
The history of doctoral training in psychology is reviewed, and a model that could serve as a template for future professional training is discussed.


This research study examines outcomes of doctoral programs representing three different training models: clinical scientist, scientist-practitioner, and practitioner-scholar. Significant differences are found in student and faculty activities.


The authors recommend that the Ph.D. serve only as a research degree and that the Psy.D. become the practice credential degree.


This article outlines a new identity for the professional psychologist and offers good discussions of fragmentation in the discipline/profession, science vs. profession issues, and the relationship between science and practice.


Peterson argues that the complementarity of basic research, applied research, and professional service requires appreciation of their fundamental differences as well as similarities.


The authors, all active in NCSPP, offer an explication of the NCSPP educational model, including an extended discussion of the local clinical scientist perspective on the importance of rigor and practicality in the application of science to the practitioner’s work and focus.


Peterson and Trierweiler offer a lively discussion of the 1998 report on “Scholarship in Psychology” which argues for an expanded and pragmatic vision of psychological research and scholarship.