

FLORENCE SNODGRASS

M: This is part of the Oral History of Psychology in Canada. I am talking with Dr. Florence Snodgrass, Professor and Head of the Department of Psychology at the University of New Brunswick, in Fredericton, on May 26th, 1969. Dr. Snodgrass retired just two years ago and is learning what it is like to be in retirement.

Florence, let's start at the beginning. Where were you born?

S: I was born in Queen's County, New Brunswick, about fifty miles from Fredericton in the direction of Saint John. Really at *Young's* Cove, Grand Lake.

M: Did you grow up and go to school there?

S: Yes. *There* ~~it~~ *only* was ~~nothing~~ but a one-room school house *there* so I attended the Gage Town so-called Grammar School where I did the equivalent of a high school course. Grammar schools were situated in each shire town, ~~so to speak~~, of the Province then.

M: I drove through Gage Town yesterday. We came up the river road and it is a beautiful drive up the Saint John River. Can you tell me why so much of the ground in the river seems to have been inundated? Is this a spring phenomenon? Does this happen every spring?

S: I am sure it is the result of these two dams that have been built--the *Beechwood* ~~Beechford~~ and the *Mactaquac*. This has flooded the area, although every spring there was a ~~so-called~~ spring freshet when the water used to rise. Sometimes it overflowed roads. Not the road that you crossed but the road from here to Sussex and then on to Moncton.

M: What was it like to grow up beside a river? What do you remember about the river? Is it important in your recollections?

S: The Lake was, for swimming and boating, and particularly ice skating, I think more than anything else.

M: You went through the equivalent of secondary school in the Gage Town Grammar School and what happened then?

S: Then I wrote the matriculation, as we called it then, and I came to the University of New Brunswick in 1920. I must say that my coming was almost a fluke, because my older brother had gone to the University and at that time it was important for the boys in the family to be educated. My family were in very ordinary circumstances and I was destined to go to the teacher's college.

M: It was either that or nursing, I guess, eh?

S: I wanted to teach, so it was the teacher's college, and that was a one-year course in Fredericton. But that very year Lord Beaverbrook initiated his wonderful Beaverbrook scholarships. There were five awarded then and I was lucky enough to get a scholarship. That meant that I had solved my education^{problem} and I came to UNB.

M: So you were one of the first Beaverbrook scholars.

S: Yes, I was one of the first group. I was always grateful that he gave ~~it~~^{them} that the scholarships were open either to boys or girls, or men or women. Later on there was a period when he restricted ~~it~~^{them} to boys only. Then later he relented. I was lucky.

M: But also you must have been a good scholar.

S: I guess I passed examinations. That's all.

M: Did you have any brothers or sisters?

S: I had two brothers who were older than I.

M: Had both of the boys gone to UNB?

S: No, just one. The older boy was an example of what we would call now a school dropout. The local school held nothing for him and he became a very successful person. I am sure that his success was one of the greatest in the family and of many people I know. He became a self-educated engineer and went into construction and went to the State of Maine. Two or three years ago he died and the Association of Contractors and Engineers wanted to honour him. Just recently a bridge in Maine which he had been responsible for building, was named after him. That I think was one of the nicest tributes. In the citation they said that they wanted to honour Snodgrass because he was a giant among men. He wasn't a giant physically.

M: In terms of what he had accomplished. And your other brother who did go to UNB?

S: He became a lawyer.

M: I understand, from somebody I met, that your law school is pretty strong.

S: He attended Dalhousie. I am sure this law school was in operation but it was in Saint John at that time.

M: What did your father do?

S: My father kept a country general store. I used to work in it sometimes, on Saturdays and nights. So I learned to make change! I can

always make change!

M: The old-time general store with its variety of spices and wonderful things, is a childhood memory for many of us.

S: It always interest me to go into one of these synthetic ones that you find.

M: They have lost the touch. Have you any idea at all when you first encountered the word "psychology" that it had any sense or meaning to you?

S: It was at UNB when Dr. Kierstead^{ed} who was the professor of ~~psychology~~^{philosophy} then, introduced a course which he called "the psychology of education." It was only a half course, but I became very interested in it. It was in either the third or year.

M: What did you take in your first year?

S: At that time the curriculum was laid down. I don't remember exactly but I am sure it included Latin, and French and English and mathematics and chemistry.

M: Philosophy?

S: Not the first year.

M: History?

S: I think history must have been the sixth subject. It was essentially a general arts course. A four-year course.

M: Do you remember any of your teachers in your first year?

S: I remember the professor of mathematics who was Dr. Jones. He was also the ~~so-called~~ Chancellor of the University. Now he would be called President.

M: Was that Bob Jones' father, by any chance?

S: No, his name was ^{Cecil} Cecil Charles Jones. He had no sons.

M: Was he a very impressive teacher?

S: He was an excellent teacher. He was Chancellor of the University for a great number of years--something like 30 years or more. At th at time he taught mathematics probably four hours every morning and did his office work in the afternoon.

M: How small was the University then?

S: I think the total student body was something just under 200. The graduating class in 1924--I know this because we just had a reunion a few weeks ago--the graduating class numbered 35. More of us entered but some withdrew.

M: Would you take most of your work in that central stone building that I was in today?

S: All of it except chemistry and physics. They had a separate building ^{for the sciences.} I took physics the second year and then chemistry ^{again} the third year. We had a two-year requirement in chemistry and one year in physics. I took mathematics three years. I am sure it was required too ^{for two years.}

M: Did you like it?

S: Yes.

M: Your first psychology was this course by Kierstead.

S: Yes, possibly two courses. I am not sure.

M: Can you remember anything about what he used as a textbook?

S: ^{No} Yes, I ^{don't} remember and I looked up in the ^{old} calendar. They used

to list some of the textbooks. While this list is a later ^{one of names} ~~list~~ of
"Readings from Pillsbury, Woodworth and MacDougall's Physiological Psychology." I don't remember that but this was listed.

M: Was it Pillsbury's Attention do you suppose?

S: I suppose it must have been. Bernard's Social Psychology was also listed. Those were listed in 1929. I do remember and I saw under the Sociology Ross's Principles of Sociology, but I can't remember the name of the psychology text. It may have been Woodworth. It is listed for 1929. I am not sure whether a first edition would have been available.

M: I don't know. I would have thought it would be later but that is because I had Warren as my textbook in 1923. I think as soon as Woodworth brought his out it started to be used very widely.

S: It was listed for 1929 and I couldn't find any list before that.

M: By that time everybody was using Woodworth, I think.

S: I don't think that was the text I used. I don't remember it.

M: By the time you graduated how many courses in psychology had you had?

S: I had had $1\frac{1}{2}$ at most. I had the psychology of education first. The other was just a general course in psychology. You see Dr. ^{Kierstead} Kierstead was primarily a philosopher. He was a tremendous person. His first interest I am sure, was philosophy, although he taught economics and sociology, and psychology ^{and} eventually education. So he was a Mr. Social Science.

M: I have come to know his son, the economist, fairly well. He has some of this brilliance that that man must have had.

S: I am sure he is a fine scholar but he couldn't have the breadth--nobody could now. He was really unusual for any time or age.

M: It is very nice that the Psychology Building is called the ~~Kierstedt~~ ^{Kierstead} Building. Did you have a hand in that?

S: I suggested it but I am sure other people did too.

M: On graduation--by this time you thought you were pretty interested in psychology?

S: I wouldn't say that my interest in psychology developed at this time. I enjoyed it but I expected to teach in high school. I think I probably thought I would teach mathematics and that was it.

M: With that in view, what did you do after graduation?

S: I taught mathematics in a high school and I taught in the United States. We didn't have to take any teacher training. With the B.A. we were qualified. There was a great shortage of teaching positions in New Brunswick however, I remember there were 13 of us who graduated then and who were looking for positions and only one person was placed in the Province, I think. I went to the United States--first to Michigan for two years and then I came back to New York State for one year.

M: Did you like this?

S: Yes, I enjoyed it.

M: By the way, when you were in UNB did you live in residence? Were there residences?

S: There were no residences. Everybody lived in boarding houses.

M: But you had already had the experience of being on your own and looking after yourself, so this was no strange experience to go down to Michigan and New York. What happened then?

S: Then teacher training requirements and this strangle-hold of education on teachers caught up with me and I was required to take courses in education. So I thought the only thing to do was to stop and do that instead of doing it on a part-time basis. I went to the Harvard School of Education for a year and there I took as much psychology as I could get in the curriculum and that was a good deal. There were people there like Walter Dearborn ~~who later did work with~~
~~and so on,~~ and Lincoln who was also working with
with Dearborn. I managed to do only the barest requirements in philosophy and history of education and did the rest in psychology, especially ⁱⁿ measurement and tests ~~of measurement~~. This was all in the School of Education. I didn't take any work in the Department of Psychology. I wasn't permitted to because I wasn't eligible. I didn't have the background for that work. But I took as much psychology as I could in the School of Education.

After a year of that I taught mathematics for another year back in New York State. I was situated on Long Island so I began to take some work in extension or on Saturday mornings at Columbia Teacher's College. I remember Gardiner Murphy. I had one course with him. It was his course on personality. I also took some general

courses to try to build up preparation because I had in mind going into doing graduate work in psychology. This was merely preparation.

M: What was your impression of Gardner Murphy?

S: He was a terrific person. I remember being practically overwhelmed by his fund of information because I came to ^{his course} ~~it~~ with much less background than I should have had. In the term paper that I had to write he wrote something quite nice--just a little personal note as well as the grade.

M: He was a very human person. Very approachable.

S: Very approachable. Very warm.

M: Yet very broadly interested in a wide variety of things--psychic phenomena and all that sort of thing, or did that come later?

S: There was nothing on psychic phenomena that I detected at that time. I remember after when he did develop this and show it in his writing I thought that this must have been a later development.

M: Who else did you have at teacher's college?

S: I can't remember now. I was just filling in, trying to get background in general courses in schools of psychology and history of psychology.

M: Where are we in time now? Was this in the late 20s?

S: Yes it would be. Some of these courses were taught by some of the lesser people as they were extension courses given on Saturday morning or Friday night.

M: Your mention of the schools reminded me that in the last 20s

or early 30s the schools were great things weren't they? There was great excitement about them. What was your own stance in regard to these conflicting schools?

S: I don't feel that at that time I was qualified to judge or select. I was very interested I am sure. This was the wave of behaviourism.

M: This is what I meant. You must have been taken sympathetically with it or antagonistic toward it, because there were only two things you could do in those days.

S: I was taken with it. I was impressed with it and carried along with the wave.

M: It was a big wave, wasn't it? So this was your make-up preparation to go into graduate work. Then?

S: Then I needed to make some money. At that time it wasn't easy to find Fellowships and Scholarships, as it is now, to go to graduate school. So I accepted a position in a small liberal arts college in Maryland: Washington College, Chestertown, Maryland. The Head of the Department was also quite a remarkable man and I gained a great deal by my association with him, although I was teaching and he was Head of the Department of Psychology and Education. It was a joint department.

M: You had left mathematics.

S: Yes, after I did this preparation. The mathematics had been a way of maintaining myself until I could get some preparation in psychology.

M: When you got this particular position in this college you moved into your own chosen field. Who was the Head of the Department?

S: He was Dr. Frederick Livingood. He was a Harvard graduate and a very able person. He reminded me more of Dr. Kierstedt^{ad} than anybody else whom I have ever met. I am sure he wasn't of his stature but he had great breadth and great interest in students and the human touch. So it was a very good apprenticeship.

M: Would you say now that he was more of a philosopher or a psychologist?

S: More of a philosopher.

M: Were there any others in the Department?

S: There was a third person in the Department who came a year or two after. It was a small college limited to about 500 students and only liberal arts so the Department was never large. I was there as near as I can remember, about twelve years. It was during the Depression and one didn't dare leave to go to graduate school. Everybody discouraged you about giving up a position. I guess people didn't have the adventure that young people have now.

M: We didn't have the confidence and we didn't have any right to confidence.

S: There were no Scholarships handed out at this time at all.

M: During this time did you do any graduate work?

S: Yes, I did. I was near Johns-Hopkins so I did some work at Hopkins when I could, on weekends, and one summer. I was simply building up preparation, I hoped, to enter graduate school.

M: Who did you encounter at Hopkins in psychology?

S: I just can't recall the names.

M: Again, these probably were juniors who were doing the extension work. This is characteristic.

S: Yes, but there was one man who urged me to go on particularly. I wish I could remember his name. It wasn't one of their greats, that's all I know. He was a very fine instructor and a very able person.

M: So where did you finally find the resources to go to graduate school?

S: I finally started to graduate school in the early years of the War, which would be about 1941. My family illness here interrupted my course there, so--

M: Where were you at graduate school?

S: At Yale. So having had one year there I had to give up and come home to look after my father and mother. During the War it was almost impossible to ^{find people to} ~~go and~~ look after elderly people, especially in the country. So I gave up and came home and was not able to return until 1946. I got my degree in 1949. I had to stay those three years because, as you can see, I was pretty rusty by this time, to get a thesis done. I was determined that this time I wasn't going to leave until I finished, so I did.

M: Now tell me about the characters you encountered at Yale in 1946-49.

S: People were just coming back from the War. Mark May, to start with. Neal Miller. He was a young man just back from the War. He had been at Yale before the War and had just returned.

M: Tell us about Mark May. What kind of an impression did he make on you?

S: Very bad mannered but very biased and very dogmatic.

M: Very pro- what?

S: I would say, first of all, pro-May, but he was very much still influenced by the behaviouristic outlook.

M: Was he anti-Freudian?

S: I can't answer that because in the seminars that he attended and the work, ^{I had with him} I don't recall any statements that would identify him.

M: Was it that Freudian psychoanalysis was just ignored? I don't see how it could be.

S: I don't think it was ignored ~~but I don't think~~ by him. ~~I wouldn't know his stand.~~

M: He was a staunch and extreme radical behaviourist?

S: I wouldn't say he was radical ^{by that time.} I would say he was influenced by it because I know that he was influenced by and in agreement with Gesell, the great man in child psychology who had just retired.

M: Oh yes, of course, he would be at Yale too.

S: Gesell had just retired at this time and I know that he was at the Institute and he was interested in environment. I would say probably May, if I had to label him, was an environmentalist.

M: The Watsonian theory that you can make anything you choose of the child if you provide the right environment.

Was Neal Miller an instructor of yours?

S: Yes, in a seminar. I didn't have him as a full-time lecturer. My memory of him is really quite vague.

M: Was he bouncy and dynamic and enthusiastic?

S: I would say he was dynamic and full of ideas. You could see the sort of person that *he was to become in psychology.*

M: Did you take any work from *Hartshorne*? This was after they did all that work on honesty.

S: Yes. He was a very understanding, kindly person. He was a complete contrast to Mark May. I think they must have complemented each other very well. May had the reputation of being impossible to work with so *Hartshorne*, I am sure, had just the right personality to go along with him.

M: That is interesting that they made a team.

S: *Warren* John Tilton was another. He had worked primarily in the field of measurement. He had been an assistant with Thorndike as a young man and had *remained at Columbia* ~~worked with Thorndike~~ *for some time before he* ~~in his later years and then~~ he came to Yale. He was primarily an educational psychologist.

M: Was the Department pretty small, or was there a Department of Psychology? Were they all in the Institute?

S: They were divided. May was at the Institute and Miller was at the Institute. I think *Hartshorne* was in the Department. Tilton was in the Department and Catherine Cox who always went by her maiden name but was married to a *well-known* ~~psychologist~~ *walter Mites*. I didn't have him in any course or seminar but I had worked with her in the field ^{of} --she was primarily

a clinician in testing and measurement.

M: Tell us what it was like to be a Ph.D. candidate in that period. What are your feelings about what it was like?

S: It was rather frustrating to be as old as I was and competing with so many younger people--although it wouldn't be the same as now because there were a lot of veterans and people who were finishing up. However I have great respect and I must say I look back on it as a very pleasant experience. The drudgery part and the frustrations fade out and you remember the pleasant part.

M: Were you left pretty much on your own or were you dragooned into courses?

S: You were pretty much on your own. You could go to ^{people} one thing I found people very willing to help if you sought them out. My thesis directors were Dr. Tilton and Dr. May and a third person Dr. Paul Burnham, who later went into the Admissions Office and became Director of Admissions. He had to leave because he became ill with tuberculosis and when he returned he never went back to the Department but went into the Admissions Office.

M: What was your thesis on?

S: ~~I can't remember the three~~ *The title was: Unreliability of Group Test Profiles,*
but it boiled down to being a study to determine how much the unevenness in test performance of students in a series of tests was due to the unreliability in the test and not to the change in the person.

M: What test did you use? Do you mean intelligence testing--Binet, that kind of thing?

S: Not the Binet, it was a group test that I had given--which the teachers gave in the school in New Haven.

M: Was it the Otis?

-the German-McKenna Test of Mental Ability

S: No, it was a battery of seven sub-tests, It was a well-known test which is still used I believe. It was a scholastic aptitude test for junior high school.

M: Do you remember what conclusion you came to?

S: The conclusion was that a great deal of the variation was the result of the unreliability of the tests rather than changes in student ability.

M: Did you have trouble with Mark May in your thesis?

S: Not trouble. He was exacting and he was sometimes unpredictable. Sometimes when I sent a chapter in he would be very critical and maybe the changes I made as a result of his criticism would be very trivial and when it went back he would sometimes want it changed back. Anyway, the other two people would say, "Oh well, he'll forget." He was not easy and I think I had respect for him as well as a certain amount of fear because he was ^apower at that time.

M: Do you remember anything about your final oral on your thesis?

S: After it had been passed by the three people it was pretty sure that it would be passed by the Department as a whole. I don't remember any great anxiety because after I got Mark May's OK...

M: Nobody would dare say anything.

S: It was more or less routine it seems to me, but I didn't enjoy it.

M: Did you do your thesis while you were still in residence there?

S: Yes.

M: That brings ^{us} up to 1949.

S: In 1949-50 I taught at Wheaton College in Norton Massachusetts. It ^{is} was one of the smaller Ivy League girl's colleges. It was a combined Department of Psychology and Education. I can't remember the personnel now but there were about five or six people in the combined department. Then in 1950 Louise Thompson who had been Head of the Department here at UNB went to Dalhousie and this position was open. My mother was still alive and she was very interested in having me apply so I did and I took it just on a year's basis. I found that I enjoyed it and when they offered the position to remain, I stayed on.

M: I think this is a good place for us to stop and for you to tell us about the history of the Department up until the time that you arrived in September, 1950. If you would go back to the time when it was philosophy, economics, sociology and psychology all under Professor Kierstead . Is that the beginning, as far as you know?

S: As far as I know. The University calendars are missing from 1915 until 1923, in the archives here at the library, but I know that during my undergraduate days, which would be from 1920-24, Dr. Kierstead was teaching under the Department of Philosophy, not only philosophy but economics and one and one-half courses in psychology, and a half course in sociology. I am sure that he continued

this until 1930 when economics was split off and became a separate department. His son was the first professor of economics at that time. The Department continued with the philosophy and psychology and sociology. In 1934 I found the first mention of a course in education added. In 1935 the Department became known as the Department of Philosophy and Education. There was still no mention of the psychology or sociology that was being taught under its wing. Dr. Kierstedt was still in charge. He retired in 1944. Of course there were assistants brought in. I found in the calendars of 1941, up through 1946, such courses in psychology as general psychology, infant psychology, the psychology of adolescence and the psychology of education. Those were the courses that were listed. In 1944 Louise Thompson became Head of the so-called Department of Philosophy and Education but the psychology courses began to take on a new look. There was a course in general psychology, one on the contemporary schools of psychology, one on experimental psychology and one on clinical, in 1944 when Louise Thompson came to the Department. Sociology was also included but not mentioned in the title of the Department.

M: So she followed Kierstedt as Head of the Department of Philosophy and Education.

S: Yes. In 1945, a year after she came, philosophy was split off as an independent department. The original department was left as the Department of Education.

M: My goodness, they kept psychology submerged a long while, didn't they?

S: It was not until 1948 that the term "psychology" crept into the title. In 1948 it was listed as the Department of Education and Psychology, with Louise Thompson as Head. Sociology was still included but it was submerged too. In 1949 education split off under a separate head and the department now became the Department of Psychology and Sociology. It was not until 1966 that sociology was split off and joined with anthropology to become a new department.

M: Where had anthropology been all this time?

S: It had been with the Department of History and thereby hangs a tale. A great many of the strange combinations had resulted from personal biases and empire building.

M: Was this, in part, due to an attitude on the part of the President, for instance? This slow emergence.

S: As I went over the calendar and found this slow ^{emergence} ~~development~~ in the name I thought it was due to a cultural lag in the area, a fear of psychology. While it was taught for so long they preferred to submerge it--to poke it under some safe name like "education."

M: These attitudes would be, in part, community attitudes, but was this also complicated, immediately, by academic colleague attitudes?

S: Yes. I am sure the anthropology was kept with history for so many years because the Head of the History Department, Alfred Bailey, also considers himself somewhat of an anthropologist. So he felt that anthropology was only safe under his wing in history. I think it was with great reluctance that he gave it over to sociology, probably for

expediency because sociology was still a small department and the trend in Canada has been to join those two disciplines. He could no longer defend keeping it. I think it was influenced by his colleagues and the Department.

M: But now, the same situation didn't exist in psychology, at least not from the time that Louise Thompson took over. In other words, psychology wasn't captured by the head of a department of some other discipline and held as is the case, presumably, in history. How do you account for the fact that Louise and you had no success for a long while?

S: Of course, it was in the name when I came. Education was split off in 1949 and I didn't come until 1950. The name had become in the open at that time, but it did take her from 1944 to 1949 to get it in the open.

M: Was her background such that she could lay claim to competence in the education area as well as psychology?

S: Yes, I think so. She had gone to the University of Edinburgh and taken a graduate course in education.

M: Where education and psychology were a combined department at that time. So this would not seem at all strange to her.

S: No, it didn't, although her interest was entirely in psychology. She went to Yale and got her degree from Yale shortly after she came back here, in about 1945. She was there before I arrived.

M: What she had done at Edinburgh, then, wasn't a doctoral program?

S: No, she got a Master's degree, I believe.

M: Now back to you. You arrived in 1950 to find Louise Thompson already gone. Had you known her up to that point, at all?

S: No, I think I met her here one summer, that's all. I had never worked with her.

M: What was the Department like when you got here?

S: It was a combined Department of Psychology and Sociology. There were the two of us in psychology and one person in sociology. The other person in psychology was a man by the name of Thomas, an American, who was here one year with Louise and stayed on one year *after* when I came. I was the Head. I was brought in to replace Louise.

I don't remember the total number of students in psychology but in the introductory course, which I taught in the sophomore year, there were 18 students. That shows how times have changed. Now, there are 450.

M: And what else did you teach?

S: I taught the introductory or general and I taught child psychology and statistics and tests and measurement.

M: What did Thomas teach?

S: He taught the experimental and history and systems and I am sure he taught the course in social. I think that was the curriculum.

M: I forgot to ask you and I must ask you now--who were your colleagues at Yale? Who were the other students that you remember?

S: One person I think of right away was Edith Osswald who went to Adelphi College in Garden City, Long Island. There was a man who went eventually to Stanford by the name of Coladarei I saw him there when I was on a sabbatical in 1962, in that area. There was another man by the name of ^{Stephen} Clark who was from the West Coast and who went back to California College or University, I don't know which one.

M: Was there a lot of graduate student interaction? Were there a lot of bull sessions outside of seminars and courses?

S: Quite a lot. The men all lived in the graduate school building. There was at that time a so-called "high rise" building for the graduate school. It contained all the offices, a cafeteria and dining room facilities for the graduate students and residence rooms for the men. The women lived in a residence nearby but ate at the graduate school. I think most of the discussions took place there and in the lounges.

M: So this tended to separate the men and women even if they were in the same discipline.

To come back, again, to the program as it was here. What happened the second year? Did you get somebody else?

S: Yes. This is going to be hard to remember--the order of some of these very good people.

M: Don't worry about the order.

S: One person that comes to mind right away is ^{Lynn} Newbigging. He was here two years. And Al Pavo who was an excellent person.

H: What was Lyn Newbigging like at this stage? Was this before he went to London?

S: No, he was back from London. He had been at Acadia. He came here from Acadia. He had all the potential of what he has become but he didn't have enough leeway here, I am sure, for his development, because I must say that the administration at this university has not been very favourably disposed toward psychology. This may not be any longer true but the Dean and Academic Vice-President, who was the Head of the Department of ^{History} and who kept anthropology under his wing, never saw psychology as very important in the curriculum. ^{Lack of department support from the Admin. discouraged} ~~The same is true, I think, of~~ Dr. Pavio, too. I wanted, at that time, for him to take over the administrative work and become Head but he was not interested. He didn't want to do administrative work. His interest was in research, as you know. He could have been kept here except for the shabby way in which he was treated. When we ^{were} very short of space and equipment I remember we had the promise of adequate space for the fall. During the summer when I inquired how the renovations were coming along I was told it wouldn't be for us. It was to go to chemical engineering. When Al came back--he was away ^{when} and heard this--he was completely discouraged. Another thing happened when we had a brilliant young man from Stanford. He was an eastern American but he had gone to Stanford for his graduate work. He was forced to do his experimental work in the basement of the greenhouse in what you might call an "alley way"--a tunnel from the greenhouse to an adjoining building. He had a little space in the greenhouse that we could rescue from the gardiner. They felt it was more important to raise their own

bulbs and shrubs than to buy them each year, but they reluctantly gave up a little space and the tunnelway between. One spring this was flooded and his rats were drowned. This was very discouraging. He was an excellent person. He became Head of the department in a college in Pennsylvania, ^{Franklin and Marshall.} So you see it has been a series of frustrations.

Finally we had a man, ^{Schnitzer} ~~Snitzer~~, who has since gone, who came ^{from the U.S.} ~~to us.~~ He was a good experimentalist. He had some space in a little house ^{on the edge} ~~back of the~~ of the campus that has since been demolished. He used that. It was renovated but it was very tiny. When we tried to expand--the University had ^{just} bought a large house which reminded me somewhat of the "White house" they had at Dalhousie--anyway we went after that. The Philosophy Department were anxious to share offices and it would have been adequate for that too. The renovations had started and the President drove by one day and saw the carpenters at work. He went in and put a stop to that. This was in late August. ^{Schnitzer} ~~Snitzer~~ was ready to resign then but finally we got, not that year but another year, another little hole or corner in another little shack that they were going to demolish anyway. So he stayed on for that year. This is why I say that psychology has had a very frustrating experience, I think, at U.N.B.

M: You would never guess you had all these difficulties when you look at that Kierstead Building now.

S: About three years before I retired, I told the President, finally, that I wanted to be relieved of the Headship, but the conditions discouraged all applicants. An excellent candidate from Dalhousie would have accepted--but after meeting the President he withdrew because he feared he could not work with such an authoritarian person.

When listing the people in the Department I omitted Norm Fletcher.

He was

/ a splendid lecturer. I think the students liked him very much. He got lured away by that Systems Development Corporation. Then when he came back he had a business of his own. I believe he is at Sir George Williams now, part time.

M: I think he is in business in Montreal with R.H. and R. I just learned that recently. I didn't know what had happened to him. He and Terry Aldergeist tried to make a go of private personnel management but it didn't go very well, and so he joined R. H. and R. and is working with them now. But you say, "When he came back." Came back here, do you mean?

S: No he didn't come back here. He came back and started his own business.

M: You mean from the States.

S: ^{Yes,} I think he probably had a part-time appointment at Sir George Williams when he came back, teaching extension.

M: As I say, you must feel a great sense of accomplishment to have achieved, against this background of cellars and disappointment, such a magnificent building. Tell us how that happened.

S: Well, as I said before, I wanted to be relieved of the Headship three years before I retired. I had been unable to get Paivio to take over, and was not able to get Kenneth Brookshire to stay on and take over the Headship. In 1964 we started looking for outside people.

Candidates came and they saw no facilities and very little equipment. When they inquired about the size of the budget they weren't interested. This went on and on. Finally it became clear after I said it, and other people said it, that we just couldn't get anybody to come unless we provided adequate facilities. So I am sure the President could have done this before--I think he was probably pressured, as all presidents are, by different people--chemical engineering came in and took our space that was promised once, and another group came in and took the space from the philosophy and psychology that we were promised that time. The Head of philosophy left the following year because he wouldn't put up with that kind of treatment. All he wanted was office space and the seminar rooms. But it was more important to build up surveying, engineering and more important to have the school of nursing and physical education, and all these frills, than to support the already established departments. It sounds a lot better in the yearly reports to say how many new departments have been developed.

Kepros

Anyway, Schnitzer, and I worked on all the plans for those buildings and we put in a great many hours. It was ready when Easterbrook came so they then had premises. There ^{is} ~~was~~ nobody ~~there~~ ^{now} except Kepros *who was in on the planning.*
~~was there, when we were planning to build it.~~

M: I have no doubt at all, as you know, that the only reason you got Easterbrook to come was the existence or the prospect of this building.

S: Oh, I am sure.

M: Who was the President?

S: It was Colin MacKay. He has resigned and is retiring this year. The trouble began to show up on this campus last fall.

M: The famous *Strax* case. Is it true what I read in the Atlantic Advocate about student strife? Have you read that article?

S: No, I haven't read it.

M: What it winds up with is a statement that I found a little bit surprising that the upshot, ultimately, of this whole tangled affair, was that at U.N.B. now the administration, the faculty and the students, are all united against the CAUT. Is this true?

S: I was told just the other day--I don't know about the students because I think they have been disbanded since this attitude has formed-- *but* I ^{do} understand that now the faculty are becoming united against the CAUT since this last action of the CAUT. The University applied for the injunction to be lifted and the court denied that. The CAUT says that they probably acted in poor faith or did not try hard enough and therefore the censure remains. It seems now as if ^{this action} ~~it~~ has united the faculty. It has been very badly split all winter, I am told. There were a great many people who were opposed to the administration and who used the *Strax* case for their ^{own} purposes. I will say that the administration, until last year, speaking from my own standpoint, was very authoritarian.

M: That seems to be quite clear from the little anecdotes you tell about the President going in and cancelling--

S: For those people who were favoured, I am sure this would seem a strange statement. But I know this was the case and I always said that

it would be the students who would bring about ^{the President's} ~~his~~ resignation, and that was exactly what happened.

M: How long has he been President?

S: Sixteen years.

M: So he came here just about the time you did.

S: He came in 1953. I had been here for two years under Dr. Trueman. I think Dr. Trueman felt very differently about psychology and I think it would have made for a different treatment had he remained.

M: I am sure of that. Has Dr. MacKay's successor been chosen?

S: No, they haven't found a new President yet.

M: This is a very deplorable kind of situation that has developed here. However you view it it is deplorable. It shouldn't have occurred at all. It seems to me very odd that in universities such as U.N.B. or Sir George Williams that there should have been such extreme instances of this kind. If they were going to happen anywhere in Canada I would have least expected it to happen at Sir George Williams where they have been so generous to coloured students from outside and so liberal. Certainly I wouldn't have expected it to happen at U.N.B., but I would expect it to happen at Simon Fraser as it did. That man who was behind the scenes and who told the President what to do, is a really extremely authoritarian person who deserves everything that he and Simon Fraser got.

This brings us pretty well up to date except that in recent years, you do seem in spite of the President and all his minions, to have achieved something. How do you account for this? Just the fact that it was so difficult to get a replacement for you? Was that the determining thing? Whatever swung the President over, finally, to giving you such a fine building?

S: I think they became convinced--the rest of the administration, the Deans--that something would have to be done. I said, "Go to other campuses and see." When people came to be interviewed for the job they also explained that they wouldn't be interested because of the lack of facilities.

M: I think, out of my experience, that at any university, it doesn't matter--the Chairman can talk himself blue in the face, without having much effect, because he is recognized and properly, as an empire builder for his discipline. So whatever he says is "biased," "prejudiced," "self-interest," It is what others say to your administration when they come to visit, especially with any prospect of perhaps being added to the staff, that really pays off. It is a thankless task bringing them under those conditions, but it is the only way to break through, I think. This is an interesting illustration.

S: We had, for instance, one man who came from the States. He was a man who had been associated with a former colleague here. When he came, even before he left, he told me, "I wouldn't be interested so don't bother to offer me the job." I could name the number of people whom we--

M: Managed to get for ~~a while~~ an interview.

S: I think it was very fortunate that we had people like--well there was a fellow by the name of Black, Percy Black, who was from the States, but he had been educated at Montreal at Sir George Williams and McGill. He got his ^{Ph.D.} degree at Harvard. He was here and he was a very good person. He was here one year during Dr. MacKay's incumbency. He was very much against him. He look on him as an odd-ball. The President just picked

him out and used to say derogatory things to me about him.

M: Was Black eccentric?

S: He was a little eccentric. He was a brilliant student and a brilliant psychologist. He interested students to go on in psychology. Some of them have since done their graduate work and become Ph.Ds in psychology. He was one person, and then Lyn Newbigging and Al Paivio,

M: Norm Fletcher.

S: And Norm Fletcher. And there was Noel Jenkin who was a New Zealander who came, by way of Harvard, who was a very good person. But he returned to New Zealand and then eventually came back to the United States. All of these people, in spite of the dire conditions, and their heavy course load, and so on, were able to interest students to go on in psychology. In the last two years I don't know of anybody ^{in the dept.} getting Woodrow Wilson Fellowships ^{but had} ~~as we did~~ have two people, or getting NRC Scholarships, which we did, ~~to go to other places.~~ Of course, now they are trying to keep them here *at this graduate school.*

M: Let's turn now to another aspect of being a psychologist, as you have been over this period of time. Looking out from U.N.B. at the Canadian scene in psychology, which of the senior psychologists have you had a chance to get to know at meetings or in any other way? All of them, I suppose.

S: I was going to say practically all of the people who attended the annual meetings from the spring of 1951 on, until I guess 1966 was the last one, ~~or maybe I didn't go to that one.~~ I went to all the meetings.

M: What were your impressions of some of the senior statesmen of Canadian psychology, from hearing them or meeting them at meetings?

S: I think there have been a great many able people on the Canadian scene. I think of Hebb in Montreal, at McGill.

M: Which of them did you have the highest regard for?

S: I wouldn't like to single out any one. I think there have been so many people beginning with Bott from Toronto. He stands out as a giant, doesn't he?

M: Did you get to know George Humphrey?

S: No, he had gone before.

M: Roy Liddy?

S: I think I saw him at only one or two meetings, so I really have no impression.

M: Noel Mailloux?

S: I have great respect for him. I think he has made a great contribution. Isn't he now Head of an Institute, or is he still at the University of Montréal?

M: He is still at the University of Montreal but he got that five-year Fellowship. I don't know whether he is still on that or not. How about Hilton Page?

S: He was one I had in mind. I think Hilton Page did a great deal in his very quiet, unspectacular way. I have the greatest respect for him.

M: Who else in the Maritime Provinces has earned your respect?

S: I would say Marion Grant and Dalton Vernon, who came back to Acadia. I was glad he did. While Clayton Baxter was primarily a philosopher,

he did a great deal to keep psychology alive at Mount Allison.

M: What happened at Mount Allison? Clayton Dexter started there, I guess, at about the time that Charlie Cruise and Roberta Smith were at Mount Allison. Am I right about that?

S: I don't know because I wasn't here at that time.

M: Then Jim Tuck was at Mount A.

S: He was at Mount Allison for a good many years.

M: Then when he left, I got the impression that psychology just closed up.

S: Well, I think it had a hard time for a few years. One thing I think is unfortunate is that the new people in psychology in the Maritimes have dropped the Maritime Psychological Association meetings. After Hilton Page retired the Dalhousie people lost interest in it, but Mount Allison and Acadia and UNB continued. Then they brought in Newfoundland and they had one meeting there. The next meeting was supposed to be here, the first year I was out. I sent word too, but Jim didn't bother to do anything about it. So they didn't meet that year. It has never met since, so I guess it is dead. Dalton Vernon I am sure would be sorry about this because he originated it. I think it is a great loss because it kept--I think regional groups play a part as well as national associations.

M: It is New Brunswick that has legislation now, isn't it?

S: Yes.

M: I would think that this perhaps may have had something to do with the breakup of the Maritime Association.

S: Nova Scotia ~~had~~^{got} the legislation ~~first~~^{too} but it didn't cause the breakup. I suppose, probably, the two together contributed.

M: Has Nova Scotia got a law ~~too~~^{too}?

S: I think so.

M: I don't think they have.

S: I think it has.

M: O.K. What about this one? Which of the students that you have had, give you now satisfaction because of what they have subsequently done in psychology?

S: First of all John Bishop who graduated in the early fifties. He went to Dalhousie for a Master's degree and then on to the University of London where he got his Ph.D. He came back to New Brunswick and worked in the mental health division for a couple of years to repay his bursary, I think, and probably stayed a little longer. Then he went to the States and worked in clinical situations--he is a clinician--and now he is at the University of Maine in the Portland Division. Also he has a consultant's job with some of the mental hospitals in that area. I think of his name particularly because I heard a student of his, when I was in Portland recently, say that he was by far the most interesting and best organized lecturer that he had ever heard. Anyway he is one person.

I think of David L ~~likely~~^{likely} who graduated from here and did his Master's degree here and then went on to Dalhousie. This is his second year at Dalhousie and I remember that Henry James told me last year, when he was over here, that he was by far the best graduate student

in their crop that year. He was in to see me this Christmas and said he was liking it very well. I am sure he will do very well.

M: What is his field?

S: I am not sure exactly. He is working with McIntosh, so it is in some area of physiological. He got started with this man Schnitzer whom I mentioned, who finally left after the treatment he received.

These are not in order. There is another student, Barbara Pepperdene who was one of the first Woodrow Wilson Fellowship holders. She went to Cornell. However, her interests changed from social psychology into anthropology and after getting her degree in social psychology at Cornell, she went to Toronto and got her Ph.D. in anthropology. But of course I don't hold that against her! I am sure she never would have gone on to anything if she hadn't had that start--getting the Woodrow Wilson Fellowship in psychology.

Another student I think of is Al Marquis who graduated from here and went to teach high school and then came back and said he thought he wanted to go into psychology after all. He did a Master's here and then he went on to Queen's. I don't think he has got his degree yet but he is working with Thompson in an area in physiological psychology.

M: We had an Al Marcus, Too, at Toronto, in social psychology. I thought he was a Toronto boy. I guess it is two boys with the same name.

S: I am sure our Al Marquis had an NRC and went to Queen's. I know he has been at Queen's because he had to come back here for his orals.

He was a boy who had no intention--at that time we tried to persuade him but he didn't want to go on. He said he was tired of studying.

Another student, Florence Saunders, went on a scholarship to Iowa and got her Master's degree.

Frank McGoldrick was the second winner of a Woodrow Wilson Fellowship in the Department. He went to Cornell. At present he is on the staff of one of the newer Ontario colleges.

M:

S: MacDonald and ^{Nickie} Michie are both here.

M: Yes, you have got quite a Toronto cell here now. I think MacDonald, particularly, is a very good boy.

S: I have heard very good reports of MacDonald.

M: One thing I wanted now, to ask you, was to get out your crystal ball and, with your background in psychology and with your knowledge of the way psychology is, not just at UNB, but the state it is in at the present time, tell me what you think is going to happen to psychology in the next decade. What is coming up? What development do you foresee in psychology as a science, or a discipline, or a profession?

S: I see it more and more becoming allied with biology and biochemistry and physiology. I think that seems to be the trend.

M: Which is it going to be? Is it going to be that psychology gets swallowed by physiology or is physiology going to get swallowed by psychology?

S: I don't think it will be a case of swallowing. I think it will be a case of breaking down the partitions and making it something more meaningful regardless of the name.

M: Certainly that has been the boiling edge of psychology in the last decade hasn't it?

S: Yes. It seems to me it is going to continue.

M: What about the other edge? What about the social sciences edge?

S: I think that is another tangent that will continue and will be ever more important if it gets enough attention.

M: Do you think it will?

S: It seems to me it is being overshadowed by this other approach to the neglect of the social side, because the social side is so hard to develop.

M; So slow to develop.

S: Yes.

M: What about this scientist-professional situation in psychology, as you see it?

S: I really don't know much about this controversy, if you are referring to a cleavage between the scientist in the university or the lab and the applied person.

M: The applied person in industry or mental health or education.

S: I think it will be to the detriment of both if there is a division.

M: But there is a division.

S: Oh, I know, but I mean if it widens--if it is allowed to widen.

M: Have you been under any pressure at UNB--any kind of community or university or student pressure to give more emphasis to life relevant things and community relevant things in training and teaching, and less emphasis to sort of hi-fi research kind of thing? Have you been under any pressure to start training clinical psychologists or educational psychologists?

S: There has been a great deal of pressure in the last few years to introduce a clinical course. The pressure came from the Department of

Education in the University, probably the Department of Education in the Government, from lay groups interested in university affairs,^{and} from a few students. My feeling at the time was that this university was not situated or did not have the facilities in the community to have a clinical program. There is no hospital^{for mental diseases.} The only facilities we would have would be a small mental health clinic here. The General Hospital has no psychiatric unit. Saint John has all these facilities but it is 70 miles away and when I was told this was a small thing I didn't think it was practical. I always said that Dalhousie was situated with all these facilities^{at hand} and there was no point in having competition in university education and that UNB ought to try to concentrate on some area omitted by Dal, or not emphasized by Dal. This is why we tried to build up the area of social if we could. Then, when *Schnitzer* came some physiological *work was started.* But it was a matter, here, of not saying what area you were going to build up, it was a matter of whom you could get. So if you could get a good man you were thankful and you let him have his reins.

M: That is a point that Dan Berlyne is always making at our staffing conferences in the Department. He says, "Most people view this business of recruiting staff as though it were a smorgasbord and you could go along and pick what you want. That is not the way it is at all. You go looking for the best person you can get and what field he is in couldn't matter less. What you want is quality staff, and if you are lucky enough to get one--." In Ontario we have so much of this idea of co-ordination of Ontario universities so that "you will do this and I will

do that." It is so utterly unrealistic because you can't decide in advance that you are going to do "this" and let somebody else do "that." It sounds very nice to a business man but, academically it doesn't seem to work.

S: The only thing I felt we couldn't do was clinical. I don't know what will be done in the future. Some people on the staff used to urge us to start clinical.

M: You had, for a while, a co-operative scheme down here that looked, on paper, to be very promising, in which there was a rotating internship and all that sort of thing, out of Dal. The provinces were co-operating in this. But that seems to have fallen apart since Henry James took over.

S: Yes I guess it has.

M: There seems to be very little life left in it.

S: Yes, we sent one student from here to be one of the exchange students. He went one summer to Dal and worked with one of their men. It only lasted about two years.

M: Oh, I think it lasted longer than that.

S: Oh yes, I guess it did.

M: Because Mary Laurence was there for longer than that.

I think I have exhausted the questions I had up my sleeve. From your point of view is there anything you would like to add?

S: I have remembered one or two names. Kenneth Brookshire--and you may have seen his name in the literature, was the one who was here

who went to the United States and became head of the Department of ~~in~~
Franklin and Marshall College, Pennsylvania.
~~Pennsylvania, but I can't remember the name of the college.~~ He was out
Leeper
at the University of Oregon with ~~Lidbrook~~ and then he came here. He was
the one whose rats were drowned in the tunnel.

M: Oh, you had him here? You lost a good man in him.

S: I begged him to stay to take over the headship if he would--
that many years ago. But nothing would have persuaded him after that.
He said, "Not with an administration like that."

M: This brings up another point. Did being Chairman, for you,
over 17 years, did it keep getting easier or harder to be Chairman?

S: Harder. More and more difficult. The difficulty of getting
staff and the increasing difficulty of getting equipment for them and
space for them.

M: Well, I have got to say that over 12 years the job got steadily
not only harder and more difficult for exactly the reasons you mention,
and this is a different kettle of fish because this was a big department
and so on--but it not only became harder and more difficult, but it became
less rewarding. Perhaps as a consequence of that, but I don't think so.
There was another change that took place, also, and was one of the reasons
why it became harder. It was that as we became more and more democratized
we seemed to get more and more confused. I felt as though I were wandering
down a crooked path--finding myself at times making too many decisions
myself, and at other times wasting everybody's time by consulting every-
body about a thing and they couldn't agree. So ultimately you couldn't

follow all of them because they differed. You couldn't do what they all thought you ought to do, so whatever you did was wrong to somebody. This added greatly to the confusion in the Department. Far from improving morale, which it is supposed to do when they feel they have a part in the decision process, it seemed to have a negative effect on morale because they couldn't agree with each other. They found themselves spending more and more time on committees to the point where they said, "Oh, you decide and leave us alone. We want to get on with the job." The upshot of this is that I sometimes wonder how we are going to get any chairmen anymore. You have mentioned several instances of people like Al Paivio and Kenneth Brookshire, people you wanted to take over, and they wouldn't even consider being chairmen. I think you are awfully lucky to have gotten Jim Easterbrook, because my goodness, I know some other Departments of Psychology that have been looking longer than you were, that haven't succeeded. And it really has to be somebody like him who conceives of himself as a generalist. If he is a specialist why waste his time doing housekeeping chores and wrestling with the difficult problems a chairman has to wrestle with?

S: That's the way I thought of myself for a while. That I could do this sort of thing and get people like Percy ^{Black} and Al Paivio and Schnitzer and Brookshire and so on. I did everything I could to support them. I am sure if you asked any one of them they would say that, but I was up against a stone wall. Of course, what you say about the last few years is exactly true. It is exactly the situation that I found myself in.

There were increasing numbers and each one wanting something different in the way of curriculum. Then I was up against the stone wall of the administration. While they knew this it was hard for them to understand it. I look on those last three years as almost a nightmare. I had a three-course load all the time as well. So I guess I should look on retirement as an out.

M: An escape from an ugly situation.

S: Yes. But however, I miss the students. Who took over when you retired as Head of the Department?

M: They had a long search and a great deal of difficulty and they got one man who was offered the job and who took it, much to our surprise. After having accepted the chairmanship at Toronto, he was then offered the chairmanship at Princeton.

S: Who was that?

M: Leo Kamin. And being an American, he simply couldn't resist going back, especially under the peculiar circumstances in which he had to leave--you know he had to leave in the McCarthy era--but this was an opportunity to re-establish himself in the eyes of his peers in the United States, in no uncertain terms, and he couldn't resist this. He told Princeton that he was committed to Toronto for a year and they said, "Well, all right, come next year." So then he came to Toronto and said, "Do you want me for a year, because after that I am going to Princeton?" Toronto said, "No, we don't think that makes any sense. You go on to Princeton and we will go on searching." They went on searching without

success and finally they appointed one of the members of staff, Glenn Macdonald, do you know him?

S: I have corresponded with him. He was one of the people I tried to decoy down here!

M: Well Glenn is to be the Chairman, but he was just due for a leave when he was made Acting Chairman. So he is going on leave next year in his second year as Chairman. Joan Foley is going to be Acting Chairman. She was the member of staff who supervised this boy Wood you have. A very brilliant girl. An Australian. A wonderful girl. There you are again. She clearly had the potential for a brilliant research career but she has got some kind of a conscience that makes her aware of group needs and, unlike some other specialists, she is prepared to sacrifice her own special research work, to some degree, in order to do these things that have to be done. Somebody has got to do these things. One of the strange things that my Dean used to complain about was that "You psychologists seem to breed a lot of selfish people who won't concern themselves with the group welfare." I don't think this is fair picking out psychology, because I think the same thing is true of other disciplines. But, nevertheless, it is increasingly, I guess, increasingly true, that there is less feeling of a necessity of sacrificing your own advancement in order to do the housekeeping for a group. This is too bad because a bunch of specialists that nobody is co-ordinating are apt to get in each other's road and defeat themselves.

S: But she will have it only for one year.

M: But it was hard to persuade Glenn to do it.

S: I think it is more difficult for a person to come in with his own colleagues and become a chairman than to come into a fresh group, from outside.

M: He wouldn't, of course, have accepted it had not the staff gotten together and expressed themselves, after six months of him being Acting Chairman. They got together and persuaded him that they wanted him to do it. Without that he wouldn't have done it. There was a solid group expression of a desire to have him.