of introspection were impossible to replicate and behaviorists found that unacceptable.

Eventually, a synthesis of these views arose in the period 1950-2000, in the form of a field termed cognitive psychology. In this half-century, the rigor of behaviorism were combined with evidence showing that more progress could be made by assuming internal constructs that could not be directly observed, such as attention, imagery, memory storage, and executive processes. Psychologists in this area were therefore looking inward and outward at the same time.

Mid-way in that process there had also been a concerted effort to link together other fields such as philosophy, linguistics, computer science, and anthropology to form a super-field.
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called cognitive science. It was eventually decided, though, that the researchers in all those other fields were by and large too weird to work with and brought with them too much required reading, and so the psychologists let them go their own separate ways.

One might think that the synthesis achieved in the field of cognitive psychology would lead to a kind of stasis. Bear in mind, though, that scientists depend on innovation for their livelihood and any kind of status quo, with the issues and methods settled, means starvation to the field. With an urge to change and the advent of new technologies, the period 2000-2050 became one in which the predominant orientation turned inward again, this time with exciting new methods to observe brain function.

It was about mid-way through this half-century that experimental psychology encountered its most severe crisis. Important challenges to its validity came from several quarters, all coming to a focus in 2024. Some of the challenges can be numerated as follows.

First, the new brain research was for the most part correlational in nature rather than experimental. The primary goal of a study of brain function was to determine neural correlates of mental states. It could not be said from this research that the brain caused the mental state. There were some experiments with methods in which brain function was temporarily altered and behavioral results measured, such as trancranial magnetic stimulation. Those methods, however, were bogged down by some legal and ethical concerns at the time. Also, it was discovered that there was a strong self-selection factor such that those individuals who chose to participate in brain-altering studies came into the study with very distinct personality traits that affected the results, a criticism that had been leveled earlier against studies of hypnotism and psychoactive drug effects.

Second, research on genetics removed what had been one of the strongest models for unidirectional causation. It had been thought that genes determine behavior but it became clear that behavior and mental states help to configure the genes, so that one’s behavior has some reciprocal sway over the effects of the genes.

Third, the statistical method termed complex directional modeling was developed. It viewed causation as being a three-way street. For any particular set of events A and B, this form of modeling sought to quantify the extent to which A caused B, the extent to which B caused A, and the extent to which third factors caused both A and B. This field eventually lost steam because it was criticized as being still too simplistic, inasmuch as the percentages could not adequately take into account higher-level interactions over time. For example, in a classroom test situation, forgetting can cause confusion (which then can cause further forgetting), whereas in a party with too much alcohol, confusion can cause forgetting (which then can cause further confusion). Contextual factors can cause the perception of the situation to vary between test-like and party-like, so the third factor changes the balance of the causation pathway between cause and effect, and complex directional modeling was unable to represent that type of problem. It is still being studied by one group, namely scientists trying to preserve what is left of the primitive natural ecology of the earth.

Fourth, and perhaps most importantly, politicians contributed to the zeitgeist that railed against the study of unidirectional causation, which greatly hurt funding of studies in that field. This happened during the aftermath of what is known as the Second Great Depression, 2009-2020 (which, by the way, is actually the third great depression because an earlier depression in the 1870s was originally known as the Great Depression, then became known as the Long Depression after the depression of the 1930s came along, and finally was forgotten). The reason for this decision of the political leadership was a bit self-serving. Given the uncertainties in the field of economics in 2009, it was at first difficult to know whose actions caused the depression. In the following decade there were some remarkable breakthroughs in economics allowing it to become established as a reliable science. At that point, it seemed rather clear which officials were most at fault for triggering the Second Great Depression. However, some leading economic scientists of the time went heavily into complex directional modeling. As a result, blame could not be placed on any individual for causing the depression. A politician’s misguided push to help the banks could be seen as a cause of more unemployment or loss of housing but, equally well, the rising loss of housing could be seen as a cause of the politician’s decision and both of them were caused partly by the prevailing social conditions. Complex directional modeling ended the assignment of blame in this long episode.

The inward orientation of brain research then changed to an outward focus in the period
I was raised in the Hyde Park neighborhood of Chicago in the shadow of the University of Chicago. Local heroes, including the likes of Enrico Fermi, kindled an interest in physics, and Scientific American focused that interest on quantum mechanics and relativity. I was a mediocre student until I accidentally encountered two high school teachers, one in biology and the other in English literature, who showed me that learning could be fun. The ‘disciples’ of these two teachers formed their own social circle of nerds (Nerds of the World, Unite; You have nothing to lose but your social stigma), which provided much intellectual stimulation then and has maintained its connections ever since. We were the chess players and the science fair participants who won city-wide prizes. Competency at these activities was considerable consolation for not being able to throw a 50-yard pass.

I followed up my interest in physics by enrolling at MIT. This was a rude awakening after being a star student at my high school. While a student there, I specialized in high energy physics and did research at the local cyclotron and the MIT reactor. For graduate school I moved on to Rutgers to
work with a faculty member who was part of the Columbia-Rutgers High Energy Research Group, which consisted of six faculty, many postdocs, several dozen graduate students, and a bevy of technicians.
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Although I earned my masters in high energy physics at Rutgers, I became disillusioned on two counts. First, I found myself programming computers rather than doing real physics. Second, my advisor was an experimentalist who seemed to play the role of a glorified mechanic to the theoreticians. I resolved to find a scientific field where I could avoid computers (you can see how successful I was) and one in which I could be both an experimentalist and a theoretician (here I was more successful). The question was where to turn. At the time I was dating a young lady who was a graduate student in social psychology at Columbia, and I amused myself by reading her text books. The problem was that I had never taken an undergraduate course in psychology. Consequently, on a late August morning I presented myself to the chair of psychology at Rutgers with a plan to spend one year taking a multitude of undergraduate psychology courses to qualify for the graduate psychology program. George Collier just happened to be in the chair’s office when I stopped in. He suggested that I read an Introductory text over the weekend and start graduate courses immediately, which is what I did (which is not to say that I recommend this strategy). Although he was not my advisor, George continued to influence my life and interests. He was the first person to point out to me the degree of genetic baggage that we all carry and the role of the ecological niche in the tuning of an animal’s behavior.

My prior exposure to some social psychology defined my initial direction in psychology. My masters thesis in psychology focused on a means of reducing conflict in a reiterative prisoner’s dilemma game, which I viewed as a model for the armaments race in the cold war. My central hypothesis was that if each player had a third option (in addition to cooperate and compete) which resulted in a payoff of zero for both players, eventually the players would come to cooperate. The data supported the hypothesis and my first publication in psychology appeared in the *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. The rub came in debriefing my subjects (and in that day and age, they were “subjects,” not “participants”). They each had an account for why they did what they did. But their accounts made it clear that they often did not correctly recall the opponent’s plays, and in some cases they misdescribed their own plays... yet, the subjects experienced more cooperative outcomes with the option of a zero/zero payoff and their pattern of successive plays confirmed the hypothesis that they worked their way from competition to no play to cooperation. This sensitized me to the limitations of subject’s verbal accounts of their behaviors and more generally the limitations of introspection.

While still a graduate student, I was offered a fellowship to work in the laboratory of Donald J. Lewis, who was interested in the physiological basis of memory. This introduced me to a whole new world of research with nonhuman subjects (as well as accompanying asthma and allergies). The lab was productive, and I soon had publications in *Science* and *Nature*. Our basic insight was that many of the behavioral deficits that were then (and now) being attributed to impaired memory consolidation, were instead due to a failure to retrieve information that had indeed been stored. This sensitized me to the learning-performance distinction, a theme that has repeatedly reappeared in my subsequent research.

Postdoctoral positions were not yet fashionable in psychology, so I sought a faculty appointment upon receiving my PhD. The job market was not as tight then as it is now. I offered four different positions, and, perhaps attracted to the lights of the big city, I went to Brooklyn College of CUNY, where I stayed for a productive ten years. But at the end of ten years, I decided that the high teaching load at CUNY was impeding my research. Additionally it dawned on me that New York was a great place to visit but not to live. An offer from SUNY-Binghamton was attractive because of the department’s emphasis on research and because the university’s nature preserve gave me a multitude of trees to hug. Binghamton provided me with many stimulating faculty colleagues, but first and foremost in providing stimulation was a long line of great graduate students, postdocs, and collaborators from diverse lands including France, China, Spain, Japan, Argentina, Canada, and Chile.

Over the decades, service has also become a major component of my activities, from heading my department, to offices in a number of professional societies, to chairing a number of NIH study sections. Additionally, serving as editor of the Psychonomic Society’s journal *Animal Learning & Behavior* was an eye opening experience as it forced me to read far more widely than I otherwise would have.

In recent years, much of my research has revolved around two sets of principles that we formulated: the comparator hypothesis and the temporal coding hypothesis. In brief, the comparator hypothesis captures the view that subjects do not respond in relation to the absolute strength of a cue-outcome association, but in relation to the difference between the cue-outcome association and the training context-outcome association. That is, subjects are responsive to increases and decreases in the likelihood of an outcome rather than the absolute likelihood of the outcome. The temporal coding hypothesis asserts that learning inevitably encodes not only what events were paired, but when [and where] they were paired. Moreover, just as associations can be chained,
separately learned intervals [and distances] can be integrated, provided one of the two anchoring events is in common between the two associations. This integration of separate memories can create spatiotemporal relationships between cues that were never presented near one another.

Another relatively recent twist in my research has been the use of human subjects. Over our 39 years of federal funding, we have repeatedly claimed that our studies with rats spoke to human behavior as well provided we restricted ourselves to simple behavior. But as I have become a gray beard, I felt that we should directly test this premise, which we have done with considerable success. Moreover, given the present academic job market, I think that my students will be more competitive if they have experience with both human and rat experiments. As we see more and more commonalities between human and nonhuman behavior, it certainly gives pause to the view that humans are greatly removed from other species. Either nonhumans are capable of more elaborate thought processes than we previously realized, or humans are more ‘mechanical’ in their thought processes than introspection suggests. Personally, based on currently available evidence, I favor the latter view.

I still read social psychology, but now cast in an evolutionary framework. Evolutionary psychology is fascinating and holds many basic truths, but has also generated vast numbers of Just So stories. The challenge is separating the wheat from the chaff. In recent years, as an avocation I have dabbled in evolutionary psychological research in collaboration with David S. Wilson, the champion of a modern and well reasoned version of multi-level selection (including group selection).

I am now completing my thirtieth year at Binghamton and the trajectory of my research surprises many people, myself included. My doctoral work was in physiological psychology (now called behavioral neuroscience). Whereas many others have gone ever more molecular, I find myself becoming more molar. Rather than focusing on chemical and electrical interventions as I used to do, I now modify my animals’ behavior by altering their experiences. Surely all animals including humans are intricate biological machines and it is essential that we understand the physiological roots of behavior, but I believe that there is also merit in studying the effects of environmental stimuli on behavior. Just as physics did not render chemistry obsolete despite all chemical phenomena ultimately having an explanation with physics, so a physiological account of behavior is not a substitute for a psychological/cognitive account. Reductionism is essential, but often cannot explain things by itself. Reductionism is at risk of losing sight of the forest due to its focus on the trees.

In sum, for 45 years I have been studying the effects of experience on behavior. If there is one thing that I have learned over this period, it is that behavior is not as plastic as I thought 45 years ago. Genes don’t determine any behavior, but they often create strong predispositions. If genes have so much effect, why do I spend my time studying the effects of experience on behavior? The reason is that even if experience explains relatively little of the behavioral differences between people, at the present time it is far easier to manipulate the environment than a person’s genes.

---
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Greetings from Washington to the members of Division 3. Here is some of what we’ve been working on recently in the APA Science Directorate:

**Science Funding and Policy in the New Administration.**

Along with other scientific organizations, APA advocated strongly for inclusion of supplementary funding for the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health in the recent economic stimulus bill. Individual APA members, alerted by APA Science Government Relations staff, also communicated with their Senators in support of the funding. The effort paid off. The final legislation, signed by President Obama on February 17, provided very large increases for both agencies. For FY 2009, the legislation added $3.0 billion to the NSF budget (on top of the FY 2008 base of $6.1 billion) and $10.4 billion to the NIH budget (on top of the FY 2008 base of $29.6 billion).

It is expected that the bulk of the funds will be used to support research projects that can make substantial progress within the next two years. The agencies will release specific plans for soliciting and funding proposals in the weeks ahead. APA will focus on ensuring that an appropriate portion of these new funds is used to support high-quality behavioral science research. APA will also work to maintain healthy budgets for these agencies in future years.

APA has already laid the foundation for a productive relationship with the new Presidential administration. During the transition period, APA, working with other organizations, submitted six statements to the incoming administration on a variety of research and public health policy issues. In December, APA Science Directorate officials met in person with the NSF transition review team. The important contributions of behavioral and social science research, both basic and applied, to health, education, national security, and economic development was a major theme of these communications. (See the December issue of Science Policy Insider News for more details on these efforts.)

**PsychDrollery**
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Science Leadership Conference. The fourth annual APA Science Leadership Conference, sponsored by the Science Directorate and Board of Scientific Affairs, was held on Oct 2-4, 2008, in Tempe, Arizona. The theme of the conference was Designing the Future: Innovations in Knowledge Dissemination for Psychological Science. Organized in collaboration with the APA Publications and Databases Office, the conference explored the changing landscape of publication and sharing of scientific information and the new opportunities that arise for the dissemination of psychological science.

The 125 conference participants included not only psychologists but also library and information scientists, publishers, and scientists in other fields who have pioneered new approaches to disseminating research. The conference agenda featured presentations and discussions on such topics as:

- Implications of the growth of interdisciplinary and translational research for the contents and formats of journals
- Open access to publications and data, including the development of academic and government-sponsored research repositories
- The impact of new technologies on how scientists access and communicate about research
- How scientists' career stages, research specialties, and home institutions influence the ways they contribute to and use publications
- The challenge of making research accessible and useful to practitioners, policymakers, and the general public

A report of the recommendations generated at the conference, which will help guide future APA initiatives, is in preparation. For further coverage of the conference, see the November issue of Psychological Science Agenda (PSA) and the December issue of the APA Monitor on Psychology.

Advanced Training Institutes. The Directorate sponsors Advanced Training Institutes (ATIs) each summer at institutions around the country. They provide advanced graduate students, post-docs, and faculty-level researchers with exposure to current and emerging research methods and technologies. Four ATIs will be offered in 2009:

- **Nonlinear Methods for Psychological Science**
  University of Cincinnati
  June 8-12, 2009
  (application deadline: March 24)

- **Research Methods with Diverse Racial and Ethnic Groups**
  Michigan State University
  June 22-26, 2009
  (application deadline: March 30)

- **Structural Equation Modeling in Longitudinal Research**
  University of Virginia
  June 29-July 3, 2009
  (application deadline: April 6)

- **Exploratory Data Mining in Behavioral Research**
  University of Southern California
  July 20-24, 2009
  (application deadline: April 14)

Modest financial assistance is available for some ATI participants. For complete information and application materials, consult the ATI webpage.

Animal Research DVD. A DVD on The Role of Nonhuman Animal Research in Psychology, produced under the supervision of the APA Committee on Animal Research and Ethics (CARE), has been released. The DVD contains three segments: "Psychopharmacology" (previously released in VHS format), “Significance of Touch” (on the role of physical contact in development), and “Recovery of Function” (on recovery of motor function following nervous system injury). The segments, which are appropriate for high school and introductory undergraduate classes, can be used to initiate discussions on the relevance and ethics of research with nonhuman animals. Each segment is approximately 15 minutes long. Teacher study guides are also included on the DVD. You may obtain the DVD for free by contacting the Science Directorate at science@apa.org or 202-336-6000.

Grand Challenges Publications. Health Disparities, the third in a series of Science Directorate booklets on “Society’s Grand Challenges: Insights from Psychological Science,” has been released. The series, which also includes booklets on Prolonging Vitality and Global Climate Change, are aimed at lay and student audiences. The booklets can be found online or can be ordered from the Science Directorate (science@apa.org, 202-336-6000).

Nurturing Interdisciplinary Science. The APA Board of Scientific Affairs (BSA), which oversees the Science Directorate, recently engaged in brainstorming sessions on how APA could enhance its support and promotion of interdisciplinary approaches to research and training. Writing
in the January issue of PSA, Alice Young, former chair of BSA, reported on the many useful and imaginative proposals that emerged from these discussions. These ideas will inform the Science Directorate’s future activities. I invite all members to contact me with their own thoughts about what APA and academic institutions can do to advance interdisciplinary psychological science.

**Award Deadlines Approaching.** The deadlines for submitting nominations for major awards administered by the Science Directorate are coming up soon:

**Meritigious Research Service Commendation**  
Recognizes individuals who have made outstanding contributions to psychological science through their service as employees of the federal government or other organizations.  
(Nomination deadline: March 9, 2009)

**Award for Distinguished Service to Psychological Science**  
Recognizes individuals who have made outstanding contributions to psychological science through their commitment to a culture of service  
(Nomination deadline: April 1, 2009)

**Departmental Award for Culture of Service in the Psychological Sciences**  
Recognizes departments that demonstrate a commitment to service in the psychological sciences.  
(Nomination deadline: April 1, 2009)

**Distinguished Scientific Awards**  
Recoginzes individuals who have made major research contributions, in three categories:  
- Distinguished Scientific Contribution Award  
- Distinguished Scientific Award for the Applications of Psychology  
- Distinguished Scientific Award for Early Career Contribution to Psychology  
(Nomination deadlines: June 1, 2009)

See the [APA Science Awards](#) page for information on all awards, including prizes and funding for students.

You may stay current on Science Directorate news by checking back at our [website](#) and by reading the Directorate’s monthly newsletter, *Psychological Science Agenda (PSA)*, and its science policy newsletter, *Science Policy Insider News (SPIN)*.

I look forward to seeing many of you this summer at the APA Convention in Toronto (August 6-9). Feel free to contact me at any time with questions or suggestions.

Howard Kurtzman  
Deputy Executive Director  
APA Science Directorate  
hkurtzman@apa.org
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department they are trying to join. A focused cover letter displays professional maturity and makes it easier for the search committee to understand what the applicant would potentially bring to the department. During the interview process, the meeting with chair is extremely important, in addition to the job talk. Applicants need to display via informed questions and thought-out answers that they have considered what will be necessary to be successful at the institution. Chairs hope that the hiring decision is much tougher than tenure decisions, so interaction during the one-on-one meeting is very diagnostic as to whether the individual has the maturity and the appropriate mind-set to be a successful contributing member of the faculty.

DD: Given the likelihood that the academic job market will be tight for some years to come, those who want to work in academia should seek to maximize their chances of obtaining one of the positions that do exist. Some of those positions will be at R1 institutions, but many of them will be at comprehensive institutions or at liberal arts colleges. The training that candidates receive in R1 institution Ph.D. programs does not always prepare them for working at or even interviewing at the latter. To rise above the applicant pool for the latter, your application needs to convince those institutions that you really are interested in working in that environment (if you’re not, then you do yourself and those institutions a disservice by applying). Many liberal arts colleges and comprehensive institutions will care deeply about the research you do, but also about your ability to teach and mentor their students. Your application has to show that you share this set of values and suggest that you’d be a productive colleague in that setting. If you should be fortunate enough to land an interview, I would suggest several more things regardless of where that interview is. The first is to go with the clear cut goal of getting the job offer. You can decline it afterwards if it really isn’t right for you once you’ve thought everything out, but get the offer first. Don’t send mixed messages about whether you really do want the position. Secondly, academic interviews are prolonged events – almost a marathon in many cases. You’ll be meeting faculty, students, staff, and administrators, and you’ll want to interact positively with all of them. When you meet with faculty, ask about their research in addition to describing your own. When you interact with staff, be considerate. I know of cases where applicants were very personable in interactions with faculty, but much less so in interactions with staff, and it killed their chances. (Remember the old line about who really runs academic departments!).

KTA: I would encourage graduate students to thoroughly research the institutions for which they are applying. Try to identify the department’s needs and the ways that you can contribute uniquely to the program(s). I also tell my students to make it impossible for them to ignore your application (without being overconfident or presumptuous). Although this can be very time-consuming, compared to a mass mailing of a general cover letter and your vita, it can be the difference between being invited to interview or not. I would recommend preparing a series of questions that more fully assess how members of the department view your potential contributions to their program. Have these questions ready so that when you get the call, inviting you to campus, you can ask them. During the interview, identify other ways you can contribute and demonstrate your genuine interest in making such contributions.

2. Is there anything different that would help a graduate student stand out from the pool of applicants during the current economic uncertainty, as opposed to previous years when funds for hiring positions may have been more secure?

MA: I don’t think graduate students should do anything differently now during uncertain economic times than they should do during great economic times. Use your grad school years (and post-doc years, if any) to make yourself an attractive candidate, in as many ways as possible, so that the hiring department is delighted to have beaten out the competition and gotten you.

FBF: There isn’t anything differently that should be done now as opposed to years past. There will always be some uncertainty with the funding for available positions. This may depend somewhat on whether the position is at a state-funded or privately-funded institution. Information is available in the public record in regards to how well each state supports education. In the end, all you can do is go after the job you want – don’t be self-protective because you are unsure whether or not the position is really available, as this will affect your interview and job talk performance.

DD: To help stand out from the pool of applicants in psychology, I would argue that a specific subset of skills such as training in quantitative psychology can help. We always look favorably on applicants with something like a minor in statistics because that gives us confidence that they can teach the quantitative courses in the department. A second way of distinguishing yourself is by demonstrating your potential for bringing in grant dollars. In tight times, those who appear capable of generating research dollars quickly will be seen even more favorably.

KTA: As noted in question 1 “fit” is very important. Marketing your research carefully can also be helpful. Think about your audience and make sure your research description is accessible to those outside of your area. Given that funding agencies have been particularly interested in interdisciplinary, translational, and transformational research, make clear what the practical implications of your research are (even if you are doing “real” basic research) and identify areas in which you might be able to develop collaborations with others in the department and on campus. Describing potential funding sources will catch the eye of those who are most concerned with your ability to contribute to the department’s bottom line. Finally, in terms of research, I would try to demonstrate an ability to generate interest in your research and ultimately attract students. More than ever before, many departments are looking for individuals who will excel in all areas of the academe. Although research is important, do not neglect the other legs of the profession. Demonstrating a commitment to quality instruction and professionally-related service is critical. Finally, faculty members are cognizant they are not just hiring just a developmental psychologist, neuroscientist, and so forth, but also a colleague that they will have to work with on numerous committees over the years. So, give some thought to how you want to come across as a colleague. In small departments, in particular, collegiality can be as important as research area.
3. During a job talk, is it more important for the job applicant to briefly review many different areas of research or instead focus in more detail on one specific line of research?

MA: Of course, the job talk is the single most important sample of your behavior during the interview -- whatever the content is, be sure you've practiced it enough! Beyond that, my own preference is a job talk that mimics a well-written journal article; start with a broad theme, narrow down to one specific line of research, and then conclude by placing that research back into a broader context. People hearing the talk will see your expertise in the specific research you present, and will also be reassured that you know where your own tree fits into the larger forest.

FBF: The job talk should show the breadth of one’s research, but also needs to be focused and illustrate a program of research. A job talk that is all over the place comes across as unplanned, and you don't want to come across as a research dilettante. You can usually take your dissertation work as the jump-off point for your job talk, and even incorporate previous work that you might not have initially considered as related to your later work. Simply and creatively establish conceptual links to the research projects. Another consideration is that at many R1 schools, the job talk also serves as a sampling of your ability as an instructor, so it is very important to articulate complex ideas and respond to questions intelligently.

DD: Finally, for your job talk, remember that psychologists have a peculiar burden – we have to describe our research and sell it to others who may have very different training and assumptions than we do. Those individuals need to understand what it is that we do and why it’s interesting and important. For example, the clinical psychologist needs to be able to convince the cognitive neuroscientist in the audience about the merits of her work, and vice versa. Therefore, while showing off your theoretical brilliance and methodological ingenuity to those with the same background as yourself, you also need to bring the rest of the audience along for the ride by explaining it to them as you would to an intelligent individual without that background. Also, know who your audience is going to be – the successful talk given to an audience consisting solely of faculty will be quite different from the successful talk given to an audience of faculty and undergraduate students. For your job talk, I also would suggest focusing on your primary programmatic line of research rather than trying to cover all the different projects you might have gone on. You’ll have plenty of chances to meet with faculty outside of the job talk, and presumably you can use those as an opportunity to describe your other research interests.

KTA: From my perspective, what is most important during the job talk is to highlight the programmatic nature of your research -- that can be done using a variety of different kinds of research or a more focused approach. At the most successful job talks I have seen, the candidates have shown how their research systematically attacks a series of specific questions or problems, and how their findings are guiding the direction of their research.

There you have it, straight from the mouths of the very people you are trying to impress. Hopefully, students early in their graduate career and those finishing up can use this information to make the job search as hassle-free as possible.

-Tom & Jim

---
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Emily Elliott

Get ready to make your travel plans for August 6-9th, 2009, in Toronto. The APA convention schedule is filled with great opportunities for high quality presentations. Division 3 has a slate of very interesting speakers, and has worked closely with several other divisions to make sure that the entire conference contains relevant scientific information. In addition, we are participating in the Convention within the Convention, and are happy to feature Dr. John Wixted, who will be presenting his work with ROC analyses.

Other great sessions include talks on aging and the resulting changes in cognition, emotion, and language (including Lynn Hasher, Meredith Daneman, Dave Balota, Susan Charles, and Gus Craik) and a well-rounded symposium on comparative and developmental cognition (including Jonathon Crystal, Robert Hampton, David Smith, Lauren Adamson, and Simona Ghetti). The presidential address will be delivered by Nelson Cowan, who will discuss the development of working memory and “keeping things in an all-purpose basket”. The list of exciting speakers could continue, as our program is just packed!

Also, we would like to encourage everyone to register early for the convention, so that we can try to get as many Division 3 members in the same hotel as possible. This will greatly facilitate participation in Division 3 programming, and will place you even closer to fun events, like Divisions’ 3 and 6 joint social hour! APA has published the convention website, which contains more details (www.apa.org/convention09). Registration for the conference and for the hotels will open on April 15th. If we all try to register for the Intercontinental Toronto Centre Hotel, that will place us closest to the convention center.

Finally, you can look forward to lots of collegial interactions with other researchers. New Fellows Jason Hicks, Darcia Narvaez, and Charles Nelson will be giving presentations on their research on false memories, moral development, and the effects of early experience on brain development, respectively. You won’t want to miss the New Investigator Award Winners from 2008 either: Timothy Flemming, David Landy, Michael Proulx, Justin Wood, and Tiffany Jastrzembski. We are looking forward to a stimulating conference, and hope to see lots of Division 3 members. Get your passport ready, and I’ll see you in Toronto!

Emily Elliott
2009 Program Chair, Division 3
Division Report

APA Council Report

Emanuel Donchin

It was just about a month ago that the APA’s Council of Representatives (COR) met for its regular February session in Washington, DC. Division 3 was allocated only one seat at this meeting of the COR, an allotment that will remain through 2009. However, the most recent apportionment process restored our second Council seat as of 2010. Our share of the seats increased due to the gracious action of Division 6 members who allotted all of their votes to Division 3.

The following report borrows from a summary of COR actions prepared by Rhea K. Farberman, Executive Director, Public and Member Communications.

The meeting, as you will see, had a full plate. Yet, it was dominated by the sorry effects of the current economic crisis on the finances of the APA. Much time was devoted to detailed reports on the factors that forced a series of major budget cuts. The Chief Financial Officer, Archie Turner, told the council that “Like many organizations, APA’s investment portfolio sustained serious losses in 2008. Those losses mean that we don’t have the cushion we might have had in other years to cover a budget deficit. Consequently, we must have a balanced budget this year.”

To assure that APA does not incur a deficit, the council adopted a budget with approximately $12 million in spending cuts (more than 10 million of which had previously been identified by the Executive Management team at APA). They include reductions in governance activities, such as some meetings, the elimination of the board and council discretionary funds, cuts in spending on public education programs and a staff hiring freeze. Council also directed APA staff to closely monitor spending and revenues as the year continues and to take steps as necessary to ensure a break even budget at year’s end.

One of the budget-related items that received some discussion but was not resolved at this meeting was the fate of the special discount that APA provides to members of some Associations, such as APS and other members of the Federation of Behavioral, Cognitive and Psychological Societies. This discount was discussed within the context of three separate topics. The State Associations proposed to provide a similar discount to members who pay State Association dues. At the same time, the Divisions organized in CASAP (of which more below) proposed that members of the Society for Neuroscience will receive the discount. The Board of Directors, on the other hand, proposed that all the discounts be abolished, arguing that the financial crisis does not permit the luxury of these discounts. This issue was widely discussed, particularly in the different caucuses, but no action was taken. The matter was postponed for one year.

The issue of the participation of Psychologists in Interrogations, and in particular in interrogations in which torture is one of the interrogators’ tools, returned to the COR agenda. This time the matter was brought in the form of a petition drive that received the necessary support from the membership. I could do no better than quote in full Rhea Farberman’s report:

“….After years of grappling with the difficult issues related to the role of psychologists in national security detention settings, the council moved to make the results of last fall's membership vote in support of a petition resolution official APA policy. The petition resolution prohibits psychologists from working in settings where people are held outside of, or in violation of, either International Law or the U.S. Constitution. The only exceptions to this prohibition are in cases in which a psychologist is working directly for the person being detained, for an independent third party working to protect human rights or providing treatment to military personnel.

According to the association rules, action on a petition is not complete until the association’s “next annual meeting” in August. However, the council voted to suspend that rule to complete action on the petition. The council also adopted a title for the petition, "Psychologists and Unlawful Detention Settings with a Focus on National Security" in an effort to clarify the scope of the petition. The petition resolution is not intended to be applied broadly to jails, all detention centers or psychiatric hospitals…."

The Coalition of Academic, Scientific, and Applied Research Psychologists (CASAP), which is one of the many Caucuses of COR, and of which Division 3 is a member, devoted much time to a consideration of an evolving document titled “Science Agenda” which articulates the goals for promoting Psychological Science as a Discipline and that outlines actions that will “promote APA as a Science Based Organization”. A draft of this document was circulated in early February 2009 to the Executive Committees of the Divisions participating in CASAP. The Caucus actually met for an extended session on the day before COR convened and conducted a detailed discussion of the Agenda as well as of proposed concrete actions that will help implement the Agenda. There was a general agreement with the thrust of the document that properly reflected the fact that the CASAP membership voted overwhelmingly to approve the Agenda. However, due to the press of business at the COR meetings, driven as we were by the budget crisis action on the Agenda will be delayed for the August meeting. Meanwhile, CASAP’s Executive Committee will circulate to the divisions, for discussion and comments, drafts of the concrete actions CASAP will present at the August meeting of COR.

Finally let me note that the APA has undertaken the currently fashionable quest for a Strategic Plan, driven by a Vision. The process is driven by an organization that specializes in such plans and its Consultant assigned to the APA lead a number of sessions in which we commented and expressed priorities with respect to various aspects of the Vision Statement the final product is presented below as the coda for this report. Personally, I am not too thrilled with the competitive language used in stating our goals. My own preference is to state that we are striving to meet very demanding standards of
excellence. To my mind, it is not enough to be better than everyone else as it is quite possible that everyone else sets too low a standard. But, these sentiments did not carry the day, and so the language following my signature was adopted. I will sign off here till the August Council…

With regards
Emanuel Donchin
Division 3 Representative to COR 2009

APA VISION STATEMENT
The American Psychological Association aspires to excel as a valuable, effective and influential organization advancing psychology as a science, serving as:

A uniting force for the discipline;

The major catalyst for the stimulation, growth and dissemination of psychological science and practice;

The primary resource for all psychologists;

The premier innovator in the education, development, and training of psychological scientists, practitioners and educators;

The leading advocate for psychological knowledge and practice informing policy makers and the public to improve public policy and daily living;

A principal leader and global partner promoting psychological knowledge and methods to facilitate the resolution of personal, societal and global challenges in diverse, multicultural and international contexts; and

An effective champion of the application of psychology to promote human rights, health, well being and dignity.

---

Division Report

Division 3 Executive Meeting Minutes

Veronica Dark

Minutes of the Division 3 Business Meeting at the Psychonomic Society Annual Meeting
Friday November 15, 2008
6:45 a.m. Pavilion Restaurant, Chicago Hilton Hotel
Chicago, Illinois

Present: Nelson Cowan (President), Edward Wasserman (Past President), Ralph Miller (President-elect), Nora Newcombe (At-large), David Washburn (At-large), Mark Faust (Web Master; Newsletter Ed.), Kristi Multhaup (Newsletter Ed.), Veronica Dark (Secretary-Treasurer), Emily Elliot (Program Chair), Michael Young (Fellows Chair), Michael Beran (Awards Chair)

1. President's announcements
A reminder that at the APA meeting, Division 3 dues were raised to $15.

2. Program Chairs' Reports

2008 Convention: Jeremy Wolfe's written report entitled Success and Embarrassment was distributed. A synopsis is that the program consisted of first-rate science presented by first-rate speakers (the Success) but the sessions were very poorly attended (the Embarrassment). The report further stated that Division 3 Members do not consider the APA Convention to be a significant scientific meeting and that the model requiring it to be such is a broken model. The report suggested that the Division needed a new model that would allow the APA convention to further the Division (and APA) goals of advocating for psychological science, maintaining important journals, and fostering a degree of unity in a diverse field.

2009 Convention: Emily Elliot reported that Division 3 was participating in APA President Bray's "science" convention within a convention. She has begun contacting speakers and that she hoped to have a math modeling theme/session with the help/participation of Rich Shiffrin.

3. Newsletter Editors' Report
As has been noted for many years, the division still has difficulty getting APA to assist in keeping up with changing e-mail addresses.

4. Fellow's Chair Report
Michael Young reported that 8 people had been nominated by the Exec Committee for Fellow status and have been contacted about completing the application. Seven so far have indicated that they will apply. The nomination materials are due to the Fellows Committee on December 15, 2008, and to the APA Fellows Committee by February 9, 2009.

5. Discussion Items
Division 6 memo to its Members: A Division 6 memo to its Members encouraging them to assign their apportionment votes to Division 3 was distributed. Council seats are allocated on the basis of a December apportionment ballot. All divisions get one Council seat and additional Council seats are assigned on the basis of the apportionment ballot. Division 3 had two Council seats, but as a result of the 2007 ballot, lost one seat. Because the goals of Division 3 and Division 6 have much in common, and because Division 6 is smaller than Division 6 and thus unlikely to gain a second Council seat, the Division 6 Executive Committee sent the memo to its Members. The Division 3 Executive Committee asked Nelson Cowan to convey the Division's heartfelt thanks to Division 6. There was some discussion of whether a member of the Division 6 Executive Committee should formally be on the Division 3 Executive Committee. Because that appears to happen naturally, no action was taken to formalize such a plan.

Declining and aging membership: There was discussion on how to encourage membership in the Division, particularly among younger faculty. One suggestion was to point out that being a fellow in Division 3 could be used for Promotion & Tenure purposes. Another suggestion was to have Division 3 flyers available at all relevant conferences. It was suggested that when Randy Engle was the Division President, there was a spike in membership, so he should be contacted about what he did. The suggestion was made that the Division have a Facebook page to attract Student Members. Mark Faust will work with Daniel Brooks, the Division 3 Student Representative about this possibility.

Fellow nomination process. There was concern that the Fellow nomination process, which involved primarily the Executive Committee, means that Members in the specialty areas underrepresented on the Committee may not receive sufficient support. In the past a list of Members has been distributed to all Fellows with a request for nominations. There was support for that process to be reinstated.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:55 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Veronica J. Dark
Secretary-Treasurer
Department of Psychology
Iowa State University
Ames, IA USA 50011-3180
(515) 294-1688 FAX: (515) 294-6424
vdark@iastate.edu

ANNOUNCEMENTS

1. Nominate Your Department or Your Colleague for a Culture of Service Award
Department Nominations
The APA Board of Scientific Affairs (BSA) is soliciting nominations for the Departmental Award for Culture of Service in the Psychological Sciences. This Award recognizes departments that demonstrate a commitment to service in the psychological sciences. Departments selected for this award will show a pattern of support for service from faculty at all levels, including a demonstration that service to the discipline is rewarded in faculty tenure and promotion. Successful Departments will also demonstrate that service to the profession is an integral part of training and mentoring.

Service to the discipline includes such activities as departmental release time for serving on boards and committees of psychological associations; editing journals; serving on a review panel; or chairing an IRB. Other culture of service activities that a department would encourage include 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. The focus of this award is a department’s faculty service to the discipline and not their scholarly achievements.

Both Undergraduate and Graduate Departments of Psychology are eligible. Self-nominations are encouraged.

To submit a nomination the following is required:

- A letter that describes and illustrates the department’s commitment to a culture of service (e.g., nature of the department’s commitment, effect on tenure and promotion, mentoring, effect on current and/or former students’ activities as a result of the department’s focus on service, etc.). The letter should be no more than three pages long.

- Three letters of support from individuals familiar with the department’s support for a culture of service. (These letters can be from current or past faculty members; a Dean familiar with the department’s service program; etc.)

Each Department selected will receive an award of $5,000 to be used for departmental activities. Nominations will only be accepted as electronic submissions to cultureofservice@apa.org. Please be sure to submit the nomination as a package that includes all the required letters.

The deadline for 2009 submissions is April 1, 2009. For more information, please contact swandersman@apa.org.

Past Recipients
2008 James Madison University, Department of Psychology
University of Miami, Department of Psychology
2007 George Mason University
2. Research Psychologist Job in Private Sector

My company is hiring a research psychologist for a unique, private-sector opportunity. Any research-minded psychologist with a background or interest in social, behavioral psychology may be interested and qualified. For more information, see job announcement: http://www.apa.org/divisions/div3/Newsletter2009-13-1/job.pdf

Todd Bresler
Human Resources Coordinator
Inflexxion, Inc.
T (617) 332 6028 x234
F (617) 614 0402
www.inflexxion.com

3. Call for Papers

We are pleased to announce the launch of the new flagship journal of the Society for Terrorism Research (STR), Behavioral Sciences of Terrorism and Political Aggression. With this launch, we would also like to formally announce a call for papers on a rolling basis – there are no deadlines for submissions. Both our inaugural issue and Instructions for Authors may be found on the publisher’s website: http://www.informaworld.com/smpp/title~content=g907849793~db=all

If you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact the Editor, Samuel Justin Sinclair, Ph.D. at JSincl@Post.Harvard.Edu.

4. Five Postdoctoral Fellowships Beginning Summer/Fall 2009 Scott & White / Texas A&M College of Medicine, Central Texas

Scott & White Healthcare and Texas A&M Health Science Center seek applications for its 2009/2010 class of postdoctoral fellows. Fellows will work within one of four research programs focused on the scientific study of factors that influence health and wellness throughout the life span using multi-layered, system-wide interventions and multidimensional outcome measures. Fellows will be mentored by leading translational scientists in the fields of gerontology, behavioral and social sciences, medical simulation, and health sciences research. Research topics will include healthy aging, caregiving, long term care, chronic disease management, obesity prevention, community-based health & wellness, health economics and outcomes and translation of evidence-based programs and practices. The fellowship program provides multidisciplinary training and research opportunities in clinical and academic settings.

Examples of available training experiences include:
- Mentoring to develop independent research projects that contribute to the goals of the Institute
- Required participation in group sessions designed to lead to the submission of a research grant application
- Manuscript development
- Access to a large clinic population for health services research and for clinical and translational research
- Quality improvement activities and health economics research within a large regional health plan
- Conduct of community-based
participatory research ● Opportunities to teach within the Texas A&M School of Rural Public Health and College of Medicine

Successful applicants will have completed a PhD or similar graduate degree by Fall 2009 in behavioral and social sciences, public health, nursing, social work, health services, health economics, or a related field. A two-year commitment is required. Salary begins at $40,000 and is determined by experience. Health insurance and travel funds are provided. Deadline for applications will be March 31, 2009. Please include the following items with your application:

● Current CV
● A 3-5 page personal statement, to include: personal background, research interests, special skills, and areas of desired development ● Writing sample ● List of up to 3 References

For additional information, contact the following:

Alan B. Stevens, PhD Professor, Department of Medicine
2401 South 31st. Street
Temple, TX 76508
(254) 215-0452
AStevens@swmail.sw.org

Marcia G. Ory, PhD Professor, School of Rural Public Health
1266 TAMU, SRPH Building, Room A-157B
College Station, TX 77843
Mory@srph.tamhsc.edu

Angela Hochhalter, PhD
Assistant Professor,
Department of Medicine
2401 South 31 Street
Temple, TX 76508
(254) 215-0459
AHochhalter@swmail.sw.org

5. Assistant Professor/Research Scientist

Scott & White and Texas A&M HSC
Scott & White and Texas A&M Health Science Center are seeking outstanding Research Scientists to join our nationally recognized Program on Aging and Care at the rank of Assistant Professor. Successful candidates will join a team of researchers conducting trials on interventions for older adults with chronic illness and their caregivers. Candidates will be expected to contribute to the goals of the program while also developing an externally-funded, independent line of intervention and health outcomes research. Collaboration with clinicians, scientists, and community organizations is expected.

Applicants must have a PhD or comparable graduate degree, plus a minimum of two years research experience.

The position is open to candidates with training in behavioral and social sciences, public health, health services Scott & White is the largest multi-specialty practice in Texas, with more than 600 physicians and research scientists who care for patients at Scott & White Memorial Hospital and Clinic in Temple and within the 19 regional clinic system networked throughout Central Texas, as well as a regional hospital in Austin, a LTACH in Temple, and others Led by physicians with a commitment to patient care, education and research, Scott & White is listed among the “Top 100 Hospitals” in America in several categories, and has been listed as a Thompson Top 15 Teaching Hospital for the past three years. All staff have Texas A&M faculty appointments, commensurate with experience. The health system and medical school are investing heavily in basic, translational and clinical research, with appropriate support.

Scott & White offers a competitive salary, comprehensive benefit package, and a generous retirement plan. For additional information regarding these positions, please contact: Alan B. Stevens, PhD, Director, S&W Program on Aging and Care, c/o Jason Culp, Recruiter, Scott & White Clinic, 2401 S. 31st, Temple, TX 76508. (800) 725-3627 jculp@swmail.sw.org

Scott & White is an equal opportunity employer. A formal application must be completed to be considered for these positions. For more information on Scott & White, please visit our web site at: www.sw.org.