

“A Time of Significant Challenges and Change:” The Psychonomic Society, 1997-2014

Jennifer L. Bazar and Kelli Vaughn-Johnson

Cummings Center for the History of Psychology

#### Authors Note

Jennifer L. Bazar and Kelli Vaughn-Johnson, Cummings Center for the History of Psychology, The University of Akron.

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Jennifer L. Bazar, Cummings Center for the History of Psychology, The University of Akron, Akron, OH 44325-4302. Contact: [jbazar@uakron.edu](mailto:jbazar@uakron.edu)

## Abstract

Between 1997 and 2014, the Psychonomic Society underwent one of the most significant periods of change since its founding in 1959. The changes related directly to the core operations of the organization, affecting the Society's administrative structure, financial security, publication enterprise, and membership demographics. This article examines the events that transpired during this recent history, drawing extensively from a series of new oral history interviews conducted with members of the Psychonomic Society. It also adds to the series of articles by Donald A. Dewsbury which outline the foundation and earliest years of the Psychonomic Society.<sup>1</sup>

*Keywords:* history; Psychonomic; cognitive psychology; publishing; oral history

---

<sup>1</sup> The authors wish to acknowledge the essential research support provided by Lou Shomette, Executive Director of the Psychonomic Society, and the editing assistance of Cathy Faye, Director of the Cummings Center for the History of Psychology. Accessing this recent history would not have been possible without the generous support of Psychonomes who responded to our email surveys and participated in oral history interviews. We are grateful to Randall W. Engle, Helene Intraub, Roberta L. Klatzky, Judith F. Kroll, D. Stephen (Steve) Lindsay, Colin M. MacLeod, Randi C. Martin, Nora S. Newcombe, James R. Pomerantz, Suparna Rajaram, Henry L. Roediger, III, Duane G. Watson, Jeff M. Zacks, and Rose Zacks.

“A Time of Significant Challenges and Change:”<sup>2</sup> The Psychonomic Society, 1997-2014

In the period between 1997 and 2014, the Psychonomic Society faced a series of challenges and operational decisions that resulted in significant changes to the organization. The changes influenced every level of the Society, including their overall administrative arrangement and operations of the Governing Board, financial portfolio, publication activities, and membership structure. The transformation affected the very definition of who could call themselves a “Psychonome”—an exclusive title since the organization’s founding in 1959 that denotes a recognized level of achievement and contribution to the field<sup>3</sup>—and laid the groundwork for systemic changes that hold the potential to diversify the demographic makeup of individuals contributing to cognitive science at large. Initiated by a series of unanticipated challenges, the changes that took place between 1997 and 2014 fell to a handful of individuals on

---

<sup>2</sup> Title derived from an oral history interview with Judith Kroll. While describing her time on the Governing Board of the Psychonomic Society between 2006 and 2011, Kroll (2022) stated: “It was an honor and a learning experience to participate in the governance of the Society at a time of significant challenges and change.” The qualifier of “change” was frequently used by interviewees in the preparation of this history (e.g., Newcombe, 2022).

<sup>3</sup> In 2012, the membership requirements were defined as follows: “a person must hold the Ph.D. degree or equivalent, have published significant psychological research beyond the doctoral dissertation, and be actively involved in independent scientific research in psychology or allied sciences” (Strategic Planning Committee, 2012). The candidate also had to be nominated by a current Psychonomic Society member. After 2014, existing “Members” became known as “Fellows” and a new “Member” category was created (Psychonomic Society, 2022b).

the Governing Board and organizational sub-committees who found themselves tackling more than they likely anticipated when they first volunteered to stand for election.

The aims of this article are twofold: first, to provide an update to the existing histories of the Psychonomic Society which represent the organization's operations between 1959 and 1997 (Dewsbury, 1996; 1997a; 1997b; Dewsbury & Bolles, 1995; MacLeod, 2021); and second, to add to the historical record through the creation of a collection of oral history<sup>4</sup> interviews conducted by the Cummings Center for the History of Psychology with Psychonomes in governance who had direct involvement in the organization between 1997 and 2014.

### **A Community for the Experimental Study of Cognition**

The Psychonomic Society was established in 1959 largely in response to a general dissatisfaction among experimental psychologists with what was perceived to be an emphasis on practice-oriented psychology within the American Psychological Association (APA) (Dewsbury & Bolles, 1995). It was a period of significant change for experimental psychology, with the shift from the Behaviorism stronghold in the field to the Cognitive Revolution. In their respective analyses of conference titles, Dewsbury and Bolles (1995), Dewsbury (1997a), and Finley (2009) reveal a distinct drop in Behaviorism-focused research in the earliest years of the Society, as distinctly cognitive presentations became more prevalent. Titles with “learning” and “animal,”

---

<sup>4</sup> Due to time constraints, only Psychonomic Society members who served on the Governing Board were invited to participate in the oral histories that inform this paper. The authors recognize that this presents a limitation; we did not consult non-elected Society members, former Society members, or the staff of the Publications Office whose interviews would add an additional perspectives and nuance to this history.

which dominated the first decade of the Society's meetings, were soon overshadowed by a rise in "processing" and "memory" (see esp. Finley, 2009). As Rose Zacks (2022) would later reflect, "...human memory, verbal learning area was transformed into cognitive psychology."

The focus of research presented at the annual meeting has continued to evolve over time in line with the interests of the members and the broader trends within the field (Dewsbury, 1997b). As Roberta Klatzky (2022) reflected:

"I think that's really one of the big challenges, is the organic nature of what it means to study psychology. It's just not fixed and you have to be proactive, but also respectful of [the past] – you don't throw out the baby with the bathwater. You want to honor core energetic fields you want to see emerging; you want to help and foster."

According to Psychonomes, this adaptation to the ebbs and flows of the field has been a strength of the Psychonomic Society over the course of its history (e.g., Klatzky, 2022; MacLeod, 2022; Roediger, 2022). The constant has been the focus on the science of psychology. Duane Watson (2022) referenced this sentiment in describing the culture of the Psychonomic Society: "It's like a bunch of nerds who are really into psychology, like cognitive psychology, which is not common among the population, even among psychologists."

The success in staying the course did not come without its losses. The consolidation of the cognitive shift between the 1970s and 1980s would lead to the emergence of new professional organizations focused on subspecialties of experimental research that overlapped with the interests of the Psychonomic Society, thereby splitting attendance. With some, like the Society for Neuroscience, the overlap came not only in subject matter, but also in the dates of their annual meetings. These developments raised concerns among several generations of Governing Boards, and the Society has experimented with how to reengage or draw new

participants from specific research areas. Declining participation from animal researchers, in particular, has been a recurring topic of concern among the Governing Board throughout the Society's history (see Dewsbury, 1997a; 1997b). Renewed efforts in the early 2000s were undertaken by Ed Wassermann, Tom Zentall, Russell Church, and Bob Lorch to encourage more conversation between animal and human researchers which resulted in brief changes to the programming structure (Psychonomic Society, 2002; 2003; 2005). This period also saw increased concern regarding the fracturing of members engaged in neuroscience. Daniel Schacter, Randall Engle, and David Balota were charged with investigating possible solutions (Psychonomic Society, 2001). The impact of these efforts was short-lived with increasingly specialized organizations continuing to draw members away from the Psychonomic Society (see Engle, 2022; Pomerantz, 2022; Roediger, 2022).

The Psychonomic Society has traditionally had more success in its practice of supporting affiliations with sister organizations and facilitating satellite groups. As Colin MacLeod (2022) described:

“It’s sort of a natural evolution.... I think one thing that the Society has been good about is helping smaller societies glom onto us. We’re trying to help others get started. I would hope that would never pull away the central piece, for sure, but I think it’s been positive.”

This tradition has ultimately contributed to diversification within the Psychonomic Society in terms of international interest, membership, and the array of research represented.

Ruminating on the resilience of the Psychonomic Society, Henry L. Roediger, III (2022) posited: “So what keeps us coming back? It’s a specialized Society.... all the people doing cutting edge work in my field are present at the Society before [their work] is published. So, if you’re one of those going to be published in the future, you’ve got to attend the Society’s annual

meeting.” Roediger’s comments touch not only on the binding communal quality that the sciences represent to the Psychonomic Society, but also on the critical role that publishing has played—and continues to play—for both the members and the Society at-large.

### **Embracing Change: Publish(er) or Perish**

One of the defining events of the first decade of the 2000s was a major shift in the publication activities of the Psychonomic Society, a move that would have radiating effects on both the administrative and financial operations of the organization. The Society had first entered the publishing world unofficially (and not entirely willingly) through the efforts of charter member Clifford T. Morgan. Morgan founded the journal *Psychonomic Science* independently in 1964, later gifting it along with several subsequently founded journals to the Society in 1967. In reviewing the history of the Psychonomic Society’s publication program, Dewsbury (1996) described the establishment as “unusual” due to the fact that, once the journals were gifted from Morgan, each step of the publication process was accomplished in house.

Morgan’s initial journal, *Psychonomic Science*, had initiated the in-house tradition with a literal *in-house* process. Working alongside family members and a small staff, Morgan converted the garage at his home in Goleta, California to accommodate the publication program. All steps in the process were handled from within the garage, from managing submissions and subscriptions to typesetting, printing, and distribution. The operation was relocated several times over the years, ultimately landing in Austin, Texas<sup>5</sup> in 1967, the same year that Morgan gifted

---

<sup>5</sup> The publication operations were split for a time between Texas and California; core oversight and editorial work were based in Texas while the typesetting, proofreading, and

the journals to the Psychonomic Society (Dewsbury, 1996). After some delays in securing tax-exempt status, the Society took control of publications in 1971 (Dewsbury, 1996; Ehrenfreund, 1977).

Although the Psychonomic Society was officially at the helm of the publication program in Austin, the Publications Office operated autonomously, with minimal oversight from the Governing Board. A Publications Committee<sup>6</sup> was established in 1974 to provide a link between the Governing Board and the Publications Office, but day-to-day operations at the Office were managed by paid staff. The program was overseen by Morgan, who took on the title of Director of Publications,<sup>7</sup> and his sister-in-law, Managing Editor Ann Sanford, until the two tragically died within 11 days of each other in 1976. Morgan's life insurance policy named the Psychonomic Society as beneficiary, and the funds were used to hire an Executive Officer for the Publications Office (Dewsbury, 1996).

---

pasteup remained in California. The process was ultimately recombined in Austin in 1970 (Dewsbury, 1996).

<sup>6</sup> The arrangement of the Publications Committee was described by John Wixted when he served as Chair of the Committee: "The PC is comprised of three members of the Governing Board and three people not on the Governing Board. The Chair of the PC must be a member of the Governing Board" (Psychonomic Society, 2005).

<sup>7</sup> The title was initially Editor-in-Chief but was renamed to Director of Publications in 1974 (Dewsbury, 1996).

Over the next three decades, the Publications Office at 1710 Fortview Road<sup>8</sup> in Austin, Texas oversaw a growing collection of journals (see Table 1) while also serving as the administrative backbone of the Psychonomic Society.<sup>9</sup> As Jeff Zacks (2022) later recalled: “...in addition to marketing, copyediting, administering peer review, binding, printing, and mailing the journals, that team also ran the meeting, ran the membership, ran all of the Society functions” (see similarly Lindsay, Ross, & Hunt, 2023<sup>10</sup>; Peterson & Rajaram, 2022). The Publications Office was the de facto “home” of the Psychonomic Society: Its building served as the mailing address for the organization and the staff in Austin were familiar voices, if not faces – they answered the phone when members had questions and staffed the tables at the annual November meeting (Intraub, 2022).

An in-house publications program seems to have allowed space for innovation ahead of more traditional operations. For instance, the Psychonomic Society journals were among the earliest in psychology to be posted online, made freely available to the public one year after publication (Jeff M. Zacks, 2022). This had been a conscious decision of the Publications Committee who pushed for full access to as wide an audience as possible in order to support the

---

<sup>8</sup> The 5,000 square foot building was purchased by the Psychonomic Society to house the Publications Office in 1986 (Lindsay, Hunt, & Ross, 2020).

<sup>9</sup> For a history of one of these journals, *Memory & Cognition*, established in 1973, see MacLeod (2021).

<sup>10</sup> This paper was initially based on a 2020 draft version of Lindsay, Ross, and Hunt’s paper; the final version was completed in 2023 and can be found online at

<https://www.psychonomic.org/history>.

overarching goal of disseminating research. Authors were even encouraged to make their publications available via their personal websites, again with the goal of increasing the potential audience reach (Psychonomic Society, 2001). In 2001, the Publications Committee initiated a project to make available all pre-digital issues of the journals on the Society website, along with raw data files. The project, led by Psychonomic Society member and *Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, & Computers* Editor Jonathan Vaughan, was completed in 2004 (see Psychonomic Society, 2001; 2002; 2004).

### **Dodging Certain Financial Ruin**

Until 2008, the finances of the Publications Office were held separately from the finances of the Psychonomic Society as a whole.<sup>11</sup> This division became a topic of increasing concern beginning in 2000 when the Society's financial holdings began a four-year decline. The decline was attributed to the increasing costs of the annual November meeting and the efforts to move membership and submission content to the website (Psychonomic Society, 2002). In contrast, the financial success of the Publications Office during this time was credited to the administrative

---

<sup>11</sup> The finances of the Publications Offices were overseen by the Director the Publications Office while the Secretary-Treasurer was responsible for the finances of the Psychonomic Society (Lindsay, Hunt, & Ross, 2020). The financial separation between the Publications Office and the Psychonomic Society created some confusion during this time. In 2004, Publications Committee Chair John Wixted secured clarification from the Governing Board that the Board was indeed responsible for the financial operations of the Publications Office (Psychonomic Society, 2004).

management of Rob Sanford<sup>12</sup> at the Office and to Dave Porter of Choice Investments who had served as the financial manager and advisor to the publications program since 1986 (Psychonomic Society, 2001; 2002).

To put a halt to the economic slide, a Finance Committee, chaired by David A. Balota, was appointed to investigate (Psychonomic Society, 2002; 2003). Among the solutions presented by the Committee, the Governing Board voted unanimously to transfer the unused portion of the prepaid journal credits held by the Publications Office to the Psychonomic Society (Psychonomic Society, 2003). This transfer the following year helped temporarily to bring the holdings of the Psychonomic Society into the black (Psychonomic Society, 2004; see also Psychonomic Society, 2005).<sup>13</sup> The arrangement lasted for two years, before a drop in the balance of the Society's account was again recorded in 2006 when the transfers were halted (Psychonomic Society, 2006).<sup>14</sup> A \$20 increase in membership dues to offset the deficit was brought to the membership via the Business Meeting in 2006 and approved for implementation in 2008 (Psychonomic Society, 2006; 2007).

---

<sup>12</sup> Rob Sanford, son of Managing Editor Ann Sanford, held the position of Director of the Publications Office until 2005 (Peterson & Rajaram, 2022). He remained with the Office until its closure (Lindsay, Hunt, & Ross, 2020) and continues with the journals to this day.

<sup>13</sup> In addition to the unused prepaid journal credits, the Psychonomic Society also benefitted financially from a one-time surplus collected following a surcharge on the hotel rooms that had been booked for the 2004 November meeting (Psychonomic Society, 2004).

<sup>14</sup> No explanation is provided in the Governing Board Minutes for 2006 for why the unused credit transfers were discontinued; it is likely their pool was simply depleted.

The financial struggles of the Psychonomic Society opened questions about the investment strategy of the funds held by the Publications Office (Newcombe, 2022; Psychonomic Society, 2002) and the rationale for keeping the Office's finances separate from those of the Society (Psychonomic Society, 2003). In response, the Publications Committee adopted a set of guidelines concerning the organization's investments in 2003. Core tenets included pursuing low risk, minimally volatile investments while avoiding complex or aggressive investments; selecting a diversified portfolio across equities, bonds, and fixed-income instruments; and contracting occasional independent financial audits. The Publication Committee also committed to providing regular, annual performance reports to the Governing Board who retained the power to institute changes (Psychonomic Society, 2003).

The guidelines came only a year after it had been reported that the majority of the publication funds were held in Collateralized Mortgage Obligations (CMOs) (Psychonomic Society, 2002). Responding to concerns from within the Governing Board, an external review was contracted (Newcombe, 2022; Psychonomic Society, 2002). Following a report by financial lawyer William B. Hilgers of Hilgers & Watkins, a decision was made to keep half of the Publications Office investments in CMOs under the management of Dave Porter of Choice Investments who had an established relationship with the Society, while the other half would be moved to index funds and equities (Psychonomic Society, 2003; 2006). A year later, however, the Publications Committee reported to the Governing Board that without the investment reserve which had always been reported as income by the Publications Office, the Office was running an annual deficit of \$50,000. To offset the loss, the Committee moved forward with a temporary solution, raising the library subscription rate for the Society's journals by 11%. A letter writing

campaign was also initiated in hopes of increasing the number of subscribing libraries (Lindsay, Ross, & Hunt, 2023; Psychonomic Society, 2004).

Questions surrounding the investment strategy and continuing financial struggles of the Psychonomic Society led to the reformulation of the Finance Committee in 2004 to oversee the investment portfolio of the publications program (Psychonomic Society, 2004).<sup>15</sup> With the CMOs far outperforming the other investment instruments, the question of risk was again brought to the Governing Board in 2006. Through a unanimous vote, the Board determined to leave the portfolio split between CMOs and equities (Psychonomic Society, 2006, Engle, 2022).

Starting at the end of 2007, Suparna Rajaram established several important protocols in her role as Chair of the Governing Board. These included reformulating the Finance Committee with an expanded scope, establishing an Audit Committee and, working with Mary Peterson and Brian Ross with guidance from lawyer John Reiss, on revisions to the Employees Handbook and the By-laws. Along with Mary Peterson (then Publications Committee Chair), Michael Masson (Finance Committee Chair), Laura Carlson (Psychonomic Society Secretary), and Thomas Zentall (Past Governing Board Chair), Suparna Rajaram also worked with lawyer John Reiss to review and update the Society's insurance policy during this period.

---

<sup>15</sup> The initial Committee consisted of Randall "Randy" Engle (Chair), John Wixted, and Nora Newcombe (Psychonomic Society, 2004). Upon the recommendations of the Finance Committee, membership was shifted in 2006 to be composed of the Chair of the Governing Board, the Chair of the Publications Committee, and another member of the Governing Board. Kay Bock, Suparna Rajaram, and Randy Engle were named to the Committee with this change (Psychonomic Society, 2005).

In June of 2008, the Finance Committee and the Publications Committee jointly arranged a meeting with Porter to address the Board's continued concerns and to weigh the level of risk associated with the CMOs. The presentation failed to reassure the Committee and a new financial advisor, Archer Investment Management, was contracted (Peterson & Rajaram, 2022). After further consultation, a decision was reached to further diversify the Society's financial portfolio. The Society transferred their funds to low-cost index funds, a type of pooled investment which carried low expense ratios and bought into the international market broadly (Pomerantz, 2022).

Although an initial loss was incurred, the timing was fortuitous, narrowly evading the Global Financial Crisis of 2008, an event largely precipitated by the collapse of mortgage-backed securities and the American housing bubble.<sup>16</sup> James "Jim" Pomerantz (2022), member of the Finance Committee at the time, later described the timing as "this close to teetering on the brink of disaster."

Considering how close the organization had come to financial ruin, the Governing Board considered it prudent to conduct an audit of the Publications Office finances in 2008. Audit Committee Chair Helene Intraub (2022) later explained that with the benefit of hindsight concerning the Financial Crisis, "the timing makes sense." The overarching goal of the audit was to confirm whether "there was anything that rose to the level of fiduciary malfeasance" (Intraub,

---

<sup>16</sup> The Governing Board also narrowly escaped another crisis during this time when it was realized that the Psychonomic Society did not carry board insurance. The lack of coverage made Board members personally liable for the organization (Intraub, 2022; Newcombe, 2022; Peterson & Rajaram, 2022).

2022). The report revealed no fraud but uncovered several irregularities: for example, checks were not being mailed to Editors and Associate Editors and there were questions about cash advances (Intraub, 2022; Peterson & Rajaram, 2022). The auditor advised the Governing Board that the publication program was on track to bankrupt the Society (Lindsay, Ross, & Hunt, 2023).

At the June 2008 meeting of the Publications Committee, the stark reality of the financial situation was revealed: The Publications Office had run a \$300,000 deficit that year. The presumed financial strength of the publications program had been seen as financially lucrative but returns from the CMO investments had been covering growing annual deficits (Peterson & Rajaram, 2022). As Henry L. “Roddy” Roediger, III (2022) recalled, “Everybody liked them [the staff of the Publications Office] and thought we were saving money by [printing in house]. I think we were losing huge amounts of money by doing it that way, but none of us really understood that.”

### **Austin, We Have a Problem**

While financial disaster was narrowly evaded, operational problems were ongoing at the Publications Office in Austin throughout the first decade of the 2000s. The more visible concern from the perspective of members and journal subscribers was a growing schedule delay with regard to both publication lags (i.e., the time between when a paper was accepted and when it appeared in publication) and publication delays (i.e., the time between the published date of the issue and the date the issue was shipping) (Peterson & Rajaram, 2022). Although the problem had been a recurring one throughout the history of the publications program (see Dewsbury, 1996), a review of publication delays between 1996 and 2007 showed a worsening problem that peaked in 2005 (Lindsay, Ross, & Hunt, 2023; Psychonomic Society, 2007a).

The Publications Office, Publications Committee, and Governing Board each made various attempts to address the lags and delays. In 2004, the Governing Board approved a \$150,000 renovation to transform the second-floor storage space of the building in Austin into office space so that additional copyeditors and typesetters could be brought in (Psychonomic Society, 2004). New equipment, including a \$45,000 binding machine, was approved on the recommendation of the Publications Office to replace and update deteriorating machinery (Psychonomic Society, 2006; 2007).

In her role as Publications Committee Chair (2006-2007), Suparna Rajaram began regular email correspondence and monthly phone meetings with Cinnamon Nemece, Director of the Publications Office, discussing and recommending flow charts to track delays, solutions, and progress reports, an extent of communication and supervision not done before but now necessitated in an attempt to address the problems. This practice was later continued by Mary Peterson when she stepped into the Chair position (Peterson & Rajaram, 2022). Despite the increases in space and staffing during this period, the demands on the Publications Office were beyond their capacity and the staff continued to struggle to maintain the production schedule. Adding to the impossibility of the situation, the Publications Office reportedly began accepting outside printing contracts without consulting the Governing Board or Publications Committee, which only further added to the delays (Peterson & Rajaram, 2022).

In April 2007, the Publications Committee and Governing Board directed the Publications Office to outsource some of their copyediting and typesetting with a view to reducing the publishing backlog (Peterson & Rajaram, 2022). Although it was announced that same year that the Office had, for the first time since 1996, mailed all 11 journals on time,

publication lags continued to be longer than desired (Lindsay, Ross, & Hunt, 2023; Psychonomic Society, 2007a).

The Publications Committee brought in external experts in academic publishing to evaluate the Publications Office in 2007. The consultants included Lawrence Erlbaum Associates founder and namesake, Lawrence Erlbaum, Association for Psychological Science (APS) Executive Director, Alan G. Kraut, and APS Deputy Director, Sarah Brookhart (Peterson & Rajaram, 2022). The Publications Committee Chair Suparna Rajaram organized a site visit and accompanied consultants Alan Kraut and Sarah Brookhart to the Publications Office in Austin Texas. The consultants' review concluded that the Publications Office was in crisis and was not equipped to keep up with the changing world of publishing. They recommended that a commercial publisher be approached to take over the publishing program (Kraut, Brookhart, & Erlbaum, 2007; Peterson & Rajaram, 2022).

An ad hoc Committee on the Future of Psychonomic Society Publications was formed the same year to investigate the possibility of shifting the in-house operations to a commercial publisher (Lindsay, Ross, & Hunt, 2023; Psychonomic Society, 2007a). Chaired by John Wixted, members of the Committee included Mary Peterson, Stephen "Steve" Lindsay, Steven Yantis, Morton Ann Gernsbacher, and David Balota. They recommended against pursuing a commercial publisher and recommended instead that the Director of the Publications Office be replaced and responsibility for publishing finances be transferred to the Secretary-Treasurer of the Psychonomic Society (Peterson & Rajaram, 2022).

By 2008, efforts to reduce the growing lags and delays combined with dwindling subscriptions<sup>17</sup> and increasing operational costs came to a head. Authors were starting to take their papers to other journals (Peterson & Rajaram, 2022). The Publications Office reported a continuing deficit and let some of their freelance staff go. A widescale hiring freeze was instituted (Psychonomic Society, 2008). In an executive session after the Governing Board Meeting in November 2008, the decision was reached to terminate the Director of Publications position in Austin (Lindsay, Ross, & Hunt, 2023; Peterson & Rajaram, 2022; see Psychonomic Society, 2005; 2009b). Because of her extensive interactions with Nemec and the staff of the Publications Office in her previous Publications Committee role (2005-2008; Chair in 2008), Mary Peterson, Chair of the Governing Board in 2009, took on the responsibility of relaying the news of her termination to Nemec. Before she traveled to Austin early in 2009 to take this difficult step, Peterson had discussions with Barry Silverberg of the Texas Association of Nonprofit organizations (TANO), a nonprofit organization management association, about temporarily taking over the management of the Publications Office and sought advice from Lorene Phillips, a Human Relations professional with TANO (Peterson & Rajaram, 2022). After informing Nemec that she was no longer employed by the Psychonomic Society, Peterson held an all-employee meeting with the Publications Office staff to tell them what had taken place, answer their questions, and to introduce the team from TANO that would oversee the operations of the Publications Office until a new director was identified (Peterson & Rajaram, 2022; Lindsay, 2022).

---

<sup>17</sup> Subscriptions dropped from 8,924 in 1999 to 7,557 in 2006 (Peterson & Rajaram, 2022).

Through their role in the Publications Office, the TANO team brought harsh observations to the attention of the Governing Board: There were no clear lines of supervision in the Publications Office, no performance reviews, and no cross-training. The Publications Office was behind on IRS filings, there were unpaid bills, and a running balance on the Director of Publications' credit card with only the minimum paid each month. Gavin Wilson of TANO worked with John Bellquist, Managing Editor of the Publications Office, to decrease the time between paper acceptance and publication, bringing the lag down from 6.3 months in 2008 to 5.6 months in 2009. However, institutional subscriptions were continuing to decline (Psychonomic Society, 2009b).

A search committee for a new director of the Publications Office was appointed, with C. Randy Gallistel as chair, and members Judy Kroll, Steve Lindsay, Steve Yantis, Alan Kraut (APS), Mary Peterson, Jeff Zacks, and John Bellquist. However, efforts to locate a suitable Director of Publications failed. The idea of hiring a Psychonomic Society Executive Director (based in Austin) who would oversee the Publications Office, its budget, and the electronic presence of Psychonomic Society Publications, and who would work with the convention manager emerged, and this idea was approved by the Governing Board. The Society advertised for the Executive Director position; the members of the search committee for the Director of Publications agreed to serve on the search committee. Donald J. Foss, who was well known to the Society, applied for and was offered the position. Ultimately Foss declined the position, however, due to an inability to meet the requested time commitment in Austin. John Bellquist, Managing Editor of the Publications Office, was named Acting Director in the interim (Peterson & Rajaram, 2022).

Discussions concerning the possibility of shifting to a commercial publisher continued among members of the Governing Board. In May of 2009, Governing Board members Mary Peterson, Suparna Rajaram, and Judith Kroll along with APS staff Sarah Brookhart and Alan Kraut, sought informal consultation from two commercial publishers during the Association for Psychological Science annual meeting. Repeating what evaluators had concluded in 2007, publishers indicated that, given their strengths, the journals should not have been operating at a deficit (Lindsay, Ross, & Hunt, 2023; Peterson & Rajaram, 2022).

Peterson sent a summary of the meeting with publishers to the Governing Board and the Publications Committee. Her memo stated that it was no longer clear to those at that meeting that having an Executive Director for the Society in place in Austin would be what was needed to solve the problems of the Publications Office. Three members of the Executive Director search committee (Yantis, Gallistel, and Peterson) attended the Publications Committee meeting in Austin in June 2009. Yantis summarized the search committee's deliberations and indicated that the search committee would most likely recommend going with a commercial publisher. The Publications Committee members hesitated. During a remote emergency meeting of the Governing Board held via telephone later in the summer, nine of the 12 members approved putting out a Request for Proposals (RFP) from commercial publishers. Don Foss agreed to develop an appropriate RFP and to solicit proposals with the assistance of Alan Kraut and Lawrence Erlbaum (Lindsay, Ross, & Hunt, 2023; Peterson & Rajaram, 2022).

Meanwhile bids from various Association Management Firms were sought to oversee Publications Office operations that neither Bellquist nor TANO were interested in handling. The Rees Group, Inc., an association management firm based in Madison, Wisconsin, was selected in 2010.

### **The Shift: From Austin to Springer**

Don Foss presented his assessment of preliminary proposals that he had received from commercial publishers at a meeting of the Governing Board at the November 2009 Psychonomic Society Meeting. Governing Board Chair Mary Peterson planned to ask the Board to vote on whether to move to a commercial publisher at that meeting. Before the meeting, Foss, Peterson, and Brian Ross (incoming Chair of the Governing Board) listed the issues that should be considered in deciding whether to move to a commercial publisher. Among those issues were pricing of the journals, income to the Society, maintaining editorial control, the publisher's copyright philosophy, and importantly, the future of the Publications Office staff in Austin.

At the meeting of the Governing Board, Foss stated that, although at the beginning it was not clear to him that moving the Psychonomic Society publications to a commercial publisher would be the best decision, as he explored the commercial publishing options it became clear that indeed it was the best option. He then presented information on key aspects of preliminary proposals from five publishing companies. Foss pointed out that his research revealed that the strength of the Society's existing journals gave them bargaining power and that there was low risk of losing editorial control. Most importantly, the financial returns would be high – a significant improvement over the annual losses that were being reported by the Publications Office (Lindsay, Ross, & Hunt, 2023; Peterson & Rajaram, 2022).

Foss spoke for an hour at the meeting. After spirited discussion with thoughtful deliberation regarding the longstanding Psychonomic Society tradition of publishing its own journals and consideration of the welfare of the staff, the Governing Board agreed to take a short break and then to vote “yes” or “no” on the question of whether to partner with a commercial publisher. Consensus of the Board members was sought. The decision did not come easily. Later

interviews with Board members reveal the somber awareness that the closure of the Publications Office meant the loss of jobs. Helene Intraub (2022) recalled the feeling in the room: “there was this big moment of real silence. I mean, I can feel the emotion now. It was really sad.” Jeff Zacks (2022) similarly reflected:

“It was not taken lightly. There was a lot of concern about the group of longstanding employees in Austin.... I remember the Board taking very seriously its fiduciary responsibility to the membership and to the larger community, but also taking very seriously its human responsibility to the people who had worked hard on behalf of the Society as employees over those years.”

He later added that, “The nature of scientific publishing had changed dramatically. And my impression was the little engine that could in Austin had become isolated from the larger world of publishing...” (Zacks, J., 2022). Steve Lindsay, who was serving as Chair of the Publications Committee, remembered being moved to tears by the weight of the decision: “I left the Board meeting and went to the bathroom and cried for a bit and came back and voted along with the majority to move forward toward making a deal with a big publisher” (quoted in Lindsay, Ross, & Hunt, 2023, p. 11). In the end, the vote to pursue a commercial publisher was unanimous.

An ad hoc Transition Committee was appointed to take on the responsibility of selecting a publisher. Reed Hunt chaired the Committee which included members Don Foss, Steve Lindsay, Brian Ross, and Alan Kraut (Lindsay, Ross, & Hunt, 2023). The RFP that had been prepared by Foss prior to the November 2009 meeting was published later that month. Proposals were received from five publishers; three were invited to present to the Committee in February of 2010. As later reported by Transition Committee members, a number of factors were considered in the decision:

“The financial offer ranked high, but also considered were that editorial decisions and control remain with the Society, benefits for Society members, marketing and technology support provided by the company to increase readership, and support for the staff of the Publications Office” (Lindsay, Ross, & Hunt, 2023).

Ultimately, a 10-year agreement was reached with Springer (Lindsay, Ross, & Hunt, 2023).

In preparation to close the Publications Office, the Psychonomic Society contracted a human resources firm in Austin that could help the organization to navigate Texas law and structure severance packages for the staff. Helene Intraub (2022) served on the Human Resources Committee that made recommendations about the resulting severance package, which included training, help finding employment, and offers of transfer to Springer. The responsibility of relaying news of the closure fell to Transition Committee members Brian Ross, the next Chair of the Governing Board, and Steve Lindsay, Chair of the Publications Committee. Ross and Lindsay made the announcement in person to the staff (Lindsay, 2022; Lindsay, Ross, & Hunt, 2023). Notice ranged from two to six months, with some employees being offered contract copyediting work from Springer. One employee, Rob Sanford, whose mother, Ann Sanford, had previously managed the publications program alongside Clifford Morgan, was hired by Springer (Lindsay, Ross, & Hunt, 2023) and continues his work on Psychonomic Society journals.

The new relationship with Springer required a period of adjustment. Colin MacLeod (2022), who was serving as Chair of the Publications Committee at the time, recalled some of the wrinkles that needed to be smoothed out as the transition was made:

“Initially there were some real concerns. I mean, they did things their way and we wanted them done our way. Just a tiny thing I remember was getting them to publish all of the titles in lowercase except for the first letter. They just published some all in uppercase,

some in lowercase.... So, dealing with them on that was just trying to get Springer used to how we do things, to fight back when they were saying ‘This is how we’re going to do it.’ We’d say, ‘No, that’s not how we’re going to do it.’ And they were responsive.”

To add another layer to the challenge, the Publications Committee was also tasked with hiring six new journal editors within a five year period (MacLeod, 2022).

### **Entering A New World**

In the aftermath of committing to transition to a commercial publisher, the Psychonomic Society was faced with a series of administrative tasks that would again challenge members of the Governing Board. First on the list was the decision regarding what to do with the Publications Office building in Austin and all the specialized equipment contained therein:

“...how do you sell a six-ton printing press, right? What's the market for that? How do you close out and sell the building that was built for a nonprofit.... You can imagine this is not expertise that any of us who trained as experimental psychologists had ready to hand” (Zacks, J., 2022).

Reed Hunt took the lead in arranging the sale of the building and equipment. The building sold in 2011; the equipment was sold off in pieces to private buyers, with some items donated to the University of Texas (Lindsay, Ross, & Hunt, 2023).

The Springer contract was limited to publishing, which represents only half of the work overseen by the Publications Office in Austin. The next task was therefore to find a way to manage the administrative operations of the Society. Mary Peterson, Laura Carlson, and Rob Nosofsky took the lead in investigating the options (Lindsay, Ross, & Hunt, 2023). After it was made clear that both John Bellquist, who had been serving as Acting Director of the Publications Office, and TANO lacked interest in the role, a decision was made to hire The Rees Group, Inc.,

an association management company specializing in non-profits (Peterson & Rajaram, 2022; Pomerantz, 2022). The arrangement also brought with it training for Governing Board members: “When we transitioned to working with Susan [Rees] and her team, she was able to give us proper Board training and help normalize kind of the ways that the Board functioned relative to other societies” (Zacks, J., 2022).

With renewed financial security following the signing of a 10-year contract with Springer in June 2010 that provided profit guarantees and new revenue from article downloads, the Psychonomic Society entered a period of planning for the future. A Strategic Planning Committee, chaired by Helene Intraub, was formed to spearhead the vision for the next generation of Psychonomes. Informed by interviews and surveys from members and non-members alike gathered by Geoffrey Knox & Associates, the Committee prioritized (1) growing the overall membership of the Society by re-defining the categories of membership; (2) broadening the impact of members’ research contributions through a strengthening of the publishing program; (3) expanding the international reach of the Society by introducing an international meeting, a workshop series of cutting edge research, and training opportunities for students; (4) increasing the visibility of the Society; and (5) strengthening the governance structure of the organization (Psychonomic Society, 2012).

The Strategic Plan guided the Psychonomic Society into a series of new bylaw changes and a redefinition of their membership categories. It also directed the Society toward the creation of a series of new awards, including a jointly hosted fund with APS that recognizes long-time Psychonome, William K. Estes, and his wife, Katherine W. Estes, and the Clifford T. Morgan Best Article Award, honoring the founding Editor of the Society’s publishing program (Intraub, 2022; Psychonomic Society, 2013). The Psychonomic Society likewise launched an international

conference and a new workshop series, Leading Edge, which had three bridging goals: (1) to highlight new topics that would create bridges between current Psychonomic Society members and researchers from other societies; (2) to build connections between senior and early career researchers; and (3) to form more links between the conferences and workshops hosted by the Psychonomic Society and the Society journals through the publication of special editions (Intraub, 2022).

### **Publication Debrief**

The demands placed on the Governing Board and sub-committee members during this period were a stark contrast to the governance model of the previous 40 years. Henry L. Roediger, III (2022) described the atmosphere of the Governing Board of the late-1980s as productive but informal and relaxed<sup>18</sup>; Rose Zacks (2022), who served in the late 1990s, saw the work as relatively minimal with the annual Board meetings serving as an opportunity to enjoy a good dinner with colleagues. Her son, and future Board member, Jeff Zacks (2022) entered a very different governance experience. In describing his first year on the Board in 2008, he: “showed up and it was as if a bomb had just gone off. We were in this crisis such that the

---

<sup>18</sup> During Roediger’s tenure on the Governing Board between 1986 and 1991, the Publications Committee terminated the *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society* and launched a new journal, *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*. While the Committee made clear to the membership that the new journal held a new mission, they secured continued library subscriptions by describing the change as “mostly a name change” to librarians (H. L. Roediger, III, personal communication, November 26, 2023).

publishing operation had gone from being a decades-long moneymaker for the Society to being a substantial financial drain with no prospects for turning the ship.”

The responsibility undertaken by members of the Governing Board and sub-committees in the early decades of the 2000s was enormous. Members volunteered substantial amounts of their time over and above the usual commitment requested of governance involvement in the Psychonomic Society and stepped outside of their expertise to meet the task that was set before them (see Peterson & Rajaram, 2022). Jeff Zacks (2022) would later recall the pressure and expectations being placed on Board members to make informed decisions:

“I have this vivid memory of being at a small workshop in London... and walking through one of the big parks listening to a podcast about [Collateralized Mortgage Obligations], trying to quickly study up on what were these investments that the Society had all this money in...”

Helene Intraub (2022) would similarly reflect: “We were all wearing hats we didn’t even have in the closet.”

Several individuals stood out for the roles they took on as the organization made the decision to transition their in-house publishing program to a commercial publisher. Suparna Rajaram and Mary Peterson in their roles as successive Chairs and Past Chairs of the Publications Committee and the Governing Board first took valiant measures to get the Publications Office back on track. When that proved impossible, they navigated the Society through the events that culminated in the decision to move to a commercial publisher. They also had frequent discussions through 2009 on the planning and organizing of many matters for the Psychonomic Society including finances, audit, insurance, organizational structures, as well as updating the website and general programming. Peterson & Rajaram (2022) wrote that they “...

had often agreed that they were working two full time jobs while they were chairs of the Publications Committee and the Governing Board [2006-2009] – their professorial jobs and their volunteer “jobs” on the Governing Board and the Publications Committee – both of which were demanding and challenging. The move away from publishing our own journals to a commercial publisher was a seismic change for the Psychonomic Society.” Jeff Zacks (2022) noted the work of Steve Lindsay: “Steve, in particular, I want to call out for being incredibly thoughtful and committed and conscientious and articulate about identifying and articulating and advocating on behalf of what was our responsibility to the staff in Austin.” In speaking of Steve Lindsay and Brian Ross, Helene Intraub (2022) added: “I don’t know if the Society totally knows the service that they did because it was a very hard thing.” James Pomerantz (2022) would later observe:

“Anybody can manage an organization during good times. It’s only certain people who have the stamina to do what’s needed.... And they [Suparna Rajaram, Mary Peterson, and Brian Ross] did it. And they’re the ones who are responsible, not only for us getting out of a bad situation financially and organizationally, but getting in a really good, organized structure by virtue of getting a ten-year publishing contract that was extremely lucrative.”

For their leadership roles in steering the Psychonomic Society through the final years of difficulties with the in-house publishing program, the closure of the Publications Office, and the agreement with Springer, Mary Peterson, Suparna Rajaram, and Brian Ross were recognized with the inaugural Clifford T. Morgan Distinguished Leadership Award in 2019 (Psychonomic Society, 2019).

### **Culture Change**

Throughout this period of financial and operational crisis, there was also a growing call for the Psychonomic Society—and cognitive psychology broadly—to recognize and address the

lack of diversity among its members. A shift in the makeup of the membership would be initiated during the first decade of the 2000s, but it was driven by individual members rather than the Society's governance. Like many other organizations within psychology, the Psychonomic Society historically had included few women psychologists and even fewer psychologists of color. As Henry L. "Roddy" Roediger, III (2022) noted in his discussion of the early days of the Society: "It was almost all male. I mean, if you count the women at the meeting on the fingers, a few hands, maybe one hand." Prior to the mid-1980s, women were few among the membership and nearly nonexistent in leadership roles until Tracy Kendler was elected to the Governing Board in 1977; Janet Spence followed the next year (see Klatzky, 2022). Jean Mandler would follow in 1982 as Kendler rotated off, Mandler eventually becoming the first woman Chair of the Governing Board in Psychonomic Society history in 1986. Board membership under her leadership included only two women, Anne Treisman and Mary Potter. It was not until 1990 that the makeup of the Governing Board had equal representation of gender, composed of six women and six men. It would take four more years before two women chairs served in succession, with Marcia K. Johnson and Lynn Hasher chairing in 1994 and 1995. It would take another five years to repeat this occurrence, with Rose Zacks and Morton Ann Gernsbacher chairing in 2000 and 2001. Thus far, there has been no trifecta (Psychonomic Society, 2022a).

To date, 17 of the 65 Chairs of the Governing Board of the Psychonomic Society have been women. In 2005, the Psychonomic Society's bylaws were fully revised to eliminate sexist language (Psychonomic Society, 2005). This change resulted from a push by Board member Barbara "Bobbie" Spellman in 2004 to replace: "all instances of "he," "him," "man/chairman" to gender-neutral language (Psychonomic Society, 2004). It would take an additional 16 years for

race and racism to be formally addressed by the Psychonomic Society with the creation of a Racial Justice Task Force in 2020 (Watson, 2022).

### **Women in Cognitive Science**

As women began to secure more leadership positions within the Psychonomic Society, they continued to encounter discrimination elsewhere in academia. Randi Martin, who acted as Secretary-Treasurer and a member of the Governing Board of the Society, faced gender bias in the tenure system of her university. Psychonomic Society member Judith Kroll had a similar experience, facing gendered promotion and retention efforts (Martin, 2022). Suparna Rajaram, then an early career cognitive psychologist, was faring better in her university, but more generally, implicit discrimination and benevolent sexism had begun to weigh on her (Martin, 2022; Rajaram, 2022). Martin had previously served on Rajaram's dissertation committee and the two separate conversations on these topics with Rajaram and Kroll inspired Martin to bring the trio together. The result was the founding of Women in Cognitive Science (WiCS). Randi Martin, who was serving on the Psychonomic Society's Governing Board during these talks, recalled the climate at the time that: "Psychonomics should stay away from anything political" (Martin, 2022). Martin, Rajaram, and Kroll, however, were not planning a revolution; they were simply seeking a place for women in the field to be able to discuss shared concerns and experiences.

The trio went to work, planning and executing a meeting that took place during the 2001 Psychonomic Society meeting with little more than "donations from senior women in the field" and space provided by the Society (Martin, 2022). Virginia Valian, a specialist in gender-based differences in achievement in professional pursuits, presented the meeting's keynote on her then popular 1999 book *Why So Slow? The Advancement of Women*. Martin later reported to the

Governing Board that the initial meeting of WiCS was attended by 100 people (Psychonomic Society, 2001).

The successful first meeting led WiCS founders to apply for more funding to continue their activities. The Governing Board supported their growth and the Psychonomic Society agreed to be listed as a supporting organization on the group's funding application to the National Science Foundation (Psychonomic Society, 2002). Their application was successful and this funding, combined with contributions from the Society and the hard work of the founding trio, was critical in the early years of WiCS' development. Suparna Rajaram (2022) reflected:

“From the very beginning, in the actual attendance itself, we've had about a hundred plus or minus attendees, and that is a substantial number for creating both energy and awareness. And we were also quite heartened because everything including site dynamics competes with everything else; it's a very busy program [the Psychonomic Society Meeting] and it has multiple parallel sessions. So, anyone who was coming to the Women in Cognitive Science Session was making a sacrifice because they were missing out on something that was in parallel related to the science itself. And you're there to do science. So, you know, it's a huge sacrifice and a huge commitment to recognizing that this is needed and that it needs to be there, because this is as important for either my career or my trainee's career or my colleague's career as the science itself. That was enormous. So, we had an immediate response, and we also had the ability to start giving out some awards because of the grant.”

In 2002 and 2003, WiCS was officially recognized as an organizational affiliate of the Psychonomic Society, in part due to the efforts of Governing Board member David Balota. As Suparna Rajaram (2022) recalled:

“we were able to get that affiliation status approved by the Governing Board. That was actually not a small step in my mind. That was a remarkable step that happened at the very outset...this may seem like a small thing, but it's actually very huge, as you can imagine.”

The group went on to facilitate training for women cognitive psychologists and securing the inclusion of women's names on the ballots for awards, keynotes, and leadership positions. The National Science Foundation first funded the collective through the Advanced Grant program and later through the Perception, Action, and Cognition program (Kroll, 2022). As an affiliate of the Psychonomic Society, WiCS was free to branch out to meetings within other associations as well and did so at conferences like the American and European Cognitive Societies, the American and Canadian Psychological Associations, and the Association for Psychological Science.

Today, WiCS has been passed down to a new generation of leaders and it supports sister organizations operating under member-driven individual leadership in other countries. To date, it has grown to over 1,000 members and continues to maintain free membership for those willing to join and commit to the work. WiCS continues to influence the growth of cognitive psychology and cognitive science some 20 years on. This continued success reflects the original goals of WiCS founders:

“New vision, new energy, new leaders are to me, a major, major success of this group. And the fact that federal agencies, National Science Foundation has seen it as a group that deserves the level of support that they have so consistently offered to us is to me a sign of major success and the fact that many other societies find it so useful to have this voice represented there” (Rajaram, 2022).

It is also worth noting that, although cognitive science has historically been a male-dominated field, today more than 50% of doctorates in the fields of cognitive psychology, psycholinguistics, neuropsychology, and experimental psychology are awarded to women (Klatzky, Holt, & Behrmann, 2015).

### **Diversity Beyond Gender**

As the work of WiCS and the greater membership continued to advance gender equity and women's contributions in cognitive science, the Psychonomic Society continued to grapple with lack of diversity in its membership and leadership. At the 2006 Psychonomic Society Governing Board meeting, Chair Kay Bock raised a business item regarding the results of that year's Board nominations: The entire nomination slate was comprised of men. The "fact elicited a strong negative reaction from several members of the Society and of the Governing Board" (Psychonomic Society, 2006). Bob Lorch reviewed the rules and procedures for the group noting that a minimal number of votes were required for nomination, meaning everyone had a chance to be nominated. In addition, there was no formal procedure for a tie between nominees, so they were chosen at random by Lorch himself. Mary Peterson requested a procedure be implemented that accounted for gender representation when none was found on the slate. Nora Newcombe pointed out that there were other aspects of diversity that should be considered in the process, emphasizing a diversity of disciplines. According to the meeting notes:

"There was quite a bit of discussion about how to define and address diversity issues in the nominating process. Some members favored legislating mechanisms to promote diversity; others were against instituting such mechanisms in the nominating process. It was finally decided to specify a tie-breaking process that was neither random nor specifically biased. Namely, it was decided that tie-breaking should be placed in the

hands of the Chair of the Governing Board in consultation with the members of the Governing Board” (Psychonomic Society, 2006).

The Board members also discussed the potential for more diversity in nominees and keynote speakers, addressing diversity in terms of gender, ethnicity, and academic subdiscipline. Like many other organizations, the Psychonomic Society had very little demographic information on its members, a situation that was improved through changes to its membership forms in 2006 but, as is the case for other professional societies, continues to pose challenges (Psychonomic Society, 2006).

People of Color have also been underrepresented within the Psychonomic Society. Since 1960, there have only been two Chairs of color on the Governing Board: Suparna Rajaram in 2008 and Duane Watson in 2021. During the founding year of WiCS, the Governing Board also supported a meeting of the African American Caucus, but there is little mention of their activities in Psychonomic Society governance records (Psychonomic Society, 2001). Later, the Diversity and Inclusion Committee, formed in 2016, facilitated conversations around representation and racism; these conversations continue in the present, resulting in the formation of the Task Force on Racial Justice and the 2020 Statement on Racism (Watson, 2022). The establishment of the SPARK Society is also worth noting. Established in 2017 by Duane Watson, a future Chair of the Governing Board, along with Jean E. Fox Tree, Alejandro Lleras, and Ayanna Thomas, SPARK has focused its mission on equity, inclusion, and representation of Black/African Americans, Latinx/a/o, and Native Americans within the family of the cognitive sciences (see Watson, 2022). The Psychonomic Society has provided early and continued support for this growing organization.

### **Conclusion**

In 2014, the Psychonomic Society entered a new phase of its operations with the hiring of an Executive Director, Lou Shomette (Psychonomic Society, 2013; 2014). The timing represents the end of an era of significant challenges that jeopardized the future of the organization. Faced with near financial catastrophe, the closure of their in-house publishing program, changing demographics, and a diversification of specializations (see Finley, 2009), the Psychonomic Society of the early twenty-first century has both shifted from and remained true to its origins in 1959. James Pomerantz (2022) explained that: “It’s much more diverse now. It’s bigger now. It meets in more interesting places. It’s much more international. It’s more diverse in every dimension that you can think of, including topical areas.” And yet the Psychonomic Society remains an organization in transition, with an identity that continues to grow and develop. Judith Kroll summed up this evolutionary period in the Society’s history perfectly: “I think the greatest success was in finding a way to update and reinvent the Society without losing its identity” (Kroll, Personal Correspondence, 2022).

Table 1. Historic and Current Publications of the Psychonomic Society

<b>Current Title</b>	<b>Original Title</b>	<b>Established</b>
<i>Psychonomic Science</i>	n/a	1964; last issue 1972
<i>Psychonomic Monograph Supplements</i>	n/a	1965; last issue 1972
<i>Attention, Perception, &amp; Psychophysics (AP&amp;P)</i>	<i>Perception &amp; Psychophysics</i>	1966; current title 2009
<i>Behavior Research Methods (BRM)</i>	<i>Behavior Research Methods, Instrumentation; later, Behavior Research Methods, Instruments, &amp; Computers</i>	1968; current title 2005
<i>Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society</i>	n/a	1973; last issue 1993
<i>Cognitive, Affective, &amp; Behavioral Neuroscience (CABN)</i>	<i>Physiological Psychology; later Psychobiology</i>	1973; current title 2001
<i>Learning &amp; Behavior (L&amp;B)</i>	<i>Animal Learning &amp; Behavior</i>	1973; current title 2003
<i>Memory &amp; Cognition (M&amp;C)</i>	n/a	1973
<i>Psychobiology</i>	n/a	1973; last issue 2000
<i>Psychonomic Bulletin &amp; Review (PB&amp;R)</i>	n/a	1994
<i>Cognitive Research: Principles &amp; Implications (CR:PI)</i>	n/a	2016

### References

- Dewsbury, D. A. (1996). History of the Psychonomic Society II: The journal publishing program. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 3(3), 322-338. doi: [10.3758/BF03210756](https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03210756)
- Dewsbury, D. A. (1997a). History of the Psychonomic Society III: The meetings of the Psychonomic Society. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 4(3), 350-358. doi: [10.3758/BF03210792](https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03210792)
- Dewsbury, D. A. (1997b). History of the Psychonomic Society IV: The development of the Psychonomic Society. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 4(4), 492-500. doi: [10.3758/BF03214338](https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03214338)
- Dewsbury, D. A., & Bolles, R. C. (1995). The founding of the Psychonomic Society. *Psychonomic Bulletin & Review*, 2(2), 216-233. doi: [10.3758/BF03210961](https://doi.org/10.3758/BF03210961)
- Ehrenfreund, D. (1977). *Chronology and history of the Psychonomic Society*. Psychonomic Society Records [Box 527], Archives of the History of American Psychology, Akron, OH.
- Engle, R. W. (2022, May 16). Oral history interview by J. L. Bazar [Zoom recording]. Psychonomic Society Records, Archives of the History of American Psychology, Akron, OH.
- Finley, J. R. (2009). *An analysis of session titles from 50 years of annual meetings of the Psychonomic Society: Characterizing the paradigm shift from Behaviorism to cognitive psychology* [Unpublished manuscript]. Department of Psychology, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.

Intraub, H. (2022, June 20). Oral history interview by J. L. Bazar [Zoom recording].

Psychonomic Society Records, Archives of the History of American Psychology, Akron, OH.

Klatzky, R. L. (2022, May 23). Oral history interview by J. L. Bazar [Zoom recording].

Psychonomic Society Records, Archives of the History of American Psychology, Akron, OH.

Klatzky, R. L., Holt, L., & Behrmann, M. (2015). The representation of women in cognition.

*Cognition*, *141*, 170–171. [doi: 10.1016/j.cognition.2015.03.010](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2015.03.010)

Kraut, A. G., Brookhart, S., & Erlbaum, L. (2007, June 26). A review of Psychonomic Society publications [Confidential memorandum]. Digital copy provided by the Psychonomic Society, Chicago, IL.

Lindsay, D. S. (2022, July 26). Oral history interview by J. L. Bazar [Zoom recording].

Psychonomic Society Records, Archives of the History of American Psychology, Akron, OH.

Lindsay, D. S., Ross, B. H., & Hunt, R. R. (2023). Psychonomic Society publications: A participants' account of the transition from self-publishing to partnering with Springer. Unpublished manuscript.

<https://www.psychonomic.org/page/history>

Martin, R. C. (2022, July 21). Oral history interview by J. L. Bazar [Zoom recording].

Psychonomic Society Records, Archives of the History of American Psychology, Akron, OH.

MacLeod, C. M. (2021). Memory & Cognition: The first 40 years. *Memory & Cognition*, *49*(2), 207-217. [doi: 10.7558/s13421-020-01104-7](https://doi.org/10.7558/s13421-020-01104-7)

MacLeod, C. M. (2022, July 26). Oral history interview by J. L. Bazar [Zoom recording].

Psychonomic Society Records, Archives of the History of American Psychology, Akron, OH.

Newcombe, N. S. (2022, May 16). Oral history interview by J. L. Bazar [Written notes].

Psychonomic Society Records, Archives of the History of American Psychology, Akron, OH.

Pomerantz, J. R. (2022, June 16). Oral history interview by J. L. Bazar [Zoom recording].

Psychonomic Society Records, Archives of the History of American Psychology, Akron, OH.

Psychonomic Society. (2001, November 16). *Minutes of the Governing Board Meeting*. Digital copy provided by the Psychonomic Society, Chicago, IL.

Psychonomic Society. (2002, November 22). *Minutes of the Governing Board Meeting*. Digital copy provided by the Psychonomic Society, Chicago, IL.

Psychonomic Society. (2003, November 7). *Minutes of the Governing Board Meeting*. Digital copy provided by the Psychonomic Society, Chicago, IL.

Psychonomic Society. (2004, November 19). *Minutes of the Governing Board Meeting*. Digital copy provided by the Psychonomic Society, Chicago, IL.

Psychonomic Society. (2005, November 11). *Minutes of the Governing Board*. Digital copy provided by the Psychonomic Society, Chicago, IL.

Psychonomic Society. (2006, November 17). *Minutes of the Meeting of the Governing Board*. Digital copy provided by the Psychonomic Society, Chicago, IL.

Psychonomic Society. (2007a, November 16). *Minutes of the Meeting of the Governing Board*. Digital copy provided by the Psychonomic Society, Chicago, IL.

Psychonomic Society. (2007b, November 17). *Minutes of the Business Meeting [Amended]*.

Digital copy provided by the Psychonomic Society, Chicago, IL.

Psychonomic Society. (2008, November 14). *Minutes of the Meeting of the Governing Board*.

Digital copy provided by the Psychonomic Society, Chicago, IL.

Psychonomic Society (2009, June 16). *Minutes of the Virtual Meeting of the Governing Board of the Psychonomic Society, held by email with open discussion*. Digital copy provided by the Psychonomic Society, Chicago, IL.

Psychonomic Society. (2012, June 1). *The Psychonomic Society Strategic Planning Committee Meeting [PowerPoint presentation]*. Digital copy provided by the Psychonomic Society, Chicago, IL.

Psychonomic Society. (2013, July 15). *Minutes of the meeting of the Governing Board*. Digital copy provided by the Psychonomic Society, Chicago, IL.

Psychonomic Society. (2014, April 28). *2014 PS spring GB teleconference*. Digital copy provided by the Psychonomic Society, Chicago, IL.

Psychonomic Society. (2009b, November 20). *Agenda for the Meeting of the Governing Board*. Digital copy provided by the Psychonomic Society, Chicago, IL.

Psychonomic Society. (2019, November). *Abstracts of the Psychonomic Society, 24*.

[https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.psychonomic.org/resource/resmgr/annual\\_meeting/2019\\_meeting/ps2019annualmeeting-FINAL.pdf](https://cdn.ymaws.com/www.psychonomic.org/resource/resmgr/annual_meeting/2019_meeting/ps2019annualmeeting-FINAL.pdf)

Psychonomic Society. (2022a). *GB history: Past Governing Boards*. Psychonomic Society website. <https://www.psychonomic.org/page/gbhistory>

Psychonomic Society. (2022b). *Membership*. Psychonomic Society website. <https://www.psychonomic.org/page/member>

Rajaram, S. (2022, August 24). Oral history interview by J. L. Bazar [Zoom recording].

Psychonomic Society Records, Archives of the History of American Psychology, Akron,  
OH.

Peterson, M. A. & Rajaram, S. (2022). Psychonomic Society History Notes (2004-2010).

Unpublished document.

Roediger, H. L., (2022, June 30). Oral history interview by J. L. Bazar [Zoom recording].

Psychonomic Society Records, Archives of the History of American Psychology, Akron,  
OH.

Watson, D. G. (2022, July 7). Oral history interview by J. L. Bazar [Zoom recording].

Psychonomic Society Records, Archives of the History of American Psychology, Akron,  
OH.

Zacks, J. M. (2022, July 28). Oral history interview by J. L. Bazar [Zoom recording].

Psychonomic Society Records, Archives of the History of American Psychology, Akron,  
OH.

Zacks, R. T. (2022, July 13). Oral history interview by J. L. Bazar [Zoom recording].

Psychonomic Society Records, Archives of the History of American Psychology, Akron,  
OH.