

Appendix C: Historical Highlights of the Department of Psychology

(Appendix C is a synopsis of this book which appeared initially, with minor differences, in the souvenir booklet distributed during the celebration of the department's 75th anniversary in 2003.)

“History is the witness that testifies to the passing of time, it illumines reality, vitalizes memory, provides guidance in daily life and brings us tidings of antiquity.” –Cicero

I. 19th Century Mental Philosophy and the Rutgers College Curriculum

Conceptions of mind were a part of the content of courses in philosophy, ethics, and theology at the handful of colleges in colonial America. These conceptions relied, in turn, on a variety of competing philosophical schools, of which Scottish philosophy exerted the most influence in America during the 19th century. Scottish philosophy was first introduced during and after the American Revolution by John Witherspoon, then president of the College of New Jersey (now Princeton University).

The appeal of Scottish philosophy in early America was that it offered a “mental science” consistent with a devout belief in God. The following widely quoted example from Thomas Reid, the founder of Scottish philosophy, reflects the place of religious faith in his mental science:

The Supreme Being intended that we should have such knowledge of the material objects that surround us, as is necessary in order to our supplying the wants of nature, and avoiding the dangers to which we are constantly exposed; and he has admirably fitted our powers of perception to this reality... The information of the senses is as perfect, and gives as full conviction to the most ignorant as to the most learned. (Reid, 1785)

This assertion by Reid was intended to be in direct opposition to the ideas of his contemporaries in English philosophy that the mind is a blank slate —a *tabula rasa*—at birth and is furnished with knowledge by life experiences. Reid proposed instead a mind possessed of inborn faculties and powers, and crusaded against English philosophy because he thought it could subvert religious faith. This was also Witherspoon's agenda as he sought to counter the growing influence of English philosophy among American scholars in the colonies.

After Reid's time, Scottish philosophy slowly took on a more eclectic cast, as did early American textbooks on the philosophy of mind. These early American texts were a mix of Scottish, English, and German philosophy, with Scottish philosophy still occupying a dominant position.

Psychology was taught through much of the 19th century under the rubric of mental philosophy. However, the title of an occasional text referred to the book's content as "psychology" rather than "mental philosophy," this as new texts appeared that reflected changes in the conception of mind. The Rutgers curriculum in mental philosophy made use of a number of these texts, particularly during the latter half of the 19th century as Rutgers College itself was undergoing a transformation as a college.

Rutgers College: Founding and Early History

Rutgers holds a distinguished place in the history of American colleges. It is the eighth oldest American college, and one of several colleges established during the colonial period to educate its young men. Its founding in 1766 as Queen's College (the name change to Rutgers College occurred in 1825) was due to the support of a faction of the Dutch Church in America. However, while other colleges (Harvard, William and Mary, Yale, University of Pennsylvania, Princeton, Columbia, Brown, Dartmouth) of the colonial period were expanding their financial support to include both religious and sectarian sources, Queen's College continued to rely primarily on the Dutch Church. The Church turned out to be an unreliable source of financial support during much of the 19th century, as did the State of New Jersey during the first half of the 20th century, when Rutgers sought to become a public institution of higher learning. The slow development of Rutgers as a major university—private or public—relative to that of the other distinguished colleges of its vintage can be found in this long history of limited financial support.

There was also a lag in development of a mental philosophy curriculum in the college during its first 75+ years. During this period, students were treated to a rather static fare of courses in ethics, moral philosophy, and philosophy of mind, typically taught by theology professors from the Theological Seminary (which also shared physical facilities with the college until 1864). Richard McCormick in his bicentennial history of Rutgers (McCormick, 1966) described the college as “a struggling, church-related institution, serving a small constituency and preparing a limited number of students for the older learned professions by means of a curriculum that rested heavily on the classics and that sought to develop discipline, inculcate piety, and inspire reverence for traditional values” (pg. 81). Rutgers slowly transformed itself in the latter half of the 19th century to meet the demands that the American college “broaden its function, enlarge its constituency, strengthen its intellectual qualities, and place itself more directly at the service of society.” (pg. 81).

Mental Philosophy at Rutgers

Professor Doolittle, Rutgers First Professor of Mental Philosophy

A marked change in the mental philosophy offerings at Rutgers took place in 1864 with the appointment of T. Sanford Doolittle as Collegiate Church Professor of Rhetoric, Logic, and Mental Philosophy. Doolittle was a scholar of wide-ranging interests, including architecture, fine arts, and elocution. During his tenure at Rutgers, Doolittle served as vice president (1890-1893) and as acting president (1890-1891) of Rutgers College.

Doolittle was a member of the clergy, as were most of the other faculty members of this period. But, as McCormick (1966) noted, "unlike many of their predecessors their primary and lasting commitment was to the academic sphere." (pg. 83). Doolittle's appointment as professor in the college coincided with the complete separation of the college and the Theological Seminary. By the 1880's almost none of the new faculty appointments were members of the clergy, but rather "trained, professional scholars" (McCormick, 1966, pg.113). Still, Bible Class each Sabbath Morning remained a requirement of all Rutgers students until the 1890's.

Doolittle chose texts for mental philosophy that were the most current at the time. Doolittle also adopted a more modern and less dogmatic approach to the topic. He described the texts as "guide books," not to be "implicitly followed." The aim of the course "is rather to arouse the student, by a diligent comparison of different authors, to investigate the open questions of Philosophy independently, and thus to train him to a comprehensive and cautious deliberation as well in adopting the conclusions of others as in forming and advancing his own." (Rutgers College 1864 catalog)

Several new American texts on mental philosophy were published in the latter part of the 19th century, and most found their way at various times into the mental philosophy curriculum at Rutgers. The text with the most longevity in the Rutgers curriculum was Noah Porter's *The human intellect* (1868). Porter's text has been described as "The encyclopaedia of pre-experimental psychology, a vast compendium of Scottish philosophy strongly influenced by contemporary German thought" (Fay, 1939, pg. 147).

Professors Cooper and Schenk

When Doolittle died in 1893, Jacob Cooper vacated his professorship in Greek Language and Literature to become head of the Department of Philosophy and Logic. Cooper was an exceptionally learned man—a man with "encyclopaedic knowledge which his wide reading and retentive memory had given him" (Rutgers faculty eulogy for Cooper, 1904)—and apparently had no difficulty teaching mental philosophy, or almost any course in the college. Cooper chose several new texts for mental philosophy, although none yet reflected a shift at Rutgers to the new psychology that was emerging in America at the turn of the century.

When Cooper died in 1904, the Reverend Doctor Schenck, Professor of Practical Theology in the New Brunswick Theological Seminary was placed in charge of the Department of Philosophy and Logic for a year, pending the selection of a successor to Cooper. Interestingly, although Schenck was a temporary replacement he did modify the course in mental philosophy so that it consisted of two distinct components: Psychology and Metaphysics. Also notable is that he chose William James's (1892) *Psychology, Briefer Course* as the text for the Psychology component. This is the first time the James text appeared in the Rutgers College catalog, and its use in a course does represent a shift, albeit modest, at Rutgers toward the new psychology, that is, psychology as an empirical natural science. The rest of the curriculum in mental philosophy relied exclusively on philosophy texts.

Conceptions of mind changed considerably in America during the 19th century from philosophical doctrines to a detailed consideration of the content and functions of mind, and Doolittle, Cooper, and Schenk presented Rutgers students with these changing ideas. Still, at Rutgers as well as at other American colleges and universities, religious doctrine continued to exercise an influence on mental philosophy even as it transformed itself into “psychology.” Indeed, 19th century academic psychology in America is typically either ignored by psychology historians who view it as a philosophy topic taught by clergymen or, if covered, briefly summarized as psychology's "prescientific" period in America. While mental philosophy's "method" is discursive rather than experimental/empirical and the presentation of ideas is suffused with acknowledgements to God for creating this wondrous creature (humans), the topics elaborated in mental philosophy are quite modern—senses, intellect, emotions, will, and psychopathology. Suffice to say, Rutgers like most colleges and universities shed its psychology offerings of religious content and embraced the new psychology that emerged in early 20th century America.

II. The New Psychology in Early 20th Century America

The “new psychology,” so dubbed at the time, was the product of a number of prominent American psychologists at the turn of the century. The most creative and influential of these American psychologists were William James (Harvard), James Mark Baldwin (Johns Hopkins), James McKeen Cattell (Columbia), Edward B. Titchener (Cornell), and G. Stanley Hall (Clark). These were the pioneers of American functionalism and the mental-testing movement in America, inspired by Darwin's evolutionary theory and by the empirical study of individual differences. On the methodological side, rigorous empirical methods for data gathering and precise quantitative methods for data analysis replaced the more discursive approach of the 19th century.

American students returning from their graduate training in German laboratories established psychology laboratories in American colleges and universities in the final decades of the 19th century. American laboratories soon differed from their German counterparts and from each other in subject matter and methodology, depending on the ideological inclinations of their founders. The psychological clinic, both in academic and psychiatric settings, also became a locus for empirical psychological research. Major changes in the undergraduate curriculum were made by the newly trained experimental (and other) psychologists. They infused the psychology curriculum with “experimental psychology,” which its adherents considered a new scientific discipline. American text books, already an established commercial enterprise in this country during the mental-philosophy era, continued to proliferate, now with the more contemporary content and methodology of scientific psychology.

Psychoanalysis met a more mixed reception among American academic psychologists than did other European imports. Psychoanalysis was viewed initially with interest by G. Stanley Hall (who invited Freud and other leading analysts to Clark in 1909) and other pioneers in the new psychology, but later cast by experimental psychologists as an antithesis to a scientific psychology.

The American Psychological Association (APA), the first national organization of psychologists, founded in 1892, gave impetus to the establishment of psychology as an academic discipline. Nineteenth century mental philosophy certainly had its adherents among some of the charter members of the APA. In fact, the first major split in the APA was between the experimental psychologists and the philosophers. After about a decade, the philosophers exited the APA and formed their own organization.

Another important development was the establishment of psychology as an academic department separate from philosophy. In the leading universities such as Harvard, Hopkins, Columbia, and Clark the founding of a psychology laboratory preceded the organizational separation of psychology from philosophy. Graduate students were trained in psychology, with or without a separate psychology department, but academic departments of psychology also developed apace, with or without a research laboratory.

The Transition at Rutgers

At Rutgers, the transition from mental philosophy to the new psychology and the emergence of psychology as an academic discipline began during the first decade of the 20th century. It was a gradual but steady transition with a mixture of the old and the new.

As already noted, the first evidence of the new psychology at Rutgers was the listing in the 1904 catalog of James's (1892) *Psychology, Briefer Course* as the text for mental philosophy. In it is James's bold-faced assertion for the new psychology, "**Psychology is to be treated as a natural science** in this book." (pg. 1). The text, itself, was rooted in Darwinian evolutionary theory, with consciousness playing a critical role in the survival of self. Scottish mental philosophy, with its theory of inborn "mental faculties," was nowhere to be found in James's psychology.

The first listing of a course in psychology at Rutgers was in 1906. The description of the course, titled *Elementary Psychology*, in the college catalog is reproduced here to illustrate the influence of the new psychology on the course content:

This course is designed to give the student a knowledge of the operations of the mind, with a view to determining their laws, or the essential facts and fundamental laws of the mind. The aim is to make the student acquainted with the normal human mind, showing its dependence upon the nervous system. Emphasis is laid upon the mental processes important to intellect and character.

That same year, the department changed its name from "Philosophy and Logic" to "Logic and Mental Philosophy," reflecting perhaps a recognition of the "mind" as a major academic field.

Professor Marvin, Rutgers Pioneer Psychologist

Walter Marvin took over the leadership of the Department of Logic and Mental Philosophy in 1909. Marvin received his Ph.D. in philosophy in Germany. Still, he was very knowledgeable about the new psychology, and successfully carried a dual identity of philosopher and psychologist throughout his career. He was a member of both the American Philosophical Association and the APA (Rutgers first member).

Logic and Mental Philosophy remained a one-man department during Marvin's first dozen years at Rutgers. However, he continued to modernize the undergraduate curriculum with the new psychology. His *Advanced Course in Psychology*, which he added to the curriculum in 1912, is illustrative:

This course consists of a study of various problems selected from different branches of psychology. It includes the following topics: The evolution of intelligence and cognition in the animal race and in man; some major problems in functional psychology, such as attention, analysis, association, the influence of special training upon general ability, imitation, and fatigue; and a few problems in applied and in social psychology. The student's reading is discussed in preceptorial conferences. (Thorndike's *Animal Intelligence*, James's *Principles of Psychology*, and selected articles and chapters from recent psychological writings.)

Thorndike's *Animal Intelligence* (1911) introduced his students to Thorndike's path breaking work on animal learning.

On Marvin's urging, Rutgers College explored the idea of using one of Thorndike's mental tests to appraise the academic potential of incoming freshman, the idea being to use it eventually to select applicants and thereby reduce student attrition, referred to then as "mortality." Marvin also enjoyed a personal/professional relationship with Thorndike, and used him as a consultant in this enterprise—a precursor to the SAT. The test was never actually used for freshman screening.

Marvin also offered philosophy courses that covered philosophical antecedents of psychology such as the Greeks, Descartes, Leibniz, Royce, Berkeley, Hume, and Spencer (no Scottish philosophy), material still covered in a history of psychology course.

In 1918 the department changed its name from Logic and Mental Philosophy to Philosophy and Psychology. In 1922 the term "behavior" is used for the first time in a course description, reflecting the growing influence of behaviorism in American psychology.

Marvin's primary role at Rutgers was now changing from teaching philosophy and psychology courses to college administration. In 1921, he was appointed dean of the Faculty, a position that he accepted with some initial reluctance, feeling "that his calling in life was teaching" (from a biographical sketch written by his widow in 1949). In 1926, he was appointed dean of the College of Arts and Sciences, a position he held until his death in 1944.

The Women's College and Marvin's Successor

In 1918, The New Jersey College for Women was established with Mabel Douglass as its first dean. The mission of the new college was to meet "a long-existing need and widespread desire in New Jersey" for higher education for women. In its early years, NJC (as New Jersey College for Women was typically abbreviated) relied on Rutgers College faculty to teach its courses.

Marvin's administrative duties meant that he needed to replace himself for teaching psychology at Rutgers College and NJC. In 1922 he hired Sidney Cook.

Cook was a broadly trained psychologist. He spent a year doing graduate work in experimental psychology at Cornell with Titchener. With a growing interest in the psychology of individual differences and in mental measurements, he completed his graduate work at Columbia University. At the same time, he also obtained clinical training at the New York State Hospital for the Insane. In addition to his faculty appointment at Rutgers, he was appointed School Clinician for New Brunswick's Board of Education in 1924.

Cook also continued to modernize the psychology curriculum in basic scientific psychology. Cook's own interest in mental testing and clinical psychology also manifested itself in his course offerings. He would later play an important role as head of psychology at NJC, a topic we take up later.

To cover the philosophy courses, Marvin hired a colleague at Columbia who offered several new philosophy courses that would bolster the philosophical underpinnings of a modern, scientific psychology, i.e., Logic and Scientific Methods, Contemporary Philosophy, and Philosophical Issues in Present-day Thought. Also of note is that Ethics and the Philosophy of Religion, a course taught by Marvin for years was dropped from the philosophy curriculum in 1928. More generally, the courses in religion that identified Rutgers as a Christian college, and other courses designed for students preparing for the ministry were already on the wane following the end of the First World War. As Rutgers moved closer to the state for financial support, coupled with a variety of secular pressures, it also severed its ties with the Dutch Reformed Church.

Rutgers Growing Pains and Identity Crisis

The decade following the end of the First World War were turbulent years for Rutgers as it underwent a transformation from a college to a university. Sharp differences emerged within the leadership of the institution and made this transformation, difficult at best, even more onerous.

A basic conflict was that of the identity of Rutgers. Was Rutgers to retain its traditional identity as a private school, seeking some necessary financial support from the state, but retaining its autonomy from state oversight, or was it to be the state's university? The designation for the first time as the State University of New Jersey by New Jersey's state

legislature in 1917 suggested the latter as Rutgers' identity, while a name change to Rutgers University, authorized in 1924 by the Board of Trustees, implied the other identity. The identity crisis continued when, in 1925, Rutgers new president, John Thomas, though sympathetic to the "traditions of historic Rutgers" announced that the university was to be identified as the State University of New Jersey.

The identity issue, along with problematic financial support from the state of New Jersey for continuing growth (a rather conservative state in its support of higher education), continued for the next two decades. It was not until after WWII that the identity of Rutgers was resolved, that of the state's leading public institution for higher learning with the name, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey.

Another issue that met with sharply contrasting views was the overall organization of the constituent colleges of the university: Rutgers College (the men's college), New Jersey College for Women (1918), College of Agriculture (first dean, 1914), College of Engineering (first dean, 1914). Just how autonomous were the several colleges to be? This question would later come to plague Rutgers as it transformed itself into a major university in the 1960's.

There was also the question about which colleges and departments were to be favored for growth. Psychology (and Philosophy) suffered in not being one of the disciplines favored by the university for development in the 1920's. While history, political science, and economics were given several faculty new lines, psychology was staffed by Cook, and occasionally by Marvin. The growth of a modern psychology curriculum, started by Marvin in the previous decade, was temporarily stalled.

III. The Founding of the Psychology Department at Rutgers, the Difficult Years during The Great Depression and War, and Post-War Aspirations: 1928-1959

The Psychology Department was founded at Rutgers College in 1928, separate from philosophy, with Henry Starr as its first chairman. A second psychology faculty was established at the woman's college, NJC, with Sidney Cook as its chairman. Psychology at Rutgers was transformed under the aegis of these two leaders. Starr established the department's first graduate program and the undergraduate curriculum quickly grew at both colleges from an introductory course and an advanced course to that of a well-rounded and modern set of course offerings.

The Rutgers Psychological and Mental Hygiene Clinic was also established on the Rutgers College Campus a year later as an autonomous unit of the university. The clinic, with Henry Starr as its director, provided a training facility and research laboratory for the department's graduate program in clinical psychology, while rendering psychological services to the community.

The founding of an autonomous psychology department at Rutgers, and the establishment of the clinic that served as its research laboratory were part of a national trend. By 1929, Rutgers was among the more than 100 American colleges and universities to have a psychology laboratory, with the earliest laboratories dating back to the 1890's.

The Undergraduate Curriculum in the First Decade after the Founding

The two psychology faculties, one at Rutgers College and the other at NJC, each developed their own undergraduate curriculum. Although there was considerable overlap between the two curricula, each department also offered courses not found in the other, reflecting among other things, the different aspirations of the two departments. The department in the men's college had aspirations to create both a graduate program in clinical psychology and a rounded undergraduate curriculum. The department in the woman's college aspired to be on a par with the "seven sisters."

The many similarities in the undergraduate psychology curriculum at Rutgers College and at NJC are not surprising since both departments were attempting to provide their respective undergraduates with a well-rounded, modern psychology curriculum, and since both faculties shared the same general ideology about the field of psychology as a science and a profession. More particularly, both Cook and Starr were well trained as experimentalists and as clinicians.

The new psychology courses offered early in the first decade at both colleges are: Abnormal Psychology, Social Psychology, Applied Psychology, Mental Hygiene, and Tests and Measurements (prefaced at Rutgers College with "Clinical"). To be sure, there were other courses introduced first at one college or the other during this first decade, and then later offered by both departments. Experimental Psychology, History of Psychology, Physiological Psychology, and Aesthetics were in the NJC curriculum several years before they became part of the Rutgers College curriculum. Personality Psychology and Acquired Behavior (later Learning) were first offered at Rutgers College in the late 1930's, and at NJC in the late 1940's.

The NJC curriculum included child psychology courses not found at Rutgers College. Cook was establishing a niche based in the child-study movement of the time, and compatible with other extant programs at NJC concerned with children. In 1930, NJC established a nursery school, The School for Child Study, to support the teaching and research activities of several departments including Physical Education, Home Economics, and Psychology. For psychology, the School for Child Study at NJC augmented their courses in child psychology by providing the students with opportunities to observe the children at the school. According to a 1931 White House Conference on Child Health and Protection, there were at this time 169 nursery schools maintained by American colleges and universities.

The School for Child Study at NJC was short-lived because of financial retrenchments at Rutgers during the Depression years. The closing of the School for Child Study did not deter Cook from providing his undergraduates with a variety of direct experiences in the laboratory and in the field. By 1932 Cook was already using his connections with outside organizations to "enable our students to come in first hand contact with practical situations in which their

Psychological knowledge would be of advantage." (Annual report, 1932) By 1938, Cook reported that "in almost one-third of the courses offered, the extra-mural laboratory plays a part." (Annual report, 1938) Cook also established a demonstration laboratory (including a room with a one-way mirror) on campus for students in experimental psychology, child psychology, and mental tests.

Cook's aspirations for the NJC undergraduate curriculum are apparent from his annual departmental report to the college dean in 1936. He wrote, "We feel that the departmental offerings are now, in variety and subject-matter, on a par with the best colleges and universities of the country and in variety and subject-matter compare favorably with the offerings of Yale, Princeton, Wellesley, Radcliffe, Bryn Mawr, Simmons, Wells, Vassar, Goucher and Connecticut. Smith, with a teaching staff of twelve, is still ahead of us."

At Rutgers College, Starr and his small faculty divided their efforts between undergraduate and graduate curricular development, along with staffing the newly established Psychological Clinic.

Largely forgotten and overshadowed by the founding of Starr's Psychological Clinic in 1929 is the fact that Cook actually established a psychological clinic for a brief period at Middlesex Hospital (now Robert Wood Johnson University Hospital) in New Brunswick three years before the founding of Starr's clinic. Cook viewed the clinic at the Hospital as "our laboratory in which students are taught to give tests... under the direction of an instructor." To be sure, Cook's clinic was more modest in scope than that of Starr's, and within a psychiatric setting—the Department of Nervous Diseases—unlike Starr's autonomous clinic run by psychologists and integrated with the graduate program.

Henry Starr's Graduate Program

To understand the curriculum introduced by Henry Starr and the role of the clinic in research and graduate training, it is instructive to look at Starr's background at the University of Pennsylvania with his mentor, Lightner Witmer. Witmer was one of the pioneers in American clinical psychology. In 1896, he established a psychological clinic at Pennsylvania, the first psychological clinic in America. In 1907, he proposed a new profession, independent of both medicine and education, which he named *clinical psychology*, and established the first training program in this new profession at the University of Pennsylvania. His guiding idea was that clinical psychologists have a doctorate in the field as well as practical clinical experience as part of their graduate training. By the 1920's, clinical psychology had established itself in America, with many of the clinical psychologists trained by Witmer. Another part of this generation was trained in the psychoanalytic tradition, which Witmer knew about, and although not hostile to it, did not incorporate it into his own training program.

Witmer maintained a strong research identity throughout his career, and the clinic was his research laboratory. One of Witmer's research interests was the relation between body chemistry and behavior. He found in Henry Starr, an instructor in body chemistry at the Medical School of the University of Pennsylvania, a collaborator for empirical research on this topic. Starr also

began his graduate work in psychology under Witmer's direction, which he completed with a doctorate in 1922. Starr published several papers on metabolism and behavior before coming to Rutgers.

Starr brought to Rutgers Witmer's design for a graduate program in clinical psychology, for a psychological clinic directed by a psychologist for evaluation and treatment (primarily, but not exclusively) of children and adolescents, and for a clinic that was also the locus of empirical research. The first master's thesis in psychology at Rutgers was completed under Henry Starr's direction in 1930. Starr's graduate program in clinical psychology was among a handful of early efforts in the biological and social sciences to offer graduate training at Rutgers.

A Change in Leadership of the Rutgers College Department (1937-1945)

When Henry Starr came to Rutgers he had but seven years to live before his untimely death at the age of 42 from Bright's disease. After a two-year search, Carroll Pratt was hired as professor and chairman of the Rutgers College Psychology Department, and ex-officio director of the clinic. Pratt was the first psychologist at Rutgers with a national reputation, both in experimental aesthetics and in psychological theory. His book, *The Logic of Modern Psychology* published in 1939, established his reputation as a theorist. In 1948 he was appointed editor of psychology's leading theory journal, the *Psychological Review*.

Between Pratt's arrival at Rutgers in 1937 and his departure in 1945 for a leave of absence from which he would not return to Rutgers, no psychologists were added to the Rutgers College faculty. Obviously then, his role as chairman in shaping psychology at Rutgers was limited. Moreover, even before America's entry into the war in 1941, war preparations were diverting the energies of psychologists (and other academics) away from the classroom, from the research laboratory, and from scholarship. Nevertheless, Pratt took time to express his concerns to Dean Marvin about the sluggish development of Rutgers psychology's national image. In a letter to Dean Marvin (1/4/43), Pratt sought commitments "for post-war consideration" including new hirings and an adequate budget for a laboratory. More generally, Pratt felt there was a "fundamental difference of opinion between the administration and myself as to what is best for the Department of Psychology." On the positive side, Pratt pointed out that "Within a year or two after my arrival here the name of the Department of Psychology at Rutgers began to appear in professional journals through my own writings and the studies of the assistants and a few graduate students." The first doctoral dissertation in psychology at Rutgers was completed in 1941 under Pratt's direction. In 1945 Pratt left Rutgers for Princeton University.

Additions to NJC faculty (1930's)

In 1933, Cook hired Helen Richardson. Her training in child development, including the work with Arnold Gesell in the Yale Clinic of Child Development fit well with NJC's curriculum. Her gender also fit well with that of a woman's college. As one historian of psychology noted of that period, "The few women who managed to gain academic employment were mostly relegated to women's colleges, and to university clinics [Anna Starr] and child welfare institutes linked to departments of psychology and education" (Caphshew, 1999, p. 32).

After Cook's death in 1944, Richardson became chairman of the NJC department until a year before her retirement in 1955.

In 1936, Cook hired Nelson Hanawalt. Hanawalt was an experimental psychologist trained at Columbia University. He took a leave of absence during the war to serve in the Navy and then returned to Rutgers for a long and active career. We will say more about his contributions to Rutgers psychology in later sections.

The War Years

World War II redirected the efforts of academics, including psychologists, away from the classroom (which was increasingly being emptied of young men serving in the armed forces) and into the war effort. At Rutgers, the emptying of classrooms at the men's college (Rutgers College) led to a suspension of many course offerings. However, the psychology offerings remained relatively intact at NJC, where enrollments were sustained throughout the war, and where the few upperclassmen at Rutgers College were permitted to enroll in advanced courses.

American psychologists began mobilizing the profession in 1939 to make their contribution to the national defense, and to prepare for the possibility that America would eventually enter the war. By 1940, six national societies and organizations in psychology, including the APA, joined forces to form the Emergency Committee in Psychology. The Emergency Committee became the "war cabinet" for psychology. Pratt was a member of the Emergency Committee from its early days.

The junior psychology faculty at Rutgers College also made important contributions to the national defense and to the military during the war. Their contributions included participation in a number of Army testing programs, and toward the end of the war working with the Veterans Administration for "vocational counseling leading to the rehabilitation of veterans" (Targum, 2/25/47).

At NJC, Hanawalt, on leave from the college to serve as a naval officer at a Naval Training Center, screened recruits for their psychological fitness for the Navy. In 1940, Cook volunteered for the National Guard in New Jersey with the idea that his war-time experience during the First World War would be useful in the military instruction of the younger men. He was refused because of age, and eventually accepted an invitation by the New York Guard to join them as a private.

Cook was also quite aware of psychology's role in national defense, and listed a course in the 1943 NJC catalog titled, Propaganda and Morale. His description of the course:

Analysis of the psychological principles underlying propaganda. Examination of the methods used by nations and pressure groups in maintaining their own morale and destroying that of their opponents, with special application to the present conflict. Practice in analysis of current propaganda.

Sadly, he became ill in 1943, seriously enough to warrant a leave of absence from NJC for the fall semester. He returned to teaching in the spring semester, but took his life in early February 1944. He was 52 years of age. With the loss of Henry Starr in 1935, and with Cook gone in 1944, psychology at Rutgers had lost two of its founding leaders early on through untimely death. Both men were dynamic leaders in developing a modern psychology at their respective colleges.

The Post-war Interlude

American universities experienced explosive growth in enrollment with the return of the veterans, and their demand for higher education. Rutgers University initially participated in this post-war growth. However, the 1950's were difficult years for Rutgers as enrollments decreased compared with the surge of veteran students immediately after the war. Also, for more than a decade after the war, Rutgers still lacked adequate financial support from the state to build the new educational facilities and to hire the faculty that was necessary to transform Rutgers into a major state university.

Rutgers College

With the departure of Pratt in 1945, and with the wartime decimation of the undergraduate course offerings and the graduate program generally, the Rutgers College Department had much work to do. The department was given a couple of junior faculty lines in 1946, but still had to rely on sending students to NJC, the School of Education, and University College (the university's evening college for part-time students) to meet the influx of veterans. Additional junior lines and the hiring of Morgan Upton as chairman of the Rutgers College Psychology Department brought the staff up to seven men in 1947, sufficient to meet the demands for undergraduate instruction. The department's efforts to revive the graduate program and the difficulties it encountered are taken up in the later section, *The Psychology Section and its Graduate Committee*.

NJC (renamed Douglass College in 1955)

At NJC, the war had not reduced the actual teaching of the curriculum as it had at Rutgers College. After Cook's death in 1944, Richardson chaired the department, obviating the need to find new, outside leadership. Nor was there a search for major new directions in the curriculum. Cook had initiated and sustained an emphasis on child psychology in NJC's curriculum. Richardson's own extensive training and interest in child development assured a continuing emphasis on child psychology.

Involvement in the graduate program, which was not a major concern to the NJC faculty during Richardson's chairmanship, changed quickly under Hanawalt, her successor. In his first annual report to the dean, he urged that NJC psychologists participate in the effort to revive the graduate program in psychology, even if only to a modest extent. He also urged the separation of psychology and philosophy into two departments. In support of this recommendation, he wrote, "...there have always been the most cordial relations between the psychologists and the

philosophers. In fact, however, we have few problems in common aside from the budget. In fact, also, we are really two departments aside from the budget." His recommendation was accepted and so a second and autonomous Psychology Department came into existence in 1955, coincident with the change in the name of the women's college to Douglass College.

The Clinic

Credit for the survival and nurturing of the clinic through several turbulent decades of problematic financial support and ideological differences at Rutgers is due to Anna Starr. The clinic was also sustained during the Depression years of the 1930's with the help of professionals who donated their services to the clinic.

Anna Starr, also trained by Witmer at Pennsylvania, came to Rutgers with her husband, and served initially as assistant director of the Psychological Clinic. When Henry Starr died in 1935 Anna Starr became the *de facto* director of the clinic. She also taught the advanced clinical psychology course--all for less than half (\$1650) of a junior-level faculty salary (\$3600).

In 1944 the clinic was transferred from the Rutgers College Psychology Department to the university's Extension Division—a non-degree teaching and public service unit of the university. The transfer may have been at Pratt's instigation. In the same letter (1/4/43) to Marvin, cited earlier, in which Pratt expressed his concerns about the sluggish development of Rutgers psychology, he also urged, "Some clearer understanding should be reached regarding the place of the clinic in the department. Money and space are now devoted to a set-up which in my opinion is of no value whatever to Rutgers. Unless a psychological clinic is designed primarily for research, it has no place in a university." The removal of the clinic from the department and the death of Henry Starr signaled the end of his graduate program in clinical psychology—or any coherent graduate program at Rutgers University for well over a decade. When the clinic was transferred from the Rutgers College Psychology Department to the Extension Division in 1944, Anna Starr was named as its director. She was also promoted to professor of psychology in University College.

A year after Anna Starr's retirement in 1956, the clinic was moved from University College on the Rutgers College Campus to the Douglass College Campus. Bernard Guernsey was hired to replace Anna Starr as director. He was hired through Douglass College, but budgetary responsibility for his line resided in the Graduate School, with the status of the clinic "somewhat unclear"—a reflection of Rutgers byzantine structure at the time.

The Psychology Section and its Graduate Committee

We now trace the efforts to revive and modernize the graduate program in psychology in the immediate post-war years.

At first, the Rutgers College Psychology Department undertook the formidable task of reviving the graduate program. The hiring of several new faculty members in the late 1940's made it possible to offer a number of new graduate courses. Still, the department needed much

more in facilities and staff to become a research-oriented department with a viable graduate program. A university-wide retrenchment in the early 1950's occasioned by a sharp decrease in enrollment (after the post-war influx of veterans had passed) was felt in the Rutgers College Psychology Department by a reduction in faculty from seven to five members for several years and, with still limited research facilities, the graduate program there languished. In his annual report to his dean in 1953 Chairman Upton reflected the underlying feelings of frustration and vague hope for resources in his statement, "The situation is still one of hope and assurance and we are more strengthened by the abundance of our cravings than weakened by the poverty of our possessions." (Was this music to the ears of an administration beleaguered by budget problems!)

Intercollegiate efforts and cooperation were to become the foundation for a revived graduate program. By 1956, a university-wide Psychology Section was formed, composed of the psychology faculty at Rutgers College, Douglass College, University College, and Newark College. Other members of the Psychology Section included a handful of psychologists from the Graduate School of Education and from the clinic. (Another tie that developed between Rutgers College and NJC near the end of the decade was the cross listing of several undergraduate courses that permitted students from both colleges to attend some of the same courses.)

It is difficult to imagine a more unwieldy organizational arrangement for developing a unified graduate program in psychology. Amazingly, this diverse and autonomous set of constituents was actually successful in reviving the graduate program, thanks to the co-operative spirit of its members and their aspirations to develop and participate in a graduate program that represented their respective research and scholarly interests.

A Graduate Committee of the section was formed in 1956. The Committee consisted of full professors, usually the chairman of their respective department, which assured its influence in the development of a full-scale graduate program with several post-war specialties in psychology represented. This committee was responsible for identifying the needs of the graduate program, which included research and teaching facilities, clinical facilities for the revival and APA accreditation of a clinical program, faculty hires, graduate student assistantships, and an annual operating budget. They met regularly with key members of the administration to obtain support for meeting these needs. The Graduate Committee was also responsible for admitting graduate students, evaluating the progress of existing ones, and designing the graduate curriculum.

The limited funding available to the university and, in turn, to psychology is evident in most of the deliberations of the Graduate Committee. In 1957, the committee had proposed a budget of \$36,000 to the university administration to launch a "full-scale graduate program" and received a few hundred dollars. Still the committee held to their resolve to develop a graduate program no matter what the vagaries of support from the state legislature. The committee identified the need to hire a senior-level clinical psychologist with a national reputation, having heard from an APA representative that APA approval of a graduate clinical program is unlikely until such an appointment was made. They also identified the need to recruit senior faculty in other areas. The committee discussed in 1959 the possibility of a new building for psychology that would meet the graduate and research needs of psychology on the New Brunswick

campuses. (It took 15 years for the building to materialize, with many interim arrangements serving faculty researchers on the Douglass and Rutgers College campuses.)

In late 1959, the Psychology section discussed a report from the men's college that was somewhat controversial. There was in this report the assertion that the "center of graduate activity ... should be at the men's college since the core courses will be taught there." Some members of the section thought this implied that the graduate program would be largely under control of the men's college rather than the section. Members of the men's college indicated that their report was misunderstood. Still, this item in the agenda does, in fact, presage future conflicts among the constituents of the section for control of the graduate program. The continued autonomy of the various academic units brought with it the strains implicit in such a byzantine structure, with its potential for balkanization.

Foresighted members of the university administration were aware of the strains in this structure and were developing plans to reorganize the university. When Dean Meder (Dean of Administration) met with the Psychology Section in late 1959, he mentioned plans by the administration to propose a new organization of the disciplines to the Board of Governors. In this plan members of a discipline, such as psychology, would be consolidated into one university department with a chairman responsible for program and personnel planning. (The actual implementation of such a consolidation occurred two decades later!)

IV. The Explosive Growth of Psychology at Rutgers: 1960-1981

The largest single, and concerted leap in the growth of psychology at Rutgers took place in the 1960's and the 1970's, when Rutgers psychology transformed itself from a collection of several modest-sized college departments to a major department with a national standing. By 1981, when the several college departments on the New Brunswick Campus were abolished and their faculties were unified into one department, the combined psychology faculty of Rutgers College, Douglass College, University College, and Livingston College (founded in 1969) was over 50 full-time members.

The aspirations of the Rutgers psychologists, often frustrated in the 1950's by lack of sufficient funding, became more realistic as the next decade heralded a new era for Rutgers University and for psychology in America. The explosive growth of Rutgers University began in the 1960's when the state of New Jersey finally started providing fairly stable funding for physical expansion, for competitive faculty salaries, and for graduate and professional training. Coincidentally, there was a dramatic increase in federal funding for psychological research and graduate training. By 1959 research funds from the Department of Defense, the National Science Foundation and the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare (HEW) to American universities had tripled over what it was at the beginning of the 1950's, with HEW accounting for most of the increase.

A research-oriented faculty recruited by the several college psychology departments at Rutgers in the 1960's successfully pursued federal funds for research, for research facilities, and for training grants. These federal grants combined with funding from the state of New Jersey for

two new psychology buildings made it possible to establish or significantly enlarge the research and graduate training facilities (as well as undergraduate teaching laboratories) at Rutgers College, Douglass College, University College, and Livingston College.

The size, the diversity in content, and the quality of the graduate program in psychology grew apace with the increasing number and diversity of research-oriented faculty who clearly saw the value, for their own research programs, of a cadre of bright, committed, and well-trained graduate students. The growth of the graduate program is reflected in the number of PhD's awarded over the two decades. The average number of PhD's in the early 1960's was about 2 a year; gradually increasing to about 25 a year by the end of the 1970's. The dissertations in the 1960's were mostly in experimental psychology, and there, mostly in learning, a favored research topic in the experimental psychology of that era. By the late 1970's the dissertations reflected five different areas within the graduate program—Biopsychology/Behavioral Neuroscience, Clinical Psychology, Cognitive Psychology, Developmental Psychology, Personality and Social Psychology.

Faculty for the graduate program came from all the colleges. Although each college had a psychology faculty sufficiently diverse to offer its own undergraduates a well-rounded curriculum, each emphasized a different major area in its faculty recruitment. At Rutgers College it was experimental psychology; at Douglass College it was developmental psychology, and included the Day Care Center and the Developmental Disability Center for research and field experience; at University College as at Livingston College, which identified itself at its founding as a "social science college," it was personality and social psychology. Thus, most (but not all) of the graduate offerings in experimental psychology came from Rutgers College, in developmental from Douglass College, and in social-personality from University College and Livingston College. Although the psychology departments at these colleges were relatively autonomous (and somewhat balkanized) during the 1960's and 1970's, the differences among them in the areas they chose to emphasize when recruiting faculty provided the necessary breadth of coverage for the Rutgers graduate program as a whole.

Clinical psychology had no concentrated strength in any of the colleges, although the Psychological Clinic, financially supported by the university's Graduate School, was located at Douglass College. As noted in the Founding section, the Graduate Committee in the late 1950's recognized the importance of reviving the graduate program in clinical psychology, a program that had essentially become dormant following Henry Starr's death before World War II. The post-war period was also an auspicious time for the revival of graduate training in clinical psychology with extensive programs and grants by the Veterans Administration and the Public Health Service to support research and clinical training in American universities. In the ensuing years, the Graduate School and the colleges all hired a number of clinical psychologists, some with a national reputation in academia, which eventuated in a clinical program of national prominence.

Psychologists in the Rutgers Medical School (since renamed Robert Wood Johnson Medical University) and in the Graduate School of Applied and Professional Psychology (GSAPP) strengthened the clinical program and also contributed to psychology's graduate

program by serving on student theses and dissertation committees, and by providing a number of research assistantships to graduate students. These two academic institutions were themselves founded during this explosive period of growth of Rutgers University, the Medical School in 1966 and GSAPP in 1974. A number of their psychologists already had ties to the graduate program, having been recruited from the ranks of the clinical faculty in the psychology departments. The clinical program also drew from clinical psychologists outside the university. Psychologists at The Center of Alcohol Studies, which had moved to Rutgers from Yale in 1962, also contributed to the graduate program in clinical and other areas of psychology.

Worth emphasizing as a boost to the growth of psychology was the increasing popularity of psychology among undergraduates. Psychology became one of the leading majors, justifying in turn sizeable increments in the size of the psychology department in each college. For students during the turbulent 60's psychology seemed a way both to understand themselves and to join a helping profession whose services were much in demand from an increasingly psychologically-minded American public.

With the steady infusion of funds from the state for the growth of the university—estimated to double in student enrollment in 15 years—came the necessity to expand its academic and residential facilities. While several plans were considered, including the possibility of expanding the two main colleges, Douglass and Rutgers, the university chose instead to add more residential undergraduate colleges. Pragmatic considerations may also have been driving a plan to create more undergraduate colleges, given that Rutgers College was located in urban New Brunswick with little room for the enormous expansion envisaged by the university. Also favoring the plan to add new residential colleges was the unexpected opportunity that presented itself to the university in 1963 when the Defense Department closed Camp Kilmer and declared the land as “surplus.” The Camp was adjacent to the university's Heights Campus (renamed Busch Campus in 1971). The university obtained 540 acres of the Camp where it planned to build several co-educational colleges, each with a special focus.

Livingston College, built on the Kilmer site and with a focus on the social sciences and urban studies, admitted its first class in 1969. A second college at Kilmer, with its focus being “man's relations to his physical and biological environment” was also in the early planning (McCormick, 1978). For various political and financial reasons, only Livingston College was built. Instead, Cook College was established as the “environmental college” and was located on the campus of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, a campus adjacent to Douglass College.

Growth at the Undergraduate Colleges

As a preface to describing the growth of psychology at each of the four undergraduate colleges during the 1960's and 1970's, it is useful to note that the differences among the respective psychology departments, already somewhat discernible for Rutgers College and Douglass College in previous decades, were enhanced during the two decades of explosive growth. Their differences were also shaped by the broader context of the colleges themselves (soon to include Livingston College) with their sharpening differences in self-image, traditions, and perceived role in undergraduate and graduate training. Also notable are the advantages for

prospective undergraduates of having several colleges from which to choose, each with its own well-rounded but distinctive focus. (There was also the option for undergraduates to choose a single gender or co-educational residential college, although Rutgers College did become co-educational in 1973).

Douglass College

The shaping of the psychology department at Douglass College during the 1960's and 1970's has its historical roots in Sidney Cook's emphasis on child development in the undergraduate curriculum at NJC, and on hands-on experiences for students enrolled in courses on child behavior. Cook's vision was revived and enlarged when Jean Burton joined the faculty in 1955. Like Cook, Burton saw the value of field experiences in teaching courses in child psychology. What Burton wanted was an on-campus facility—nursery or day care for teaching and research—a facility Douglass had not had since 1932 when NJC's Child Study Center was closed because of the Depression. With her efforts and those of other faculty hired in the 1960's, the Douglass Psychology Department established its own Nursery School (later renamed the Douglass Day Care Center) for undergraduate and graduate teaching, and for research in child development. Developmental Psychology became one of the graduate specialties in 1967 with Douglass as its primary locus.

One of the most important developments for psychology at Douglass College in the early 1960's was the construction of Davison Hall to house the college's Psychology Department, the Nursery School, and the Psychological Clinic. Davison Hall, completed in 1964, housed the Douglass department until the unification of psychology in 1981.

Facilities in Davison Hall for the clinical program included observation rooms with one-way mirrors, interview rooms, a seminar room, the Psychological Clinic, and an office for the Director of Clinical Training. In all, the facilities were very good (Bert Cohen, personal communication). The clinical program remained in Davison until 1974 when it moved to the new psychology building on the Busch Campus under the aegis of GSAPP. Even with Psychology no longer at Davison (it houses the university's Philosophy Department), the Douglass Day Care Center continues to operate in the building today.

The founding in the 1970's of the Developmental Disability Center (DDC) by Sandra Harris, then a member of the Douglass faculty, linked the developmental program with the clinical program. The DDC, located on the Douglass Campus, provided several assistantships for students in the graduate program. Like the Day Care Center, DDC was a locus for undergraduate and graduate training and research. Research for many undergraduate theses, MA theses, and PhD dissertations in developmental psychology were conducted at DDC. (As of this writing, DDC has relocated in a substantial building of its own adjacent to the Douglass Campus.)

Faculty interests in the Douglass department were by no means limited to children. In the early 1960's Nelson Hanawalt and Donald Forgays were both active in experimental psychology and were among the first faculty members to supervise doctoral dissertations in that area.

Among the young faculty with interests in a variety of topical areas of experimental psychology was Marilyn Shaw, whose promising research career was tragically cut short by her premature death in 1983. An award “for excellence in undergraduate research in psychology,” established in her name, continues to be awarded each year.

The Undergraduate Curriculum and Major at Douglass. Hands-on experience was an integral part of the courses in child development from the 1930’s. By the 1950’s other courses also featured either field trips or “an original experiment.” By the beginning of the 1970’s, as the curriculum gradually expanded, a three-hour laboratory component was added to many of the new offerings. By the end of the decade, the laboratory was part of the courses in Learning, Perception, Cognition, Thinking with optional lab (a Neimark specialty), Language and Meaning, Mathematical Models, and Theories of Personality. And in the Douglass tradition, most of the courses in developmental psychology were enriched with an experiential component, either in the laboratory or in field observation. They included Child Psychology, Adolescent Psychology, Adulthood and Ageing, Day Care and Early Education (a Goss specialty), Developmental Disabilities (a Harris specialty), Atypical Child, and Behavior Disorders in Children. Most of these courses were not available at the other colleges. The undergraduate at Douglass was indeed treated to a rich fare of psychology topics.

The requirements for the major were rigorous. Dating back to the 1950’s students were urged to take courses both in zoology and sociology to satisfy the distribution requirements of the Liberal Arts curriculum “since psychology views man as a biological organism adjusting to a physical and social environment.” (college catalogs of the 1950’s) By the 1960’s the outside requirements were more specific in urging 12 hours in the “sciences other than psychology and in mathematics.” (college catalog 1960-61)

Rutgers College

Experimental psychology at Rutgers College, which was to become its primary area for teaching and research during the 1960’s and 1970’s, began to take shape in the late 1950’s. Two clinical psychologists from the Starr era had both retired by 1960 and were replaced with young psychologists whose research and teaching lay in one or more of the experimental topics of learning, comparative psychology, sensory processes, motivation, emotion, and physiological psychology. As the department grew, junior and senior faculty members in areas other than experimental psychology were also hired. Experimental psychologists who came on board during these decades reflected changes that were gradually taking place in American experimental psychology—most notably the shift from learning theory *qua* theory to its applications in psychopharmacology and, more generally to a more biologically oriented psychology.

The roots of the department’s success in recruiting productive researchers in experimental psychology and in garnering support from the administration can be found in the early leadership of Donald J. Lewis, who came to Rutgers in 1961 as professor and chairman of the Rutgers College department. Lewis’s own interests were both in social psychology and in learning and behavior theory. Lewis clearly aspired to build a strong graduate program at the university, led and nurtured by the Rutgers College group. The morale and enthusiasm of the

department were high and undoubtedly contributed to Lewis's vision of a graduate program with a national reputation. Lewis hired me for the Social Psychology program with an eye to later joining the Livingston College faculty, the future locus of a strong social psychology faculty.

1968, when Lewis left Rutgers to assume a chairmanship at the University of Southern California, the department had established itself as a productive research-oriented group in the various facets of experimental psychology. George Collier replaced Lewis as chairman and remained in that administrative position for the next nine crucial years in the shaping of the department. A number of additional highly productive research-oriented experimentalists joined the department during this period.

A couple of years before he left Rutgers, Lewis approached the University administration for a new psychology building that would house both the Rutgers College Psychology Department with its manifest need for modern animal laboratories and for research laboratories that would strengthen other graduate specialties as well. He (and some others in the Graduate Faculty) thought that the facilities of the graduate program and its leadership, then scattered over the campuses, was an impediment to the growth of psychology at Rutgers into a nationally recognized department. After Lewis left, state funds became available for several new buildings and the administration gave psychology priority in the use of these funds. After several years of planning, the psychology building was completed in 1974 on the (now named) Busch Campus. Originally intended to put psychology under one roof, a period of high inflation in America during the early 70's eroded considerably what the allocated funds could now buy in terms of the size and architectural quality of the new building. In the end, the Busch Psychology Building housed only the Rutgers College department with modern animal research facilities, the Psychological Clinic, and the office of the New Brunswick chairperson. Lewis's far-sighted recognition of the need, for several reasons, to put psychology under one roof was not realized even after the unification of the New Brunswick Psychology Department in 1981. Unsuccessful attempts to expand the building on the Busch Campus after 1981 are taken up later.

The Undergraduate Curriculum and Major at Rutgers College. In the 1960's the laboratory courses in Experimental Psychology were limited mainly to human learning and memory, topics requiring the rather modest equipment that was then available. In the 1970's laboratory sections for Comparative Psychology, Physiological Psychology, and Sensory Processes were added and furnished with sophisticated laboratory equipment purchased with competitive grant funds provided to the department by the National Science Foundation.

This extensive set of laboratory offerings in the basic processes was rounded out with courses in other psychological topics: Social Psychology, Personality, Abnormal Psychology, Tests and Measurements, and Psycholinguistics. Courses not available at the other colleges included Psychobiology of Sex Differences (a Stern specialty), Personnel Psychology (a Schwartz specialty), Artificial Intelligence, Behavior Modification, Behavioral Pharmacology (a Falk specialty), and Behavior Genetics.

The requirements for an undergraduate major in psychology included exposure to one of the laboratory sciences other than psychology. A year of Mathematics was another outside

requirement from the 1950's on, with later stipulations that it had to be calculus or a one-year computer science course. Statistics was also required of majors starting in the 1960's.

When asked by the editor of the Rutgers College Yearbook for 1980-81 to characterize the psychology program at the college, Flaherty, then chairman, gave the following statement (reproduced here in part):

The psychology program at Rutgers College emphasizes the empirical basis of psychological knowledge. Students are asked to obtain experience with a laboratory science, math, statistics and computer science outside of psychology and many of the psychology courses, especially experimental psychology, emphasize research procedure as well as content. We hope students will learn how to conceptualize a problem...[that] they will realize that data depend in part on the methods used...and that objective results may be open to several interpretations... We hope also that students will see the value of the empirical method for clinical and health-related areas as well as fields other than psychology.

Livingston College

Dean Lynton, Livingston's first dean, set about defining and fleshing out an innovative educational program for the Livingston College student. One of the basic features of the college curriculum was that department and college requirements be minimal ("students need more advice and fewer requirements" –p. 2, Curriculum Planning Committee 10/5/66), including the opportunity for the student to develop his/her own course of study. This was coupled with an emphasis on independent study and field experience. Multidisciplinary courses were encouraged to address topics that spanned several disciplines. The grading system was different from that of the other colleges and consisted of three "notations" (Livingston's euphemism for grading): *honors, credit, no credit*.

New departments and study programs in support of Livingston's focus on societal problems were established in the college: Department of Urban Planning and Policy Development, Department of Community Development, Afro-American and African Studies, Asian Studies, Labor Studies, Puerto Rican Studies. Two academic departments new to Rutgers University, Anthropology and Computer Science, were also established at Livingston.

The planning for Livingston College from 1964 to 1968 coincided with a stressful period for higher education in America. Russia's superiority in space was interpreted as reflecting poorly on education in America; protests about the Vietnam War were a common sight on college and university campuses, where the relevance of traditional college curricula were also questioned; Afro-American students protested the inequities in college admissions and staffing, while the feminist movement focused on long-standing inequities in the hiring and promotion of women in the faculty and administration. By 1968, urban riots and unrest in New Jersey (and elsewhere) and black militancy led Livingston planners to add a second mission for the college: the recruitment and education of a substantial number of minority students. When the college admitted its first class in 1969, about a third of the students were minority.

As one of a handful of “experimental colleges” and unique in being founded within a large public university, Livingston was gaining something of a national reputation for its innovative programs in higher education. Incidents of inter-racial conflict, physical assaults, and drug trafficking on the Livingston Campus soon tarnished the reputation of the college in New Jersey. But Livingston College did provide the university with a response to minority demands for opportunities in higher education in New Jersey. This was no tokenism. The focus of the college on societal problems was also a strong response to the student protest movement of the 1960’s that the curriculum be “relevant.”

The Livingston Psychology Department embraced the two missions of the college.

In 1969 the department described itself as having “some freedom not to duplicate existing strengths [in other colleges] and some possibility of responding to a dominant theme of Livingston College—namely that of the relation of the university and higher education to social and urban problems.” Indeed, there was among the research interests of faculty members a mix of psychological topics associated with “social and urban problems.” The department also enhanced considerably the graduate program in Personality and Social Psychology by assuring that personality and social psychology were the strongest single areas at Livingston. With regard to minority concerns, the department asserted its “commitment to equality of educational opportunity for non-whites” both in its recruiting of faculty and graduate students. By 1975 there were 19 faculty members in the department, 4 of whom were Afro-American with research interests both in the basic areas of experimental and social psychology and in the psychology of the black experience.

The early years at Livingston College were exciting and novel academic experiences for junior and senior faculty alike. The zeitgeist encouraged experimentation in teaching methods, informal student contact, and innovations in curriculum. In the total mix of faculty time and commitment to teaching, research, and service to the college and university, the Livingston College credo accorded highest priority to teaching. Lauded at the college for honoring this credo, junior faculty members sometimes found themselves at a disadvantage for promotion as the Federated College Plan (described in a later section) began to give the university-wide disciplines more of a voice in the promotion process, with their primary emphasis on research productivity as evidenced by publications.

By the mid 1970’s, Livingston lost much of its innovative zeal. Incidents of conflict and tension diminished, along with the student activism that had characterized the early years. Also palpable was the backlash from student protests of the 1960’s, a backlash that put higher education on a generally more conservative path. At Rutgers, there were also the homogenizing effects of reduced college autonomy. However, many of the innovative features in curriculum, interdisciplinary courses, flexibility for students in devising their own courses of study, and the commitment to minority admissions remained.

The Undergraduate Curriculum and Major at Livingston. The undergraduate curriculum expanded to include the full range of basic courses as the enrollment at Livingston College grew

to encompass students in all four undergraduate class years. Courses not offered at the other colleges included Prejudice and Conflict (a Gary specialty), Psychology and the Black Experience, Community Mental Health, Interviewing Techniques, and four different senior-level Seminars, one for each of four areas, Developmental, Social, Experimental, and Personality. These Seminars, capped in enrollment, were the heart of advanced undergraduate study with their emphasis on individual research and in-depth examination of specific problems. This full and diverse curriculum was intended to prepare undergraduates for graduate work in any of a variety of professional careers in psychology and related disciplines, as well as undergraduates with other career plans who were simply interested in psychology.

There were few specific courses required for the major. Students contemplating a research and/or teaching career were advised to take Quantitative Methods, Experimental Psychology, and courses that “provide research training”; students contemplating a service career were advised to take Quantitative Methods and three courses from among offerings in human development, abnormal, personality, and social psychology. In addition students were strongly urged to talk with a departmental advisor—all this in the Livingston credo of lots of advice, few requirements.

University College

University College, the evening college, was established in 1934 to provide part-time students with an opportunity obtain a college education. Enrollment at the college consisted mostly of students unable to attend daytime classes because they had full-time employment. The college offered bachelors’ degrees (BA, BS) in a number of traditional areas, including psychology.

In general, the hiring choices in psychology were predominantly in social and clinical psychology. The faculty members of the department participated in the graduate program of their specialty. Even though the size of the Psychology Department almost tripled in the two decades—from three to eight full-time faculty members—it was still modest in size relative to the psychology departments in the other colleges.

The Undergraduate Curriculum and Major at University College. The undergraduate curriculum during the 1960’s was “traditional” in some ways, but also tailored to the adult evening student. The curriculum included: Principles of Psychology, which covered the basic topics or Introduction to Psychology, which dealt with the application of psychology to problems in business, industry, and government; Psychology of Childhood; Psychology of Adolescence; Social Psychology; Mental Hygiene; Clinical Psychology; Abnormal Psychology; Psychology in Industry; Personality; Psychological Tests in Industry; History of Psychology; Seminar in Group Dynamics. What were not available were courses in experimental psychology, learning, physiological psychology, and their associated laboratory courses—less practical perhaps to an evening school with a small faculty and no facilities for undergraduate laboratories.

Changes were made in the curriculum during the late 60’s and the 70’s. Course offerings that reflected new strengths and interests of the faculty included several that are rather novel for an

undergraduate curriculum but well suited to an evening college for older adults. They included Child Rearing, Psychology of Death and Dying, Psychology of Marriage and the Family, Psychology of Aggression, Psychology of Women, and Clinical Psychology and Behavior Change. Courses were also added to bring the curriculum more in line with those at the other colleges: Statistics (required for majors), Experimental Psychology with a lab section (the department had acquired some lab space and new faculty to teach it), and Learning and Motivation

In the 1960's the outside requirements for the psychology major at University College were different from and actually more stringent than those at the other colleges. The major was required to take 12 hours of an intermediate level foreign language (or pass a proficiency test of equivalent level), 6 hours of Biology or Physical Science, 12 hours of Sociology, 6 hours of philosophy (including logic and scientific method), and 6 hours of History or Political Science. By the early 70's these specific outside requirements for the major were all dropped. Instead, students were encouraged "to take as wide or as concentrated a sequence as their own intellectual and professional interests dictate, although premature specialization should be avoided." In spirit, the undergraduate major at University College now resembled that of Livingston College.

The Federated College Plan

With the explosive growth of graduate and research programs in several academic disciplines, the university had now to face in earnest the question of how to organize the faculty and other pertinent resources of the colleges to develop and support these programs. The focus of the problem was the academic disciplines in the arts and sciences and their dispersal among the colleges, each with its own budgetary control of resources for the departments in the college, including hiring and promotion of faculty. It was apparent by the mid 1960's that the university-wide sections, established by the university in 1956 to coordinate the activities within each major discipline, were no longer effective, particularly where they were most needed, that is, in the development of graduate and research programs.

University planners now considered several alternatives. At one extreme was the idea of leaving things as they were, that is, maintaining college autonomy. There was much to say in favor of this alternative. Diversity among undergraduate curricula (including psychology) thrived under these conditions. The differences in student life at the men's college and the women's college were staunchly defended by faculty and students alike. Even the newly-founded co-ed Livingston College found college autonomy congenial to its unique image as an "experimental" college, suited to the new zeitgeist of the '60's and early 70's in higher education. At the other extreme was the idea of abolishing college autonomy in New Brunswick and combining each of the disciplines into one department with a New Brunswick discipline chairman—the model actually extant on the main campus of virtually all of the major American universities.

In 1967 the university chose a middle road, seeking a balance between the two extremes: college autonomy and the disciplines. The Federated College Plan was inaugurated as an organization that would combine "the advantages of a major university with those of a moderate

sized college” (McCormick, 1978, p. 21). There would be a New Brunswick chairman for each discipline. The function of the chairman was to coordinate the academic activities of the discipline, but with limited budgetary authority. Funds earmarked specifically for graduate programs were to come from the dean of the Graduate School, who was actually given very limited resources for disposal to the disciplines.

There was significant concern and even strong opposition to the Federated College Plan among the faculty on both sides of the issue. On the one hand, Rutgers College faculty felt that too little budgetary authority had been given to the New Brunswick discipline chairmen, and to the dean of the Graduate School. On the other hand, the Douglass faculty felt that the Plan went too far in reducing college autonomy. It soon became clear that the initial Plan of 1967 would not really achieve much for the disciplines. Each discipline as a whole needed more of a voice in recruiting and in graduate funding—even if it came at the expense of college autonomy.

Over more than a decade, the university gradually transformed the Federated College Plan, experimenting with various organizational structures that expanded the authority in each of the disciplines, and yet retained significant elements of college autonomy. The impact of this “experiment” on psychology’s development is taken up in the next section.

Psychology and the Federated College Plan

When the university established the Federated College Plan in 1967, the New Brunswick Psychology Department came into being. The Graduate Faculty was now taken out of the section and put in the New Brunswick department. It was expected that the departmental chairperson would be director of the Graduate Faculty in the discipline.

In 1972 the Psychology Department was one of a very few disciplines without such a New Brunswick-wide chairman. Although the department’s internal affairs were working well without a chairman, it was also apparent that a department chairman was needed to provide a communication link to the upper administration of the university. Psychology continued its active search for an “outside person” to fill the position.

Filling the position of New Brunswick chairman for psychology became something of a drama over the next two years. By early 1973, the possibility of hiring an “outside person” as chairman was all but foreclosed by a budget crisis in the university. However, in spring 1974, the Provost did give psychology a faculty line reserved for minority candidates for hiring an outside person as chairman when he was presented with the possibility of filling it with Leslie Hicks, an Afro-American who was then chairman at Howard University. Hicks declined the offer and psychology was again voting on an inside person. As one faculty member remarked, Hicks was the only candidate “who could step into this position without arousing the irrational fears of several contingents of the faculty.” The ballot submitted to the New Brunswick psychology faculty in 1975 consisted of D’Amato of Rutgers College and Burton of Douglass College—candidates who aroused the fears of one or the other contingent. D’Amato was elected by a very slim majority and the drama for finding a chairman was finally over.

D'Amato, as the first New Brunswick chairman of the Psychology Department, now faced the task of setting precedents for the role and authority of a discipline-wide chairman in the everyday functioning of the department and both its undergraduate and graduate components. He also needed to accustom the department to the increasing authority of a discipline-wide chairman, as directed by the university administration. However, the college departments retained the responsibility of searching for candidates for new lines given by the college dean; initiating reappointment recommendations, as well as having a formal vote for promotions which they forwarded to their respective deans; overview of the undergraduate curriculum; and setting requirements for the undergraduate major.

On the horizon was the growing reality that the Federated College Plan with its various lines of authority was not working. In 1981, Rutgers abandoned the Federated College Plan, so ending the struggle by the university and its academic disciplines to satisfy the incompatible demands for college autonomy and centralized control within the disciplines. The new plan, Unification (or Consolidation), called for the abolition of the disciplinary departments in the four undergraduate colleges. The faculties from these colleges were now members of a single department in their academic discipline. These unified departments were responsible for the undergraduate and graduate curricula in their discipline and for initiating the hiring and promotion of their faculty. College deans at Rutgers continued to administer many of their college's functions such as residential student life, extracurricular activities, and an honors program.

In the spring of that year, the disciplines were each told by the university to elect a chairman that would preside over both the undergraduate and graduate programs of the discipline. The unified Psychology Department elected me its first chair.

The Graduate Program in Psychology

In 1960, the Psychology Section created the Graduate Faculty consisting of members of the section who taught one or more graduate courses. Kenneth Berrien of University College was the first chairman of the Graduate Faculty. Members of the Graduate Faculty agreed to work first on the development of two areas: Experimental Psychology and Clinical Psychology. The Experimental Psychology program staffed mainly but not exclusively by Rutgers College, also needed senior appointments. Coincidentally, a pressing need existed for a senior appointment at Rutgers College to lead the department in its aspirations for major growth—a need met by Lewis's arrival in 1961. For the clinical psychology program, it was clear that a director with national stature was needed to lead its development so that it could be accredited by the APA, with all the benefits that would ensue from such accreditation. This need was met in 1962 when Bertram Cohen was hired as professor and Director of Clinical Training.

The years 1962 and 1963 were a banner period for Psychology's budding graduate program. The Graduate Faculty now enunciated four graduate areas: Clinical, Comparative-Physiological, General Experimental, Social-Industrial. Ten new courses were added to the graduate curriculum to flesh out these specialties, and significant additions were made to the

Graduate Faculty. Within three years after Cohen's arrival the program had APA's formal approval.

At the same time, strains began to emerge among the constituent academic units of the Graduate Faculty. One of the major sources of conflict and antagonisms was eligibility for membership on the Graduate Faculty—membership being the *sine qua non* for participation in the graduate program. The Graduate Faculty was dominated by the Rutgers College faculty because of its size relative to that of the other colleges, and a number of decisions regarding membership offended the leadership in the other two colleges. Lewis, now chairman of the Graduate Faculty, believed that the Graduate Faculty needed to have a determining voice in faculty hiring by a college department, particularly to assure that such faculty would be active researchers and thereby strengthen New Brunswick's graduate program.

The graduate program was almost totally dependent on the undergraduate colleges for their contribution of faculty time for graduate teaching and other resources, given the *very* limited resources given to the university's Graduate School. Members of the psychology faculty from the colleges who participated in the graduate program lived in the two organizational entities—their undergraduate college department and the Graduate Faculty—sometimes with conflicting loyalties. The autonomy of the college departments *reified* personality and ideological conflicts and competition for resources commonly found in unified departments, large and small. Unique to Rutgers were ambiguities over the control of the graduate program, which further exacerbated these kinds of conflicts.

Whatever the wrangling about hiring practices and membership on the Graduate Faculty, the graduate program itself grew and prospered. Some statistics: In 1969 there were 97 students in the graduate program and 328 applicants to the program. In 1970 the number of students doubled to 197 and the number of applicants increased to 600. (In 1973 there were 900 applicants, two thirds of them in clinical.) For student support there were research assistantships, teaching assistantships, fellowships (supported by Federal training grants and by the university's Graduate School), totaling 73 in 1969 and 90 in 1970.

After Lewis's departure from Rutgers in 1968 the conflict between Douglass and Rutgers was replaced with a guarded cooperation helped undoubtedly by new leadership of the Graduate Faculty with conflict. A new governance structure was also put into place: The Graduate Executive Committee consisting of the Area Coordinators for the graduate areas. The conduct and direction of the graduate program were firmly in the hands of this committee and the graduate chairman—all of whom generally held the same values about graduate training. College chairmen were present at meetings of this committee when it dealt with department-wide issues.

The Graduate Faculty had also grown considerably in number and membership was now coming from a variety of new academic units: Livingston College, the Medical School, GSAPP, and the Graduate School of Education. A handful of researchers and research-oriented clinical psychologists outside the university community were also admitted to membership. However, there was little to fear from the diverse constituencies of the Graduate Faculty with the Executive

Committee, composed of the Area Coordinators, serving as the gatekeepers of the graduate program.

Various changes of significance were taking place in a number of graduate areas. Human Experimental gradually transformed its emphasis and title to Cognitive Psychology, in line with strong shift in American psychology toward cognitive psychology. By the end of the 1960's the Social-Industrial area changed its title and its focus to Personality and Social Psychology. The industrial-psychology component of the area waned and personality psychology, the other traditional link to social psychology, took its place as it established a strong presence at Livingston College. By the end of the 1970's members of the Personality/Social area voted to shed Personality from its title, citing the need to give the area a clear identity. With GSAPP training their graduate students for a professional career in clinical psychology, the PhD program in clinical more clearly identified itself as a research-oriented program (although, in fact, four out of five of their PhD's went into clinical practice).

V. Unification: 1981-present and Prognostications

Unification in 1981 of each of the major academic disciplines in the arts and sciences on the New Brunswick Campus was a radical transformation for the university. The disciplinary departments were abolished in the four undergraduate colleges and the faculties from these colleges were now members of a single department in their academic discipline. The unified departments were responsible for the undergraduate and graduate curricula in their discipline and for all the hiring and promotion of their faculty. The unified departments were organized under the newly established Faculty of Arts and Sciences (FAS) with David Mechanic as its first dean.

Unification ended over two decades of experimentation by the university with various structures designed to balance the authority of a discipline to govern itself and the historic autonomy of the colleges. Rutgers University now resembled virtually all other major universities in America in the way academic disciplines were organized. College deans at Rutgers continued to administer many of their college's functions such as residential student life, extracurricular activities, and an honors program.

Each academic department adopted a new set of by laws, consistent with the university's guidelines for reorganization. In psychology, the by laws, approved by faculty vote, provided for a chair, a vice chair for Graduate Studies and a vice chair for Undergraduate Studies. The chair was responsible for the running the department while the vice chairs oversaw the daily operations of their respective programs. There was also a six-member Executive Committee with rotating membership elected by the faculty at large.

In addition to a new governance structure for each discipline the university sought to unify each of the disciplines geographically on one of the college campuses. Where could psychology be geographically unified? It was obvious that no single building could accommodate a faculty of over 50 members along with their specialized research facilities. Even forgoing geographic unification, it was not possible to accommodate the entire faculty in the

combined space available in the two psychology buildings: Busch Psychology Building and Davison Hall.

The solution, viewed as temporary, was the allocation by the university of most of Tillett Hall on the Livingston Campus to house the psychology faculty from Douglass, Livingston, and University College. Much of Tillett Hall had become available with unification when most of the college departments housed in Tillett were geographically unified with their respective disciplines on other campuses. The university also converted several classrooms in Tillett to research laboratories.

This interim arrangement required that the majority of the psychology faculty be moved in 1981. Most affected was the Douglass faculty. They gave up Davison Hall, a building designed by and for them, and their presence on the Douglass Campus. For members of the Douglass department whose academic life and loyalties were tied to the college with its special mission to educate young women, their loss was the most acute of the faculty displaced by unification. For developmental psychologists in the Douglass faculty, unification also meant geographic separation from the Day Care Center and the DDC, both important to their teaching and research interests. Less affected were the Livingston and University College faculty, both of which had been in adequate quarters but not buildings originally designed to house psychologists. Least affected—actually unaffected—by unification was the Rutgers College faculty since they remained in the Busch Psychology Building.

The faculty in the Busch and Tillett buildings was grouped (more or less) in terms of common interests. Most unified were the behavioral neuroscience faculty at Busch and the social and personality faculty at Tillett. Most, but not all, of the developmental faculty from Douglass moved to Tillett. The clinical faculty was also housed in Tillett but separated from the clinic and from clinical colleagues in GSAPP—all housed in the Busch building. The cognitive faculty was also split between the two buildings but later consolidated in the Busch building, some with a split appointment between the Psychology Department and the Rutgers Cognitive Science Center, later located in the Busch building when a wing was built for them.

The geographic unification for psychology contemplated by the university was the enlargement of the Busch Psychology Building so that all of the department would be housed there. In the long run then the dislocations of the faculty, particularly that of Douglass, seemed worth it given the eventual unification of psychology in the Busch building.

The expansion of the Busch Psychology Building appeared to become a reality when it was given top priority by the university for the bond issue of the mid 1980's. The plan also received the endorsement of the chairs of the other disciplines in FAS. However, when the list of building priorities was published, psychology was not even listed! Instead, expansion of the Busch building was made to accommodate GSAPP (which was already in the building but had been promised more space for several years), the Cognitive Science Center, and the Laboratory for Vision Research.

Psychology still remains the only major department split between two locations on two different campuses. For psychology a more apt title for this section is **Unification: Yes and No.**

The problems engendered by this separation were cogently summarized by Flaherty who served as chairman of the department for 10 years (not all consecutive) in the two decades following unification. First, the two buildings are not equally desirable. The Busch building is a modern structure, designed for psychology, and close to the Library of Science and Medicine, the principal location for psychology books and journals. Coupled with this was the perception among faculty at Tillett that the Busch administrative offices were favored with better equipment and more resources. Second, and more serious, was the growing rift between the faculties in the two buildings as to which was making the greater contribution to the department. Vestiges of inter-college conflicts were still reified by the continuing geographic separation of the faculties formerly from Rutgers College and Douglass College. Moreover, one of the major potential benefits of unification, that of scholarly exchange among faculty from a diverse discipline like psychology, was made more difficult by the two locations, including specialties split between the two buildings. In fact, before unification and within each college there was more diversity of interests than there was now either at Busch or at Livingston.

On the positive side was the success of the governance structure of the unified Psychology Department. The differences among the colleges in their requirements for the major were resolved by having two types of majors in the unified department, one leading to a B.A. and the other to a B.S. Overall planning for the future of the department was successfully handled by a Long Range Planning Committee that met informally with the department chair, and then by the Executive Committee who, with the department chair, proposed to the faculty which areas needed strengthening. Also laudatory was the complete integrity with which promotions were handled by the entire faculty no matter in which building the given faculty was housed. The governance structure of the Psychology Department today is essentially what it was at the beginning of the academic year in 1981. Although the governance structure of the department turned out to be successful, the ultimate effects on the department of the geographic separation are still not clear.

The separation of the department into two buildings (and two campuses) corresponds to some of the growing fractures in American psychology. Increasingly, members of some sub disciplines are attracted to organizational affiliations outside the boundaries of the traditional psychology department. Most salient are the two sub disciplines, biopsychology and cognitive psychology. Some biopsychologists find affiliation with biologists, neuroscientists, and geneticists more productive than that with other specialties within a psychology department—least of all their social psychology colleagues. Cognitive psychologists seek affiliation with computer scientists and linguists. In the case of the latter, Rutgers is already experiencing effects of these changing affiliations with the presence of the Cognitive Science Center. An old fracture, that between clinical psychology in the department and in the professional school, has been present at Rutgers since 1974 when GSAPP was established. Changes in the clinical profession may eventually reshape both of these sources of clinical psychologists.

What is the likely composition of the Psychology Department at the centennial celebration of its founding? I am loath to be a prognosticator about the specifics of such a composition 25 years from now. I would note however that the history of psychology at Rutgers has shown that important transitions (here denoted as highlights) have always occurred between 20 and 40 years. The last transition was in 1981. We are due for another one before the centennial celebration in 2028.

I am not even sure the next transition will have to do with a resolution of the centripetal and centrifugal forces that the Psychology Department at Rutgers is experiencing. We are of course not alone in the push and pull of these forces. One prognosticator (Scott, 1991) who believes that the centrifugal forces will win out argues that “the administrative unit that currently houses an integrated department of psychology will be viewed from the 21st century as having been a necessary phase in the *bildungsroman* of the behavioral sciences.” He cites a number of large universities in which this has already occurred. In contrast is my own experience—and those of others—of the continuing strength of the centripetal forces in psychology. My alma mater department at Indiana University, in their recent newsletter, proudly announced the geographic reunification of the department in their recently completed enlargement of the psychology building on the Bloomington Campus, this after 12 years in which some specialties had to be temporarily housed elsewhere on the campus as the department grew over the years.

If the next transition of psychology at Rutgers does have to do with the resolution of the two forces, continued geographic separation or the ability to unify in one building may be a deciding factor. It could go either way. We will undoubtedly know at the centennial. See you then.

References

- Capshew, J (1999). *Psychologists on the march*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Fay, J.W. (1939). *American psychology before William James*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press. (Reprinted 1966 by Octagon Books, New York.)
- McCormick, R.P. (1966). *Rutgers: A bicentennial history*. New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- McCormick, R.P. (1978). *Academic reorganization in New Brunswick, 1962-1978: The Federated College Plan*. Unpublished monograph in Special Collections, Rutgers University.
- Porter, N. (1868). *The human intellect: With an introduction upon psychology and the soul*. New York: Scribner.

Reid, T. (1785). *Essays on the intellectual powers of man*. Edinburgh.

Scott, T.R. (1991). The personal views of the future of psychology departments. *American Psychologist*, 46, 975-976.

Thorndike, E.L. (1911). *Animal intelligence: Experimental studies*. New York: MacMillan.