



UNIVERSITY OF
ILLINOIS PRESS

The Society of Experimental Psychologists: 1904-1938

Author(s): Edwin G. Boring

Source: *The American Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 51, No. 2 (Apr., 1938), pp. 410-423

Published by: University of Illinois Press

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1415667>

Accessed: 20-03-2018 03:36 UTC

REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

http://www.jstor.org/stable/1415667?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://about.jstor.org/terms>



JSTOR

University of Illinois Press is collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *The American Journal of Psychology*

NOTES AND DISCUSSIONS

THE SOCIETY OF EXPERIMENTAL PSYCHOLOGISTS:

1904-1938

The close of a decade of formal organic existence for the Society of Experimental Psychologists is an appropriate time at which to review the history of the Society, though that history begins, not in 1928, but in 1904, at Cornell, when Edward Bradford Titchener initiated the informal spring meetings of Experimental Psychologists.¹

THE INFORMAL MEETINGS

The early group formed an unorganized institution that centered upon the personality of Titchener, who stimulated its attendants with his grace and wisdom and sometimes vexed them with his insistent punctiliousness. The group never had a by-law, and its name, Experimental Psychologists, came to be fixed upon the group by usage without formal fiat. Except for one year during the war (1918), the meeting of Experimental Psychologists occurred annually in the spring from 1904 until 1928, the year after Titchener's death when formal organization was undertaken. The group had no officers. There was a "host," who invited laboratories in the persons of their heads, and each head brought along members of his staff and some of his more advanced graduate students. At the first four meetings papers were read, actually and even "by title," and also at some of the later meetings as in 1912. There grew up gradually, however, the custom that the guests should participate by informal communication and report. No abstracts of their remarks were published after 1907. Few formal papers were read after 1912. It was usual to report work in progress, to discuss difficulties and to ask for help. The older men found the frank and friendly atmosphere of the meetings pleasant and helpful, while the younger men were stimulated by this intimate view of persons who had seemed to them remote and important. This is the positive side of the picture.

On the negative side there were the difficulties created by Titchener's insistent regnancy. Always Titchener dominated the group. There was the recurrent question as to who was to be invited. Invitations were supposed to be by laboratories, but personalities in their relation to Titchener played an important rôle. Each host consulted as to his guests with Titchener, who was virtually the arbiter of invitations. Not only were there certain persons in certain years who were understood to be ostracized from Titchener's presence; there were also those whose status as experimentalists lay in doubt. Practically up to the time of Titchener's death *experimental psychology*, in this group, meant generalized, human, adult, normal, experimental psychology. It was easy to exclude the mental testers, but animal psychology was always slipping in. Yerkes, for instance, came occasionally and usually kept silence in the field of his own expertness. Representation by laboratories also caused minor

¹ This history is written at the mandate of the Society of Experimental Psychologists at its meeting at Smith College in the spring of 1937. The chairman appointed, as a Committee on History, S. W. Fernberger, chairman, K. M. Dallenbach, H. S. Langfeld, W. R. Miles and myself; and my colleagues made me the historian. These colleagues, my older associates in the present membership of the Society, and some of Titchener's old group have aided me by reminiscence, correspondence, and review of my paragraphs.

difficulties, for Titchener never came around to the American view that there could be two leading psychologists in the same laboratory. Who was the "head" when Angier, Dodge and Yerkes turned up together at Yale, when Boring joined Langfeld and McDougall at Harvard, or when Langfeld joined Warren at Princeton? And was not Cattell the head at Columbia? But Titchener stood firm on his two kinds of qualifications for the guests: certain social proprieties and the meaning of the term *experimental*. In consequence most of the memories that still persist about these meetings of Experimental Psychologists in 1904-1927 are anecdotes which gain their points from the personal relations of everyone else to the focal personality of Titchener.

The first meeting was at Cornell on April 4-5, 1904.² The invitations were by laboratories, and it is certain that the following laboratories were represented: (1) Cornell by Titchener, who was host and founder, and Madison Bentley (assistant professor), G. M. Whipple (lecturer on education), J. W. Baird (Carnegie research assistant), H. C. Stevens and C. E. Ferree (assistants in the laboratory) and G. H. Sabine (a graduate student of philosophy); (2) Yale by C. H. Judd, who was very active in the discussion and wrote up the meeting; (3) Pennsylvania by Lightner Witmer, who was also active; (4) Clark by E. C. Sanford, who reported experiments of his own, although not of other members of the Clark laboratory; (5) Michigan by W. B. Pillsbury, who brought C. E. Galloway along with him; and (6) Princeton by H. C. Warren, left in charge at Princeton by Baldwin's recent move to Hopkins.

Some of us remember that Titchener at the Cornell meeting in 1923 reviewed the history of the Experimental Psychologists, and showed on a chart that ten laboratories had been represented at the first meeting. It now seems probable that this memory is wrong or that the chart was wrong. It seems clear that Columbia, Harvard and Hopkins were not represented in 1904. C. E. Seashore had been asked for Iowa and sent a paper which Baird read. J. R. Angell had been asked for Chicago and introduced Matilde Castro, whose paper was "read by title." From the first the group—especially Titchener—was opposed to the presence of women at its meetings, and Miss Castro was not there. It may have been that Titchener invited ten laboratories whose heads indicated their willingness to support the new meetings, although only six (or seven) actually came, while at least two more (Chicago and Iowa) made the gesture of membership by sending papers.

Judd in writing up the account of this meeting listed thirteen papers that were actually read: three by himself, two each by Witmer and Whipple, and one each by Sanford, Pillsbury and several of the younger men. Six papers were read by title, including two by Titchener, who seems as host to have refrained from displacing others on the program. That Titchener wanted from the start to have the meetings informal is shown by the fact that he suggested calling the group the Fechner Club, a suggestion which, however, met with little approval.

The second meeting was at Clark with Sanford as host, on March 31 and April 1, 1905.³ Münsterberg had sent an invitation from Harvard to the previous meeting, but probably it was decided to go to the laboratory of someone who had actually been present at the first meeting. Moreover, Titchener was especially close to Sanford

² C. H. Judd, Meeting of Experimental Psychologists at Cornell University, *J. Philos.*, 1, 1904, 238-240.

³ Unsigned note on the Clark meeting with no title, *J. Philos.*, 2, 1905, 223.

and to Clark. The published note shows that, besides Sanford and Titchener, L. M. Terman and Arnold Gesell were there from Clark, Bentley and Stevens from Cornell, A. H. Pierce from Smith, and J. P. Hylan from Harvard. Witmer and F. M. Urban were there from Pennsylvania, and presumably Judd from Yale. Baldwin was there from Hopkins. It is not at all clear about Münsterberg. Stevens read a paper sent by Max Meyer from Missouri. President G. Stanley Hall, who no longer claimed to be an experimental psychologist, entertained the group and also gave an address on "Tendencies and Dangers in Experimental Psychology." We may guess what was said by the man whose later advice to psychologists was: "Build the top of the mountain first!" Titchener led the discussion of Hall's views. A. G. Webster, Clark's distinguished physicist and acoustician, demonstrated apparatus for the measurement of the absolute intensity of tone. The brief unsigned published note about the meeting shows that the counsel of intimate informality was beginning to prevail.

The third meeting was at Yale under Judd in the spring of 1906. There was no published note and reminiscences are few. The meeting was small and held in Judd's study. It was Raymond Dodge's first meeting, and he recalls his surprise that Judd disputed with the great Titchener with such freedom. Titchener was thirty-nine and Judd was thirty-three, but Titchener usually managed to add about ten years to his prestige. R. S. Woodworth was there, and he recalls making a report on his introspective study of the antecedents of voluntary movement and being commended for it by Titchener. At this meeting Titchener insisted that there be no published note, and there was none.

Witmer had the fourth meeting at Pennsylvania in 1907.⁴ The resolve against publicity lapsed, and Baird published a five-page note, containing abstracts of sixteen papers read by fourteen persons. E. B. Twitmyer, Urban, and J. D. Heilman participated for Pennsylvania; Titchener, Ferree, L. R. Geissler and W. H. Pyle for Cornell; Sanford for Clark; Baird for Illinois; J. H. Leuba for Bryn Mawr; and H. H. Goddard for the Vineland Training School. Baird read a paper of S. S. Colvin's representing work of Colvin's at Illinois. A novel feature was a round table discussion of plans and methods for instruction in psychology. Urban's paper was on "The Method of Just Perceptible Differences." The paper was long and difficult and Urban was feeling discouraged about his work, but Titchener broke a silence to pronounce it epoch-making in the history of psychophysics, and thus to gain Urban's lasting appreciation and gratitude. This must also be the meeting at which Witmer jocularly referred to Titchener as "the king of the meeting," thus invoking Titchener's anger.

In 1908 the meeting went to Harvard.⁵ Hugo Münsterberg was in charge, assisted by E. B. Holt and R. M. Yerkes. The brief note that was printed about the meeting recognizes the fact that the representation was by laboratories rather than by persons. It lists as present fourteen laboratories, and gives the names of the eighteen persons representing them in parentheses afterward: Brown (E. B. Delabarre), Bryn Mawr (Ferree), Clark (Sanford and J. P. Porter), Columbia (J. McK. Cattell and E. L. Thorndike), Cornell (Titchener), Hopkins (J. M. Baldwin), McLean Hospital

⁴ J. W. Baird, The proceedings of the Philadelphia meeting of Experimental Psychologists, this JOURNAL, 18, 1907, 383-388.

⁵ Unsigned note, Fifth annual meeting of Experimental Psychologists, this JOURNAL, 19, 1908, 288.

(F. L. Wells), New York University (J. E. Lough), Pennsylvania (Urban), Princeton (Warren and C. L. Vaughan), Smith (A. H. Pierce), Wesleyan (Dodge), Wisconsin⁶ (Daniel Starch), Yale (R. P. Angier and E. H. Cameron). The representation seems to have been much more general than at any previous meeting. All the important laboratories and nearly all the important men from the East were there.⁷ Judd had gone to Chicago, and Witmer was absent, but Baldwin, Cattell and Thorndike were there. Münsterberg had the gift of showmanship. He organized this more representative convocation, staging the exhibition in the new psychological laboratory in Emerson Hall. It was in the account of this meeting that the participation of the members was referred to as "communications" and not as "papers." In later years read papers were discountenanced, and ultimately all reports were informal and ostensibly *ex tempore*, although Titchener at least was known to drill his graduate students in advance for their oral presentation of the results of their experiments. Still the practice varied. In 1911 there were no read papers; in 1912 all the reports were read.

In 1909 the meeting went to Warren at Princeton.⁸ There were said to have been twenty-three psychologists in attendance, but only the names of a few who gave formal communications were listed. Knight Dunlap was there from Hopkins. The other names were not new to the group. No anecdotes seem to have survived from this meeting.

J. B. Watson was host at Hopkins in 1910. There was no printed report of the meeting. He recalls the presence of Titchener, Holt, Yerkes, Baird, H. S. Langfeld and H. M. Johnson. It was the first meeting for Langfeld and Johnson, as well as for Watson. Holt and Yerkes called each other by their first names, and Titchener was distressed by such unBritish conduct.

The eighth meeting in 1911 went back again to Titchener at Cornell. It was my first meeting. Just as Dodge five years before had been impressed by the temerity with which Judd stood up to Titchener, so here I was astonished at the way in which Dodge and Holt argued against Titchener on the matter of introspection—especially Holt, who was so caustic and dramatic that he had later to explain to me, as I took him to the trolley, how great was his real underlying admiration for Titchener. There were no published notes about the meetings from 1910 to 1912 inclusive.

In 1912 there was a second Clark meeting, this time under Baird, for Sanford, as the new President of Clark College, had withdrawn from active work in experimental psychology. Besides the usual attendants, Thorndike was there to represent Columbia, and he and Titchener led in a symposium on imageless thought. The meeting was the first for K. M. Dallenbach and H. P. Weld. Dallenbach played

⁶ The published note prints *Wellesley* but must mean *Wisconsin*, for Starch was never at Wellesley, the Wellesley psychologists (M. W. Calkins and E. A. McC. Gamble) were women and not welcome, and the laboratory is listed in a position alphabetically correct for *Wisconsin* and not for *Wellesley*.

⁷ In 1908 the American Psychological Association had 209 members, less than a tenth of its present membership, and they represented instruction in sixty-two colleges and universities. In other words, Münsterberg gathered together at Harvard about one-tenth of the membership of the American Psychological Association. Today a group of eighteen would be less than one percentage.

⁸ Unsigned note, The sixth annual meeting of Experimental Psychologists, this JOURNAL, 20, 1909, 471.

blindfold chess and introspected upon the process to show the dominant rôle of kinesthesia in his playing.⁹

The tenth meeting in 1913 with Dodge at Wesleyan was an anniversary meeting.¹⁰ The heads of the larger laboratories undertook to summarize the researches of their laboratories during the decade of the society's existence. In all there were about twelve laboratories represented. Dodge arranged to have Wells and Goddard discuss mental tests, "their theory, value and limitation," and the discussion seems to have been lively and somewhat opposed to the use of the word *test*. There was a more lively discussion of Watson's new school of behaviorism and a seemingly unanimous dissent from his views; but Watson was not there. Münsterberg was there; Dodge arranged for him to give a semi-public lecture on the mind-reading of Beulah Miller. The introduction of Münsterberg, mind-reading, tests and behaviorism into the usually circumscribed sphere of these meetings was consistent with Dodge's chairmanship, for he always exerted his influence toward catholicity of interests against Titchener's support of rigid specificity.

Columbia, like Hopkins, had been represented somewhat sporadically in the group. The interests of Cattell and Titchener diverged widely. Cattell said, for instance, that, since he could not trust his own introspection, he was dubious of anyone's else. Moreover, attendance at the spring meeting was difficult because Columbia had no vacation at that time. Nevertheless Cattell, Thorndike and Woodworth went to the meetings at times, and in 1914 Columbia was host. Cattell presided, though Woodworth made the arrangements. Cattell introduced the plan of having reports of research made by subject-matter, according to the classification of the *Psychological Index*, instead of by laboratories, thus dislocating slightly one of the traditions of the group. It was at this meeting that Christine Ladd-Franklin, always militant in behalf of her color theory and the rights of women, almost invaded the masculine sessions. She did come to one session, but tradition was kept supreme at the others. Between sessions she captured psychologists to have them view her demonstration of simple and complex colors, an exhibit which she thought proved Titchener wrong on the controversial issue of the simplicity of all hues. This meeting was the first for A. T. Poffenberger and W. R. Miles.

In 1915 the meeting was at Yale with Angier as host. K. S. Lashley was present. In 1916 the sessions were at Princeton with Warren as host. A photograph taken at the Princeton meeting shows thirty-two psychologists. The group was growing. There are after 1913 no further printed notes about these meetings until the formal organization of the Society of Experimental Psychologists after Titchener's death.

The 1917 meeting at Harvard occurred shortly after Münsterberg's death, in the specific excitement caused by Titchener's call to succeed Münsterberg (but he did not go), and the general excitement caused by the United States' declaration of war against Germany. Langfeld was the official host for he had just been made acting Director of the Harvard Laboratory, but Yerkes and Holt shared the responsibilities with him. At the final session on April 6, the day of America's declaration of war, the group turned to the consideration of what American psychologists could do to

⁹ K. M. Dallenbach, Blindfold chess: the single game, *Studies in Psychology* (Titchener Commemorative Volume), 1917, 214-230.

¹⁰ S. W. Fernberger, Convention of Experimental Psychologists, this JOURNAL, 24, 1913, 445.

assist the Government in the war.¹¹ Yerkes, who was then president of the American Psychological Association, took the chair. Titchener, as a British subject, withdrew to the periphery of the group. Captain W. S. Bowen, instructor in military science at Harvard, was brought in for advice. The problem of the selection of men for a great army and of the elimination of the feeble-minded was considered. Finally a committee, under Yerkes' chairmanship, was appointed "to gather information concerning the possible relations of psychology to military problems." It was this small stone that began the avalanche of intelligence testing in the United States Army, although it must be said that the stone required many other pushes before it could roll alone.

The war prevented any meeting in 1918. In 1919 Titchener had a small group at Cornell, some of them still in uniform. In 1920 they went to Cornell again for a larger meeting, and then in 1921, they went to Boring at Clark, for Baird had died in 1919.

In 1922 Dodge was host at Wesleyan. This was the year in which a breach between Woodworth and Titchener was healed. In 1920 Woodworth, finding that he could not attend the meeting at Cornell, had posted Titchener's card of invitation on the laboratory's bulletin board, with the added query: "Who can go?" One of the juniors did go, but Woodworth's action seemed to Titchener to indicate so great a misunderstanding of the personal character of the invitation to the meetings that it became a question as to whether Columbia was still a member of the group. In 1922 Dodge determined to correct this situation. Woodworth appeared, and Titchener, well prepared for the critical moment, greeted him with all necessary cordiality. It was also at this meeting that Dallenbach acquired adaptation to rotation on Dodge's beautiful apparatus and then willfully raised his head, proving that the relation of the stomach to the semi-circular canals is not one of psychology's fictions.

The nineteenth meeting in 1923 was again at Cornell, and Titchener treated it as a second decennial occasion, for the first decenary had been celebrated in 1913. Titchener reviewed the history of the society.

In 1924 the meeting was again at Clark. Sanford, having retired from the presidency of Clark College, was again back in experimental psychology, and he was host. Boring had left, and J. P. Nafe was not to come until the next year. Titchener, having insisted on coming by automobile from Ithaca, was blocked by a snow drift near Albany, and his junior colleagues had to shovel him through. He was late, but not too late to make, on behalf of the group, the presentation of a clock to Sanford to mark his retirement from teaching. Sanford retired in June and died in November.

The 1925 meeting went to Warren at Princeton. The session was in part a dedication of Eno Hall, the new Princeton Laboratory. Titchener delivered a formal address, a retrospect of experiment psychology.¹² Wolfgang Köhler and Kurt Koffka were in America, emissaries of the Gestalt movement, and they attended as guests. The meetings were, however, getting unwieldy. The picture of the group at this meeting shows forty persons.

In 1926 Fernberger had the meeting at Pennsylvania. In 1927 Boring had it at Harvard. This meeting was much too large. Thirty-eight men came from twelve

¹¹ R. M. Yerkes, Psychological examining in the United States Army, *Mem. Nat. Acad. Sci.*, 15, 1921, 7.

¹² E. B. Titchener, Experimental psychology: a retrospect, this JOURNAL, 36, 1925, 313-323.

laboratories: Clark (7), Princeton (6), Yale (6), Cornell (5), Columbia (3), Wittenberg (3), Hobart (2), Wesleyan (2), Pennsylvania (1), Smith (1), Stanford (1), Wellesley (1). Boring selected seven members of the Harvard staff, and thirteen of the experimentalists among the graduate students. That made fifty-eight in all, and Titchener had always complained that Harvard brought a maximum of men and a minimum of research to the meetings! There is a strip of moving pictures of some of the men at this meeting. Titchener's beard looks quite white.

And then in August Titchener died.

The twenty-fourth meeting, the last meeting of the unorganized group that had accepted Titchener's will instead of by-laws, was held at Yale in 1928 with Dodge

TABLE I
MEETINGS

(The meetings have been held every spring since 1904, except 1918, the year of the War.)

Informal Meetings

Place	Year	Host	Place	Year	Host
1. Cornell	1904	Titchener	13. Princeton	1916	Warren
2. Clark	1905	Sanford	14. Harvard	1917	Langfeld
3. Yale	1906	Judd	15. Cornell	1919	Titchener
4. Pennsylvania	1907	Witmer	16. Cornell	1920	Titchener
5. Harvard	1908	Münsterberg	17. Clark	1921	Boring
6. Princeton	1909	Warren	18. Wesleyan	1922	Dodge
7. Hopkins	1910	Watson	19. Cornell	1923	Titchener
8. Cornell	1911	Titchener	20. Clark	1924	Sanford
9. Clark	1912	Baird	21. Princeton	1925	Warren
10. Wesleyan	1913	Dodge	22. Pennsylvania	1926	Fernberger
11. Columbia	1914	Cattell	23. Harvard	1927	Boring
12. Yale	1915	Angier	24. Yale	1928	Dodge

Formal Organization

Place	Year	Chairman	Place	Year	Chairman
25. Princeton	1929	Warren	30. Harvard	1934	Boring
26. Cornell	1930	Bentley	31. Yale	1935	Miles
27. Vassar	1931	Washburn	32. Clark	1936	Hunter
28. Columbia	1932	Woodworth	33. Smith	1937	Koffka
29. Pennsylvania	1933	Fernberger	34. North Carolina	1938	Dashiell

as host. It too was a large meeting. Nineteen of the older men at dinner decided that the tradition could not be continued without radical change. They appointed a committee (Warren, chairman, Boring, Dodge, Langfeld, Yerkes) to plan a society to carry on the tradition of experimentalism with such organization and changes as should be necessary to insure smoother working of the group in the future, and they instructed Dodge to refuse the invitations that had been tendered for the following year and to announce that the meetings of the past would not be continued.

THE FORMAL ORGANIZATION

The function of the Committee of Five of 1928 was to enlarge itself into a representative committee which could adopt principles and a form of organization and then enlarge itself still more. The Committee of Five, however, had also to consider principles lest it start growing in the wrong direction. Certain principles

had been established at the dinner. (a) There was to be a simple form of organization and a determinate membership, so that there should be no longer uncertainty and disagreement about invitation lists. (b) The meetings were to be kept small, considerably smaller than some of the recent meetings that had had an attendance of more than fifty, and the size was to be controlled by excluding younger men—graduate students and perhaps instructors. (c) Animal psychology was to be admitted as experimental psychology, and Yerkes' inclusion in the Committee of Five was intended to settle this point. Everyone was ready to change from Titchener's immutable conservatism, which held that experimental psychology is only a psychology of consciousness.

On the other hand, there were some questions not yet settled. The most important of these was (d) the issue between the academy plan and the club idea. Dallenbach was supporting a plan for an American academy of experimental psychology, an honor society of the older experimentalists, limited to about fifty persons, holding small meetings for discussion and mutual aid, and competent to become a stimulus to younger men. Since an academy would be national in scope, its meetings would be less representative than those of a more local society. Opposed to the academy idea, there was the conception of a small eastern group, chosen for the purpose of meeting for discussion and mutual aid, a group including younger men and excluding inharmonious personalities; in other words, a club. Of course, the Committee of Five could not undertake to settle the issue of academy *vs.* club.

In enlarging itself the Committee of Five had to consider other problems. (e) Should it elect psychologists not in the east? If it elected men from the west, it had prejudged the issue in favor of an academy. If it elected only men in the east, it had not got a representative group. Actually it dealt with this matter inconsistently, for it first decided not to prejudice the club-academy issue, and then later elected Bott to represent Canada, Miles the west, Bentley the middle west, and Peterson the south. (f) Should it elect women? That would be another break with the tradition of the past. It decided not to prejudice this issue and thus did not elect Miss Washburn or Miss Downey, both of whom were discussed favorably. (g) Should it define experimental psychology to include the tests, educational psychology and abnormal psychology? It decided against this extension for the time being, leaving the matter to the future. (h) Although the question of compatibility of personalities was discussed, as well it might be after the long years with Titchener, the matter did not become a factor in any judgment. It appeared that all the important experimental psychologists in the limited field thus far defined were now sufficiently congenial to go profitably to the same meeting. Something had changed.

The Committee of Five next undertook to make out a list of distinguished experimental psychologists, excluding the men of the tests, educational psychology and abnormal psychology, but including all others in the United States and Canada. It wanted men who might be in an academy if an academy were formed, and it was surprised when it was unable to find more than thirty-two plausible names for such a list. It suddenly became clear that Dallenbach's academy of fifty could not even be filled at once. The committee voted on this list, and chose the ten persons who received a unanimous vote to add to its number. The result was a Committee of Fifteen, an "organizing nucleus" which could meet in 1929, effect a permanent organization and elect other members. The Committee of Fifteen was:

Bentley (<i>Illinois</i>)	Fernberger (<i>Pennsylvania</i>)	Peterson (<i>Peabody</i>)
Boring (<i>Harvard</i>)	Hunter (<i>Clark</i>)	Robinson (<i>Yale</i>)
Bott (<i>Toronto</i>)	Lashley (<i>Inst. Juv. Res.</i>)	Warren (<i>Princeton</i>)
Dallenbach (<i>Cornell</i>)	Langfeld (<i>Princeton</i>)	Woodworth (<i>Columbia</i>)
Dodge (<i>Yale</i>)	Miles (<i>Stanford</i>)	Yerkes (<i>Yale</i>)

These fifteen men were invited by Warren to Princeton in 1929 for a "quiet meeting" to affect a permanent organization and also to discuss experimental psychology. This meeting is regarded by some as the prenatal meeting of a new society, by others as the first meeting of the new society, and by still others as the twenty-fifth meeting of the Experimental Psychologists. Your historian takes this last view because the continuity of the Society, in spirit, purpose and accomplishment, is clear from 1904 until the present.

Ten of the fifteen members of the "organizing nucleus" were present at this Princeton meeting: Bentley, Dallenbach, Dodge, Fernberger, Langfeld, Miles, Peterson, Robinson, Warren, Yerkes. This group decided (a) that it would organize a society of experimental psychologists for the purpose of informal discussion, (b) that the membership of the society should be limited to North American experimental psychologists, (c) that there should be no other regional limitation upon membership, (d) that there should be no restriction of membership with regard to sex, and (e) that there should be no restriction with regard to organism studied.

The meeting then adopted the by-laws which are printed at the end of this article. It will be seen that, in adopting these by-laws, the committee chose the academy plan. Dallenbach had worked out a set of by-laws which he distributed at the meeting, and to a very great extent his views prevailed. Thus the Society of Experimental Psychologists limited itself to fifty members with the intention that election should become a distinctive honor conferred upon a new member. The provision that election at the annual meeting should be by roll-call and unanimous was Dallenbach's idea. Altogether it has worked quite well, since one objector will seldom persist long in obstructing an election that is wanted by all the other members present, and it is probable that the full discussion associated with a roll-call results in better judgments than would a high percentage on a secret ballot.

This Committee first elected to the Society the fifteen persons of the "organizing nucleus." It then elected eleven more persons:

Brown (<i>California</i>)	Dunlap (<i>Hopkins</i>)	Stone (<i>Stanford</i>)
Carr (<i>Chicago</i>)	Johnson (<i>Pittsburgh</i>)	Washburn (<i>Vassar</i>)
Cobb (<i>Nela Park</i>)	Koffka (<i>Smith</i>)	Weld (<i>Cornell</i>)
Downey (<i>Wyoming</i>)	Seashore (<i>Iowa</i>)	

That made twenty-six members in all, and, if the term "charter member" were to be used, it should be applied to these twenty-six, since they are the first fully representative group to come into function in the new organization. Washburn, for instance, would certainly have been elected in 1928 if there had not been the question about women, and others also would have been elected then had the principles for election become clear.

Fernberger was elected secretary of the Society at this meeting and has continued in this post until the present time. The Chairman, who takes the place of the "host" in the Titchener days, is elected annually as a senior man at the institution at which the Society will meet. He has few administrative functions except at the meeting.

In general, it may be said that the adoption of the academy idea has not interfered with the free and informal discussion that was the genius of the Titchenerian era. The meetings are well attended and are growing as the membership grows. Elections are hotly contested, but there are a few successful nominees every year. The younger men join in discussion with the older and titles are dropped between members. There are never any papers. The chairman calls upon members in turn and each limits himself to the report of one or two problems. Reports are *ex tempore*. Published articles are not reported. Research in progress is frequently reported, and criticism of it sometimes leads to an alteration of procedure. Members bring in problems about research in progress or research not yet begun, and ask for assistance, and get it. The sessions are kept short as Titchener always had them: a morning, an afternoon, an evening, another morning, and another afternoon. Members go away tired but stimulated.

TABLE II
MEMBERSHIP AND ATTENDANCE

(The figures for members, attendance and Fellows show the status of the Society at the beginning of each annual meeting before any new members had been elected or were in attendance.)

Year	Place	Attend- ance	Total members	Total Fellows	Elected at meeting	Deaths during year
1929	Princeton	10	0	0	26	0
1930	Cornell	16	26	0	3	0
1931	Vassar	15	28	1	5	0
1932	Columbia	19	33	1	3	0
1933	Pennsylvania	18	34	2	3	1
1934	Harvard	18	36	1	3	2
1935	Yale	20	38	2	1	0
1936	Clark	20	36	4	6	1
1937	Smith	25	40	5	4	1
1938	North Carolina	—	43	6	—	—
Total.....					54	5

Table II shows the attendance and the membership of the Society in successive years. A member becomes a Fellow automatically on his sixty-fifth birthday, thus also creating an additional vacancy in the membership, which is limited to a total of fifty. Thus far there have been seven Fellows in the Society (Table III). There have been five deaths (Table III). Altogether fifty-four persons have been elected to the Society. In 1937 the Society had reached a total of forty-three members and six Fellows (Table II). The annual elections of members up to 1937 are shown in Table III. The attendance has increased in numbers from sixteen to twenty-five, but the relative attendance has remained constant at a little more than half the total number of members and Fellows (Table II).¹⁸

In general it appears that the Society draws its membership from about half the membership of the American Psychological Association, since the Society excludes certain fields from consideration. Within this half of the American psychologists,

¹⁸ The meetings from the 26th at Cornell in 1930 to the 33rd at Smith in 1937 have been reported by K. M. Dallenbach in this JOURNAL: 42, 1930, 469; 43, 1931, 525; 44, 1932, 582; 45, 1933, 539; 46, 1934, 511 (this report was by Fernberger); 47, 1935, 344; 48, 1936, 526; 49, 1937, 487.

TABLE III

ELECTIONS

(Membership by year of election. The institution cited shows the location of the member at the time of his election.)

1. *Elected in 1929:*
 Madison Bentley, *Cornell*; Fellow,
 1935-
 Edwin G. Boring, *Harvard*
 Edward A. Bott, *Toronto*
 Warner Brown, *California*
 Harvey A. Carr, *Chicago*
 Percy W. Cobb, *Nela Park*
 Karl M. Dallenbach, *Cornell*
 Raymond Dodge, *Yale*; Fellow, 1936-
 June E. Downey, *Wyoming*; died,
 1932
 Knight Dunlap, *Hopkins*
 Samuel W. Fernberger, *Pennsylvania*
 Walter S. Hunter, *Clark*
 Harry M. Johnson, *Mellon Institute*
 Kurt Koffka, *Smith*
 Herbert S. Langfeld, *Princeton*
 Karl S. Lashley, *Inst. Juv. Res.*
 Walter Miles, *Stanford*
 Joseph Peterson, *George Peabody*; died,
 1935
 Edward S. Robinson, *Yale*; died, 1937
 Carl E. Seashore, *Iowa*; Fellow, 1931-
 Calvin P. Stone, *Stanford*
 Howard C. Warren, *Princeton*; Fellow,
 1932-34; died, 1934
 Margaret F. Washburn, *Vassar*; Fellow,
 1936-
 Harry P. Weld, *Cornell*
 Robert S. Woodworth, *Columbia*; Fel-
 low, 1934-
 Robert S. Yerkes, *Yale*
2. *Elected in 1930:*
 John F. Dashiell, *North Carolina*
 Edward C. Tolman, *California*
 Albert T. Poffenberger, *Columbia*
3. *Elected in 1931:*
 Leonard Carmichael, *Brown*
 Elmer Culler, *Illinois*
 Shepherd I. Franz, *California in Los Angeles*; died, 1933
 Walter B. Pillsbury, *Michigan*; Fellow,
 1937-
 John F. Shepard, *Michigan*
4. *Elected in 1932:*
 Harry L. Hollingworth, *Columbia*
 Ernest G. Wever, *Princeton*
 Clark L. Hull, *Yale*
5. *Elected in 1933:*
 John G. Beebe-Center, *Harvard*
 Heinrich Klüver, *Inst. Juv. Res.*
 Herbert Woodrow, *Illinois*
6. *Elected in 1934:*
 Carney Landis, *Columbia*
 John A. McGeoch, *Missouri*
 Carroll C. Pratt, *Harvard*
7. *Elected in 1935:*
 John P. Nafe, *Washington University*
8. *Elected in 1936:*
 Charles W. Bray, *Princeton*
 Clarence H. Graham, *Clark*
 Ernest R. Hilgard, *Stanford*
 Carlyle Jacobsen, *Yale*
 Wolfgang Köhler, *Swarthmore*
 Max Wertheimer, *New School Soc. Res.*
9. *Elected in 1937:*
 Joy P. Guilford, *Nebraska*
 Lyle H. Lanier, *Vanderbilt*
 Donald G. Marquis, *Yale*
 Harold Schlosberg, *Brown*



THE HOWARD CROSBY WARREN MEDAL

election to the Society appears to be implicative of distinction as indicated by other measures of eminence.

There had sometimes been talk of prizes in experimental psychology. Titchener and Urban, with William Brown, had once been a committee of award for a prize in psychophysics, a prize which was awarded in 1920 to Dr. Godfrey H. Thomson.¹⁴ In 1931 Dallenbach wanted the Society of Experimental Psychologists to establish a prize for experimental research, and Warren supported him, but the matter was tabled. Then in 1934, shortly after Warren's death, Dallenbach suggested to Mrs. Warren that she might found a memorial medal in honor of her husband. Mrs. Warren welcomed the idea, and, after the Society had indicated its support by a mail ballot, it adopted at the Yale meeting in 1935 a plan whereby the Howard Crosby Warren Medal could be awarded annually, on decision of a standing Medal Committee of three, "for outstanding work in experimental psychology in the United States or Canada published during the five years preceding the time of the award." (For the obverse and reverse of the Warren Medal, see the accompanying Plate.) While the legal arrangements for the final acceptance of the gift were not completed until 1937, Mrs. Warren made possible the award in 1936. This award was to Wever and Bray of Princeton. The second award in 1937 was to Lashley of Harvard, and the third in 1938 was to Culler of Illinois. (See Table IV for the citations.) The Medal Committee has had the following personnel: 1936—Woodworth, Dallenbach, Carmichael; 1937—Dallenbach, Carmichael, Poffenberger; 1938—Carmichael, Poffenberger, Boring.

TABLE IV

WARREN MEDALISTS

1. In 1936, ERNEST GLEN WEVER and CHARLES WILLIAM BRAY, of Princeton University, for their studies of auditory nerve responses in reptiles and insects, following up their similar work on mammals, the whole research constituting an outstanding contribution to the study of auditory function.
2. In 1937, KARL SPENCER LASHLEY, of Harvard University, for his distinguished work on the physiological basis of learning and on the neural mechanisms involved in vision.
3. In 1938, ELMER CULLER, of the University of Illinois, for his work on the fundamental mechanisms of hearing and on the physiological basis of the conditioned reflex.

The acceptance of Mrs. Warren's endowment of the Warren Medal required that the Society incorporate. Accordingly, in 1936, a committee (Langfeld, Wever and Fernberger) incorporated the Society in the state of New Jersey. At the 1937 meeting Bray, Fernberger and Wever were elected trustees of the Corporation for one year. There is, however, no sign as yet that the Society of Experimental Psychologists, Inc., is likely to be any more formal, any more structured, any more constitution-ridden than the original group of Experimental Psychologists that Titchener brought together.

Harvard University

EDWIN G. BORING

¹⁴Unsigned announcement of a prize of \$100 in psychophysics, this JOURNAL, 25, 1914, 148; cf. also notes by E. B. Titchener, *ibid.*, 26, 1915, 620; 31, 1920, 100.

BY-LAWS OF THE SOCIETY OF EXPERIMENTAL PSYCHOLOGISTS

ARTICLE I: NAME

The organization shall be known as the Society of Experimental Psychologists.

ARTICLE II: OBJECT

The object of the Society shall be to advance psychology by arranging informal conferences on experimental methodology.

ARTICLE III: MEMBERSHIP

Section 1. The Society shall consist of members and fellows.

Section 2. Membership in the Society shall be limited to persons who are engaged in the advancement of experimental psychology.

Section 3. The number of members shall not at any one time exceed fifty (50).

Section 4. A member who has reached the age of sixty-five (65) years shall automatically become a fellow.

Section 5. Fellows shall have all the rights and privileges of members except the privilege of voting for new members.

Section 6. A member who takes up permanent residence outside of the North American continent shall automatically be dropped from the Society.

ARTICLE IV: ELECTION OF MEMBERS

Section 1. Nominations for membership may be made by any member or fellow.

Section 2. After discussion of the candidate's qualifications, the nature and character of his experimental work and such other information as may assist the members in judging his fitness for membership in the Society, a vote by roll call of the members present shall be taken.

Section 3. A candidate shall be declared elected to the Society on the unanimous vote of the members present and voting at any business meeting. A quorum for this purpose shall consist of one-third of the membership.

ARTICLE V: OFFICERS

Section 1. The officers of the Society shall be a Chairman and a Secretary-Treasurer.

Section 2. The term of office shall be one year for the Chairman and three years for the Secretary-Treasurer.

Section 3. In case of a vacancy the most recent chairman shall have direction of a mail vote to fill the vacancy.

Section 4. The Chairman shall ordinarily be chosen from among the members resident at the prospective place of meeting.

ARTICLE VI: MEETINGS

Section 1. The annual meeting of the Society shall ordinarily be held during the spring at a time designated by the Chairman.

Section 2. The Chairman may invite a limited number of investigators in experimental psychology from the institution entertaining the Society to attend the scientific discussions as auditors.

ARTICLE VII: DUES

The annual dues of members shall be one dollar (\$1).

ARTICLE VIII: AMENDMENTS

These By-Laws may be amended at any time by a three-fourths vote of all the members of the Society.

STANDING VOTES AND RULINGS

Nominations by mail. The Secretary shall issue a call for nominations of new members at least ninety days before the annual meeting. At least forty days before the annual meeting he shall send the list of all names suggested to all members of the Society with the request that each member second or offer objection to all names in which he is interested. Only those names which, five days before the annual meeting, shall have received at least one second and not more than two objections shall be presented to the annual meeting for consideration. (Voted unanimously, March 24, 1932.)

Quorum for election. The last sentence of Article IV, Section 3, of the By-Laws, which reads, "A quorum for this purpose shall consist of one-third of the membership," must be interpreted to mean that this ratio of the members must vote positively for any candidate. (Ruling by Chair, sustained by vote of meeting, March 24, 1932.)

Electoral votes not cast by mail. Nominations, seconds and objections, expressed to the Secretary by mail, shall apply only to the question of the presentation of the names to the meeting and are not to be considered in the balloting at the meeting. (Ruling by Chair, sustained by vote of meeting, April 3, 1934.)

Mail votes on matters of policy. It is the sense of the meeting that matters of fundamental policy should be referred by the annual meeting to the entire membership, with indication of discussion during the meeting, and further that mail votes should be authorized only by the vote of an annual meeting or by a mail vote. (Voted, April 4, 1935.)

Award of the Warren Medal. (1) The Warren Medal shall be awarded annually, unless no suitable contribution shall have appeared, for outstanding work in experimental psychology in the United States or Canada, published during the five years preceding the time of the award.

(2) The award shall be determined as follows:

(a) A standing Medal Committee of three shall be appointed by the outgoing Chairman of the Society, whose terms of office shall be staggered so that one member retires every year. The senior member shall serve as the Committee chairman.

(b) The duties of this Committee shall be:

(i) In November of every year the Committee shall request the members of the Society, through the Secretary, to suggest studies that are in their opinion worthy of the award.

(ii) The Committee shall review the suggested studies and select the one that it regards as the most worthy.

(iii) The results of the award, which shall be final, shall be reported to the Chairman of the Society, who shall invite the recipient or recipients of the award to attend the annual meeting of the Society to be presented with the Medal.

(c) Studies written or directed by members of the Medal Committee are not eligible for consideration. (Voted, April 4, 1935.)

Medalists need not be members. It is the sense of the Society that the award of the Warren Medal does not commit the Society to the election of the recipient to membership in the Society. (Voted, April 9, 1936.)