

Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History Project

Interview with Deborah Belle

Interviewed by Alexandra Rutherford

Boston, MA

August 13, 2008

When citing this interview, please use the following citation:

Belle, D. (2008, August 13). Interview by A. Rutherford [Video Recording]. Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History and Online Archive Project. Boston, MA.

For permission to use this interview in published work, please contact:

Alexandra Rutherford, PhD
Project Director, Psychology's Feminist Voices
alexr@yorku.ca

©Psychology's Feminist Voices, 2010

Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History Project
Interview with Deborah Belle
Interviewed by Alexandra Rutherford
Boston, MA
August 13, 2008

DB: Deborah Belle, Interview Participant

AR: Alexandra Rutherford, Interviewer

AR – An interview with Deborah Belle on August 13th, 2008, in Boston, Massachusetts.

DB – I am Deborah Allen Belle. That was my birth name and is my current name, too. I was born in New York, New York on November 26th 1948; a baby boomer.

AR – Yes. Well, let's start, if you would, by telling us about how you developed a feminist identity. I have assumed that you have a feminist identity, but if there is a bigger story, feel free to tell.

DB – I certainly have a feminist identity and I think there are many definitions of feminism. I am [inaudible] on subscribing to all. But, I certainly feel like a feminist and I think it must have started very young because I do remember that I fully intended to become the first woman Jewish president of the United States as a child or had that as a hope. I was certainly encouraged by my parents to think that I could do anything. I was the elder and I was a better student than my younger brother and, being a girl, more well behaved, to use a stereotype that I think is true a lot of the time. I think by the time I was in high school I was very taken up in puzzle with issues like, why there are so few women in privileged roles? My mother was clearly very, very bright; very frustrated to have given up her high-powered career before I was born. [She] later moved back to a less high-powered career as a high school teacher.

AR – What had she been doing before?

DB – She had been doing public relations and [had been] a newspaper woman who worked with the Joint Distribution Committee during the war. So, writing and important things – running a tiny news paper and working on bigger newspapers and interviewing Leonard Bernstein who came to Pittsburgh. [She] had an exciting time and being a professional woman in Manhattan during the war was the high point of her life, I think, although she always insisted that she loved having us kids too. And she did, but the whole role of the professional woman was one that I looked forward to and hoped that I could have. And I was certainly encouraged to think that there was no doubt that I could do it.

AR – Oh Wow, so you had a lot of support from your family.

DB – Complete support from my family.

AR – Well, tell me, how did that play out in terms of your education?

DB – I started thinking very early on about where I wanted to go to college. This was the thing I thought a lot about in high school, being sort of frustrated and feeling not fully utilized in my

high school. I chose the University of Chicago, went there and became – seems like a strange choice in retrospect – an English major; a popular choice at the time. And it was in an era there, of course, great political turmoil and war in Vietnam. In my entire career at the University of Chicago – and this is on the course system, so I had twelve professors a year – I think I only had three women professors. And as an English major, I never read a woman author except for a short piece by Virginia Woolf criticizing Arnold Bennett. I could have [read women authors], of course. There were courses offered, but what strikes me is that I never sought them out and it was easy to fill up my schedule with Shakespeare and Chaucer and not read women authors. My whole western civilizations course or my introduction courses [included] no women authors. So, among the three women faculty that I did have, two were in psychology. I thought about switching to become a psychology major, but did not. It would have required an extra year. I then went immediately into graduate school in human development at Harvard graduate school of education.

AR – What was it about psychology that attracted you?

DB – I think at that point it was more negative, or partly negative. Partly, it was the feeling [that] I am not going to be a creative writer and I did not feel that there was a place for me in English, which may have been looking around and seeing no women and reading no women. Only afterwards, many years later, did it strike me as a possible issue. I had the sense that by going into the social sciences I could, by adding a little brick, help to build a wall. I had sort of a sense that in the humanities or in writing you had to build your own sky scrapers or something. I think there were some misconceptions there.

AR – That it is very individualistic and you built your own?

DB – Something like that. So I re-conceptualized it afterwards as having more to do with just a sense of fit and not feeling that I quite belonged, even though I did very well, Phi Beta Kappa. But I thought I would be interested in psychology and the applied, as well as the basic research aspect, appealed to me. I threw myself into graduate school not knowing what I was doing and sort of floundered around. I was very attracted by the cross-cultural perspective of Beatrice Whiting, who was at the program of human development. [She was] someone who, with her husband, co-founded, I think, the field of the cross-cultural study of human development with such a divergent voice from many of those at the time, back when there was clearly a best way to raise a child and there were certain things that obviously were valued in the child. All of their research was about the fact that if your group, if your economy, had to do with herding cattle you would value different things in children than if it had to do with growing corn or being nomadic or having your child get ahead through education. So, it gave me a very relativistic perspective, also.

Bea was quite an inspiration, I realized afterwards, and this may get to some of your other issues. Her own career had been so different because of her generation. I think when I studied with her she was merely a lecturer because under nepotism rules she could not be the full professor that, I think, eventually she became. Her career was so tied in with that of her husband's and, as I was reading about the history of women in academia, that is often how one did it. So, I think that she was a wonderful mentor, intellectually and yet, as far as careers go, I do not remember much of the [*inaudible*] advice that she gave me. And I think that there were gaps in what I could have used and in knowledge I could have valued.

AR – There was sort of a generational difference, in a way, from her experience.

DB – Such a generational difference. She was near to retirement when I studied with her.

AR – So, tell me about the evolution of your research during your doctoral work.

DB – Really, a lot of accidents. I fell into this. I was interested in how children connect with each other and how they understand each other. I ended up doing a doctoral dissertation in which I followed around little preschoolers to see when they were alone and when they approached another child and maybe fell into discussion or shared play without speaking. I was interested in how kids connect basically, which I think is a continuous theme in my research, looking at social networks and supports and these issues. But I did this highly theoretical piece of research that did not have much immediate applicability, [which] was interesting to me at the time. I thought that I would go on to do a post doc and there was someone, actually, at B.U. at the time, who had video tapes of slightly younger children and their social interactions. So I applied to UNICEF, basically, I think, to watch videos in a darkened room for two years and on a post doc. But I was also committed to stay there because of a man that I married, just as I finished my doctoral degree.

{9:48}

So, I also looked around for what there was locally and I fell into the arms of this magnificent stress and families project that was directed by Marcia Guttentag, a woman that I had never heard of before. She was at the education school and she also had an affiliation at University of Massachusetts Boston. I found this by pure accident. She was starting up this new project with funding from the National Institute of Mental Health. She had to hire staff and I think because I had done observational research, and her proposal included an observational component of mothers and children, or for whatever reason, she hired me as the project director. It was such an incredibly exciting project. And that was the beginning of my career, everything before is a prologue. This was a very exciting time.

And NIMH should have gotten feminist. They realized that they had not been studying women and knew so little about women. There was certainly a push to do something to expand their knowledge. They had come to Marcia Guttentag, who was not well known at this point. Students had never heard of her, but she was a major figure at the time. [NIMH] came to her to review the literature on women's mental health and she came back saying that a lot of studies had shown that depression is a particular problem for women and that, among women, the group at highest risk are low income mothers with young children. Then they said, "Well, why don't you do some research to figure out why this group represents such high risk and what we could do both in treatment but also in prevention?" [It was a] much more optimistic, much more politically engaged time, where the results of this research were expected to affect the legislation on things, like the food stamp program or aid to families with dependent children. She had set up a national advisory group for this study, which was chaired by a woman who was a twenty year senior staffer on the U.S. Senate Committee on Labor and Human Resources. And, even better, she was married to the senator and chair of the committee. So, we had an in and there were lunches in the Senate dining room to discuss this one little project. Well, it was not so little; it was over a million dollars in those days, the seventies.

It was initially funded and this was the proposal that Marcia Guttentag had written, to study hundreds of women in two sites in Washington, D.C. and Boston. We, her staff, got started with this and we said to her [that] we did not know; we could not write the brief questionnaire to give to these, I think it was, 480 women or 640 women, because we did not know what the questions were. We knew what the demographic group was and what we thought we really needed to do

was an intensive interview and observational study of a small group of women that we could really get to know well and inductively figure out what the issues were. Marcia took this back to the National Institute of Mental Health, which said, "Fine, keep the million plus dollars and study 24 women." We got it eventually to 43 women and we did do, later, a questionnaire study with a larger number, only in Boston, and it was never quite the numbers we had planned. But the major work clearly was that first study, which has been well cited and, I think, has been influential in its own way.

So, it was a tremendously exciting time. Mostly the rest of the staff were graduate students. I was three months out of my doctorate and there were a few other more senior people around. We figured out what the issues were and we figured out what we wanted to study. Certainly, we wanted to look at women's social networks. We wanted to look at their experiences at work and their childhoods, their life events, life conditions, and their nutrition. We had a wonderful young black woman in the group who was a student of nutrition she insisted that we had to [inaudible] (14:43). So, we built this wonderful set of interviews.

AR – So, it was a multidisciplinary group?

DB – Multidisciplinary; there was a large group of us from developmental psychology, with a heavy influence from the cross-cultural. Then we had people from sociology and social psychology and public health; the nutrition person. So, we had some breadth of disciplines. We were all women. Many of us, like me, were childless and some had children. We had an age range difference in the staff of probably fifteen years. A couple of us have grown up poor and a couple of us were black. Those were tremendously important variations. Although, superficially, I was in charge, we developed, very early on, this totally consensus-driven style of operation. We would meet in the morning, I think, on Tuesdays at 10. I probably misremember the details, but we would break for lunch at 3 because we just could not solve the thing. And I used to say that my chief obligation as director of the project was to shoo people out of the building when it got late because people would stay and work. There was tremendous excitement about doing this. We really thought that we were, we promised the women we worked with, that what we did would not simply end up as a book on a shelf, but that we would recommend policy changes that would lead to improvements in their lives and [those of] their children and other families like them.

And then, of course, the conclusion of the study was very distressing because Ronald Reagan was elected and it was the end of an era in NIMH. That was the beginning of the diagnosis driven period in which it was actually the rule, or effectively the rule, that if your grant proposal had the word 'social' in it, it could not be funded. And, simultaneously, an unrelated tragedy, you probably have never heard of a minor political scandal of that era called Abscam. It was a scandal in which people presented themselves as wealthy Arabs who wanted legislation and were willing pay for it, bribing congressmen and senators. They got tape recorded interviews, sort of a sting operation, and they caught up in this several members of the house representatives and one senator, who was our senator.

AR – Oh no, so your tie in was severed.

DB – So, our tie in was totally lost.

AR – Oh how disappointing!

DB – I think... I do not know what would have happened, anyway, with the Reagan assault on everything. So, we had thought optimistically what was obvious, and other people have said, that a lot of these women would be happy to leave welfare if they could have health insurance, which they could not get in any job that they could get; if they could earn a larger salary; if they had decent affordable childcare. And we really hoped that there would be legislation building on commonsense ideas like that, as well as ideas about outreach and treatment for depression in this population. But, instead of that, we saw resisting programs, [inaudible], outright destroyed, and the beginning of an era in which the issue was not poverty; the issue was welfare. Somehow, that was the problem. And you have to simply embellish the program. So, it was a very sad conclusion to what has been such an exciting several years of work. And it was the period in which each of us had responsibility for a different subset of areas. My content area focused on women's social networks and supports.

AR – I was going to ask you, yes, how about that? What did you find about social networks?

DB – Well, we had gone into the study thinking that... there was a phrase, “social support networks” and there was the notion that networks are protective and they are this sort of magical protective shield.

AR – Like a buffer?

DB – You can have this onslaught of negative events and conditions, but if you have the right supports, you are golden and nothing bad will happen. Happily, we disentangled the concepts of social support, which is the resources you get, and social network, which are the people, the cast of characters. And what we found was that women who had larger, local, active social networks got more social support resources. They more often had a confidant. They more often got help with daily tasks, including childcare. And, in turn, the women who had more social support resources, more reliably had a confidant, more frequently had help with child care and tasks of daily living, those women were much less likely to be depressed or to have fewer depressive symptoms. But, having a large, local, active social network also meant that you were at risk of having negative things happen to you because of your network, being stressed vicariously because your network members are suffering.

We had envisioned, naively, as we started that a network is about people giving you things. It is also, of course, about people that you give things to. Many women in our study, particularly being poor, were supporting and providing for a lot more people than were providing for them. Subsequent research, by friends, shows that the ratio of how much good, how much help, you get out of a network versus how much cost there is to a network – and there is always going to be a potential for rewards and costs – the cost-benefit ratio is worse for women who have less money. That is, the less money you have, the higher the costs of your network and the smaller the rewards. And it works the same [way] for education. So, rather than being the magic panacea, what we ended up recommending or concluding was that many times, yes, networks absolutely save women's lives – literally. But, they often are extremely costly and many women prefer isolation to the cost that they would otherwise pay. If you want to improve women's networks so that the networks can benefit the women, give those women more money and more education. The notion that you can apply principles that you have discovered from studying middle-class people to the networks of poor people is quite misguided. And subsequent research, as I have followed it, absolutely concurs with that fundamental conclusion; you have got to look at the costs as well as the benefits of the network involvement.

AR – I know that you, yourself, went out and did some of the interviews. What was that experience like?

DB – Earth changing, life changing. We had a research team. Every team had a child person and a mother person. The mother person did more of the interviews with the mother while the child person interviewed the mother once, interviewed the children, and then did a string of behavior observations in the home without conversations, preceded and followed by conversations, but observations were meant to be nonparticipant observations. The whole thing was a totally powerful experience to me. I was the child person, so I went with my peer, who was the young woman that I just mentioned, the nutritionist who was a black woman. [She] had grown up in segregated schools where they used the textbooks the white schools had finished with and white people set their dogs on her sometimes while she was on the way to school.

So, one of our respondents was a black woman and Holly did a wonderful set of interviews with her and I think helped facilitate my connection with her. It was exciting! [In] our first visit to that family, which was one of the very first in the entire study, we were met, not only by our respondent, but by a member of the South End Boston Research Review Committee. Because the South End had been burned, poor families had been studied in the past by researchers who had come back [with] all these deficits, problems, and flaws in these people. So, I was cross-examined by a member of that committee who wanted to know that this study would not rip off the community and come back saying...and we had a very good conversation and we were allowed to proceed. We had done some other groundwork in the community, but our respondent knew this person and brought this person along. So that was certainly an exciting [experience].

{24:23}

AR – That is exciting, yes.

DB – And I have written about my two respondents. There is one paper where I talk about them both. My other respondent was a much more privileged and white woman who was superficially sharing a demographic category, in that they both had three young children; they both had low incomes; and both [were] legally single women. Their lives could hardly be more different and so the whole thing opened my eyes to the diversity concealed behind the word “poverty.” [It] also opened my eyes, very much, to white privilege and to so many things that are associated [with] being white in this society.

It was a very moving experience. I felt for my adult respondent. I very much felt for her daughter I followed around. In this family the mother was quite depressed, very high levels of depressive symptoms, and there were very pointed exchanges. One, I remember, when her daughter fell while I was observing her on the playground and skinned her knee. She was with a girlfriend and a slightly older girl and they went back inside and the mother never looked at her daughter in this conversation. The older girl was saying, “She skinned her knee. We need a band-aid,” or something and the girl very gently helped wash it off and put the band-aid on. But, the mother was so depressed that she could not connect. Not always was she that way, but one of the messages that I took away was that just about the worst thing that could happen to a child, I think, is to have a parent become depressed because it was just excruciating to watch a child whose mother did not connect, did not look at her, did not respond. We found, statistically, that the more depressive symptoms the mothers had, the more they were unlikely to respond to the child’s overture. As well as that, when they did connect with children, it was much less often around nurturing the child in any way and much more often about conveying rules and regulations and “get your feet off the sofa” and that sort of thing. Then, to talk with the mothers,

of course, mothers told us that just about the hardest thing to do when you are depressed is to connect with your children, certainly in a positive way. It is just very painful, all around, to see.

AR – Yes, so many questions about this study. But, let me step back maybe a few years earlier, even. You were studying for your doctorate in the seventies, right? I think your CV said that you got your doctorate in '76. And you have alluded, in the interview, to the fact that there was a lot of political turmoil going on from the late 60s into the 70s. Certainly Vietnam, gay rights, women's liberation was part of that whole political and cultural backdrop. What was your connection with any of that?

DB – I was so much less political then than I am now and I am not quite sure why. I think, and it's funny, I think in my college years and my graduate school years was the appearance, and maybe this is appropriate, of sort of the greatest doubt about myself and whether I had the correct understanding of issues. I remember in college there was some event that I was invited to as, not quite as a student leader, but a student that they invited. And it was being picketed because the person was associated with the Johnson administration and I really did not know which way to go. I felt tormented and I did go on some antiwar marches, but I was not a leader. I did not go to meetings and figure out what to do next. I was upset about it, but not involved with it. I was not involved with the women's movement on a national, political level. I think I was much more concerned about career opportunities for women in graduate school and whether we were being treated seriously by the faculty. I know another faculty member, whom I adored, and who was just a wonderful, wonderful man who died recently, Sheldon White. I remember a conversation with him – he was spectacular in every way – but I remember a conversation that stuck out to me at the time, we must have been talking about this issue about women going on

{29:41}

and women in graduate school and he said, "Well, you know, the last student that I worked with and trained dropped out, too. She is not going on and I have to wonder to what extent women are going to take advantage of this education," and, "can you invest in them as much as you can in male students?" That was a revealing conversation. So, I was interested in issues like that. I think to gay rights I would have been sympathetic, I am sure, but I think they were sort of off my radar [because] I do not remember engaging with that issue [and] certainly there was no formal engagement with that issue. And then I think that this study of poor women was my thing. So, when people criticize the women's movement as a white middle class movement, it is so contrary to my own experience, where my first deep involvement, beginning in 1986, was with a multi-racial movement about poor women. And it seemed to me, that feminists, as I mentioned elsewhere, were very sympathetic and very concerned with poor women and with women of color. So, I can appreciate the criticism and I am aware that I am not tuned into all the strands and I have read some of the history, but my own involvement began with a focus on race and a focus on class and economic opportunity. And that, to me, is part and parcel. I do not think it makes the slightest sense to be a feminist who is... and I would say that there are strands of feminism that I find myself uninterested in because they do not pay sufficient attention to these issues. I made the decision early on that my passion then and was going to be poor women and there were exciting things going on at the time about professional women and career opportunities. I think that is a very important issue and, ironically, this is the issue I am now working on: women in the sciences and engineering. But, at the time, it felt to me that the greater urgency or my greater interest was around the issue of poor women.

AR – Well, tell me your views on how it has actually played out, the issue of how psychologists have dealt with issues like class. For example, you come from a background where it was deeply

central to what you did as a psychologist from early on, but there has been, in fact, some criticism from people outside psychology, so, people in the broader women's studies fields, who do not see psychologists as having engaged with those kinds of issues adequately or have not theorized them in the same way as people outside of psychology have. What is your perspective on that?

DB – I agree with the critique. I do not understand why there has been so little attention. And I have a sort of career niche in being one of the few psychologists that attend to those kinds of issues, which is why I get invited when people want to talk about social class. It should be a provocative concern, just as the great revelation that you cannot simply take theories that you have developed about men and apply them to women or the treatment forms that you have developed. In fact, if you study women, you will probably learn some things that are very interesting and useful when you go back to thinking about men again. So that seems to me such an obvious piece of knowledge [that] we have gained, but we seem to forget that frequently. Then, if you have that piece of knowledge and understanding, how can you not extend this? And I think, maybe, there has been a better job done on race and ethnicity and immigration status, although I think these are still tangential, peripheral, to psychology.

We happen to live in a nation, which is unique and fascinating for the bizarre extremity of our class divides. This should be central, I think, just as we discovered that being white is not nothing, being white is highly significant, being male is very significant, being female, being of upper-middle class, or living in a historical era of rapidly widening gaps between the rich and middle class, poor. I think these things are central to psychology. There are little bits of exciting work that is being done where people study how if you just bring money into the conversation people become more self-interested in later game playing. But, I think there is a whole world here of work to be done and it seems to me surprising that it has been kept so peripheral.

{34:50}

There is an APA group of psychologists that [inaudible] the social class network, or SES network or something like this, and the two events that I am involved with in APA this year are ones that they have highlighted. And one of them is a panel about how can we enrich psychology by attending to socioeconomic class issues. So, I think, by all means, this is needed in the field both for adequate theory [and] for adequate treatment. I reviewed a study, which I do not think has been published yet, that suggests that clinicians who attend to these issues do better and not just for poor people. I think so much of human psychology has to do with how we rank ourselves, how we see ourselves in relation to our peers, anxieties we have about status and money. So, there should be so much more of it.

AR – Well, I know that within APA some of the voices of late for inclusion of class and psychological research and teaching have been Bernice Lott and her colleague, Heather Bullock. I know that they have really been trying to bring that home, at least to the APA representatives, if that represents psychology, which, of course, it does not, but I know they have been very vocal about...

DB – They are the people who organized the symposium and the network that I have been speaking incoherently about.

AR – Yes, that is great. So, let me get back to your career trajectory. You worked with Marcia Guttentag on the work and stress project and then, when that ended, where did you go next in terms of your own career?

DB – As you know Marcia died early in the fieldwork. So, I stayed at the ed school for six years working on that project and its sequelae. Then I came to Boston University. I was hired as an assistant professor, hired as a social psychologist, although my training was in human development. I tell my students that when I arrived there I would be asked, “what do you study?” and I would say, “Well, I study social stress, social support, and social networks” and people would say to me, “Well, that does not sound like social psychology.” Now those topics have been integrated to some extent and you find them in my textbook, but, in those days, those topics were mostly studied by people in public health, sociologists and anthropologists. So, it was just the period when they were making their way into the field of psychology.

So, I was hired as a social psychologist. I have never taught developmental psychology; I have always taught social psychology and the psychology of women and psychology of the family and so forth. Because shortly after I arrived, I guess, I became aware of an opportunity that the WHIM TEAM Grant Foundation was offering. They were offering an early career, five year, fellowship, which gave you release from teaching one semester of the year and an invitation to their wonderful annual meetings with your peers and with senior people in the field. Stress [was] broadly defined and they brought in people from medicine and anthropology and all kinds of wonderful diversity with a focus on children and adolescents. So, I applied for such a thing to study stress and coping and particularly social support issues. The population that I picked was children who are unsupervised after school because their parents were employed. So, then I got drawn into the study of children. I mean, I was interested in the study of children, but I had been studying mothers and my focus had been on the social networks of mothers, so this moved my focus to the social networks of children. And I organized an SRCD study group on children’s social networks and supports and got a little NIMH funding there, but mostly the WHIM TEAM Grant Foundation. I do not know if I quite knew this at the time because I remember reading this and being surprised to read an oral history or discussion of that program, that the WHIM TEAM Foundation created the program because of Ronald Reagan, because of the destruction of so much research funding on the federal level for these kinds of topics.

AR – So they were trying to pick up some of that slack.

DB – They did not want to lose a generation. So, I was rescued, in a way, by the WHIM TEAM Grant Foundation and given this wonderful opportunity. [It was] also a wonderful childrearing opportunity; I had come to B.U. with a baby, with a few weeks old baby. And I should mention this for your historical purposes, too, that it was a wonderful year. I had him with me the entire time. I interviewed pregnant. I did not tell anybody, but then when I had been offered the job, I confessed to Abby Stewart, [whom] you must have interviewed.

AR – Oh, I have not yet. But, I know her and will.

DB – Abby, Abby, such a glorious figure. And she was at that point the associate chair of my department. So, I confessed that I was pregnant and was going to have a baby over the summer and she said, “Ha! That is wonderful! Do you need a crib?” That was her response! Her son was outgrowing his crib. When I arrived for my first day, there was a playpen crib set up in the office with some little outfits there from Abby. I was under the impression that many people, including Abby, had had their children there full time. But it turns out, afterwards, I was the first. I had him there everyday. Because it was my first year I only had to teach one course a semester. For those few hours there were some wonderful students who watched him, would never let me pay them, and I just had Daniel with me everywhere. Then when I got the Grant Foundation money, I immediately got pregnant and had my second child so that this five-year fellowship that I had, I

was doing research but on my own schedule, not teaching half of each year. It was very, very nice.

AR – Wow, so that is how you managed to combine these things.

DB – And my late husband was superb, a tremendously and unusually involved father. So, when I got home, exhausted, that first year, I'd kind of throw Daniel to him and collapse. And it was good.

AR – Well, what a godsend to have Abby Stewart there.

DB – Abby was incredible and she formed around her a group that was wonderfully supportive to all of us and she sustained that group. Then, of course, she was wooed away by the University of Michigan, driven away by John Silber, our president. It took me years to realize what I had lost, which was not only Abby – it was tremendous wonderful influence – but the support systems that she had created and the social networks that she had produced. When I arrived at the department, I felt almost like a superstar; I was coming from Harvard; I had big federal money; I was much published; the work was talked about; and I felt my career was in high gear. I felt I was much respected in the department. And the department, at the time, was unusual because this was 1982, about a third of the faculty were women and I am quite sure that many of the most respected faculty were women. So, it was really a wonderful opportunity to be there.

What was not wonderful was being in a university that was run by John Silber. But it, for many years, was just a [inaudible] to me against the awfulness of the Silber administration. Then, when Abby left, many things deteriorated and even the people that had been part of our circle, I kind of drifted apart from. The psychology department eventually had three buildings instead of one, so that all the clinicians, for instance, are half a mile away or a third of a mile away, so I did not see them naturally. You had to make special efforts [because] you didn't share the facilities together. And I think that the administrations that came into the department had very little respect for the kind of work that I was doing. So I think my career was slowing down for all of these reasons and I was feeling not particularly valued, not particularly connected, and not particularly inspired.

{44:36}

Then we had a whole series of personal family difficulties. Starting with my mildly bad breast cancer, six months later my husband was diagnosed with Lou Gehrig's disease (ALS), and then our younger son with a benign, but immense tumor in the sinus cavities that had to be removed with a gruesome surgery. Anyways, we had a very difficult period and my husband died. I think, at that point, my priorities were very far elsewhere from the research. So, I did little bits and pieces, but not very much. And then, and this is a feminist story too, John Silber had retired, but we had his fully appointed clone to run the university and then there was this ridiculous hiring of someone that then they fired before he started. These are all wonderful stories, but they are long stories. What happened was that they hired a man who had run NASA and he was temperamentally a match with John Silber, who had hand picked him; [he had] bouts of furious anger, harassing employee subordinates, short attention span, micromanaging, control freak, so it would have been quit a disaster to have him arrive as our new president. Happily he went on the record after the regalia were ordered and really the inauguration was a few weeks away. He was quoted in one of the papers saying that now that he would be taking over as president John Silber would not be making the decisions anymore or something like this. He was fired and he was given a million dollars, a million point seven dollars, or something to basically get out of the

way. It turned out, afterwards, that he was not planning on moving to Boston. He lived in California and his wife was in California, [so] he was going to commute every week or something, insanity! It was so embarrassing and humiliating that many of the members of the board of trustees who had okayed this hiring decision resigned in humiliation.

Some new members came on and they did a new search. They had hired Bob Brown who had been at MIT when women's issues emerged there as a major issue and he was thought of as a good guy by people who were there at the time. Ironically, of course, one of the things he had done at MIT was to put in place so many incentives to hire women that in many circumstances it was difficult to hire men. When they searched for a new president, of course, they hired a woman and he did not get his dream job. This is my [inaudible] on the situation. But, anyway, they put him on the labor market and we hired him.

So, he arrived and one of the first things he did was okay the making public of our salaries, not with names attached. John Silber, for twenty-five years, had refused to release salary data to the American Association of University Professors. When the data were revealed, in almost every university, men made more than women, but at Boston University, the ratio was particularly appalling. We were just almost off the charts. In many departments – you could not see department by department because there were not enough women to make the comparison... They would not release the department level data unless there were three or five people, I think, of the same gender and rank. But, the psychology department had 6 full professor women, of which I am one, and six full professor men, so the comparison could be made. On the day they were released, the full professor women earned fifty-seven percent of what the full professor men earned. So this caught my attention and it also caught my attention that my salary was the very lowest of this group. I think probably not coincidentally my having been involved in women's issues. It was sort of presumed that one would be punished for assigning a book called, "Feminism and Methodology" or something like that. So, I threw myself in everything that had to do with women and, at that time, one viable organization we had was a new organization started by young women, the B.U. Women in Science and Engineering. First they had only invited half of us in the psychology department to do natural science kinds of research. Then they thought it was awkward and invited the whole psychology department.

{49:45}

When I discovered this organization I got very excited. They were working on a lot of the issues that I was interested in. I threw myself into that and I think for the subsequent year I was made the chair of that organization. I was also invited by President Brown to a dinner, along with others, to talk about the gender and ethnic issues because we also had an appalling record on racial issues. Then he formed a council on faculty equity, diversity, and inclusion and I was on that. So, for the next several years, for the last two years, my passion and activity has been around women in science and engineering and women's issues, generally, at the university.

So, having done poor women early in my career, now I've focused on the issues and am fascinated with the issues for professional women. And I find in many cases [that] they are the same issues; they are issues of disrespect; they are issues of lack of resources; they are issues of problematic networks. So, I wrote a grand proposal to the National Science Foundation, which was funded. We are just starting September 1st to do this work on women in relationships, building community, and gaining voice. So, I have been very excited. For the last two years, I have been reading about the history of women in the sciences and about research for which Abby Stewart, of course, is the leading national figure at this point. And I am so touched and pleased to see some of the old research cited because one of the things that has saddened me is that many of

the important early works, seems to me, have fallen out of awareness. And one place where they have resurfaced is this literature on women and science. So, interesting things, interesting studies.

AR – What are some examples of what you would see as those important early works?

DB – Well, Jean Baker Miller and [her work is] being cited in studies of women's relationship and men's relationships. And someone that I worked with when she was affiliated with the stress and families project, she was a graduate student, at the time, and I was on her dissertation committee, Dana Jack. She did wonderful stuff on voice, which comes out of Jean Baker Miller and Carol Gilligan. And to find, in one of Abby's papers on women and science, that one of the key issues is voice and, even in situations which women perceive as unfair and biased against them, if they feel like they have a voice, they are not particularly demoralized and they are still in pretty good shape. So, these were issues that we have incorporated in our research as well. Also, of course, the network stuff, the notion of networks and the support that comes or does not come from networks, turns out to be a very big issue these days in women and science and engineering.

The current crop of proposals that was funded in the realm that we were funded in is heavy on looking at networks. It is part of the way of saying that the women are not broken, there is nothing wrong with the women. Let's look at the circumstances in which the women find themselves, both within their departments where, in the sciences and engineering, women are quite likely to be very isolated, both numerically as a woman and simply just not connected with other people on a comfortable social level. Or, if you look at their broader professional networks and people who I know in other universities who could advance their career by sharing information and alerting them to opportunities and recommending them, writing strong support letters for tenure, they also tend to have inferior networks compared to comparable men. Again, those networks are easier to form if you are male. You know, it is what Sheldon White said, if your male supervisor knows more people and connects you to them, there is a greater ease of connection. So, what we are going to be doing for the next three years with this NSF is a number of things, but a lot of what they have in common is that they are trying to build women's networks and help these networks be more productive.

AR – I am so curious about it because, as you say, it has such a long history. I am curious about the role, in what you have read in what you are doing now with this project, [whether] there is a role, [whether] you see a place for feminism in all of this?

{54:50}

The reason I ask that is, one of the ways professional women in psychology really created a sea of change in terms of numbers and representations was, to my mind, the feminist organizing of the early seventies. For the first time, women came together in large groups and said, "the problem is not just me. It is not that I am inadequate. It is just that the system is set up to disadvantage me because of these reasons." And when groups of women got together under the banner of feminist and collective action, there started to be a big change. We do not have that anymore in the same way as we had in the seventies. So, when you talk about networks and creating networks for women, what would bring women together, at this point, in networks? Or, are you talking about networks that transcend gender, professional networks, be they with men or women? Part of the back-story of this question is that I think that feminism can still be used that way, but it would have to be used very differently than second wave feminism. Part of the reason for this website, is to try and get people connected to feminist psychology, whatever that means

for them, [and] to have access to feminist women, but that requires some kind of an ideological connection to feminism that not all women, and maybe not even most professional women, have nowadays. So, I guess, what I am curious about is your reading of the literature and your involvement in this project now; what do you see as the way, the vehicle, through which you can create networks for women? And is gender the issue or is it bigger or broader than that or less ideological than feminism? Do you see a role for feminism in there? I guess these are just questions; I do not know where you want to jump in there.

DB – Well, to go back to one of the earlier things you were saying there about the different kinds of networks, I think you would need different kinds of solutions for the problems, but I do think that one of the key issues in science, let me talk about that group, is that they tend often to be numerically isolated in the department and some of their research interests might be somewhat different. The danger is that the woman will, and it is feminist tradition, blame herself and see herself as relatively incompetent and will not correctly diagnose the structural difficulties she is facing. So, what we have done at BU is, and this is all of the comparable organizations, these are not our unique, individual discoveries, but we have monthly or so luncheons, which we call “Lunches with Leaders.” I think we are ripping off University of Washington there, a term and idea that they use.

We invite women in the sciences and engineering, somewhat broadly defined, to come and have an informal lunch and meet with someone who has had a significant career in the sciences or engineering or is a leader in academia or some other realm. We invite the woman to talk very formally about her life and career trajectory, briefly, and give us whatever tips and pointers she would offer for women who would like to also have successful careers and maybe think about leadership roles, chairing department, or something. Then we have a general discussion in which ideas are arranged. The subtext, of course, is, ‘We are in this together; we are facing common problems; gee that happened to me too...well, what did you do?’ And we are also getting to know each other, so the next time I say, “Oh! I am having this problem with my program administrator in my department; what is happening in your department? Are you having this problem?” We need each other.

When I was feeling very demoralized for that period in recent years, I thought about retiring. I have remarried and I have a wonderful husband who is somewhat older and is free to run around and we can do that. Then I thought, “If I had a retirement party, who would come?” I had such a tiny network at B.U. and more people, actually, that I thought quite negatively about. But, sort of eyeing my own best-case example, I have reinvigorated networks.

{59:47}

When we six full professor women in the psychology department realized how poorly paid we were, it was a tremendous bonding experience. We continue to have lunches whenever we can find the time we can all get together. This has revived friendships and really created new friendships that did not exist for me before. And there are now people who have an array of skills that I can go to about the stupid things that would have hung me up before because I did not have anybody. So, these are strengthening relationships with women and these are helping us diagnose, “Well, maybe this is just my problem or maybe there is some systemic thing going on, or maybe we could even help resolve this together.” So, [today] I am going to be writing a letter in support of the tenure of a woman and the implication behind my letter is [that] there are many others of us who think that [inaudible], so maybe you should reconsider this decision. So, the goal here, these are the old feminist goals, of diagnosing the situation, recognizing the role of the

context, building political power and strength, building joy in one's life and in the relationships that one has; I think that these are all the old feminism and a lot of this is with women.

We are also broadening out. We have also considered that we have the responsibility to change the intellectual climate on the campus by having speakers that will bring awareness of some of these issues to other, including men. And a lot of the programs that we are funded to do now by NSF are consciously, we made this decision, some of them are focused only on women in the sciences and engineering, so only they can apply for this or get that, but many are open. We are going to have pre-tenure mentoring for everyone and we are going to have welcoming receptions for everyone. In fact, that was the thing we did for the first time last year. I did an interview study of women here, [at] B.U., some whom were here and some of whom left in disgust, and one of the things that has come up again and again has been [that] there was no welcome, many women remembered no welcome. So we said, "we have got to have welcome receptions." We started welcome receptions.

AR – Got to change the culture...

DB – But then people said that there is also a male that had been hired this year, so we said, "invite him too." So, we are having welcome receptions for all. The goal here is that some women's problems can be...

CD1 ENDED
CD2 STARTED

DB – For these new programs, some of which are gender blind and discipline blind, we are going to invite humanists and social scientists and so forth, and build a network. The other role that I have been asked to take on, starting September 1st, or whenever the semester starts, I am the new acting director of the new women's studies program at B.U.. The current director was on sabbatical for a year and he was so much in the dark ages as far as many things that, of course, that women's studies program has been...

AR – Decimated...

DB – Strangled and kept very tiny. But, we have a new woman feminist dean in the college of arts and sciences. We have a lot of key figures popping out around campus, a lot of them women, and it is clear that the program is going to develop and enlarge. My charge from the dean is to do for the women's studies program what I have been trying to do for the women in science and engineering: build community, get to know who people are, people who would not have affiliated with the formal program because it was such a kiss of death, but who are doing wonderful work and should know each other and be excited to connect with each other. So, my mission, as I have redefined it, is [that] I am building networks as my mission for the year for women's studies, too.

1:35

AR – You are taking the subject of your research over the years and actually now applying it in your immediate community. That is wild! Let me, I am skipping around a bit now, but I am really curious about your thoughts about methodology. You have alluded to all of these interview based studies and you have written about research methods and qualitative methods. I am curious to know how that has evolved in your own work. What do you see as the value of qualitative

methods? How do you see their role and status in psychology? Maybe you could talk about how you have used them, what you see is their role, and so on.

DB – I love qualitative methods. When I think about studies that I love and that I have learned from, my own and other people's – I mean, there are definitely quantitative studies. One just published in science which shows that if you look at statistics of how well high school girls, I think, eighth grade girls and boys do on mathematics tests, in many countries around the world, in most, but not all countries, boys do better. In Iceland, girls do better and dominate the top one percent. Take that Steven Pinker and Iris Sommer! But, they also looked simultaneously at a couple of variables about women's status in those societies, some of which was how much are women paid and some were attitudinal that were asked to the general population. [For instance], "if jobs are scarce, do you think that men should have first dibs on those jobs?" So countries, of course, differ very much on these variables, as well, and they are gorgeously correlated with women's math scores. If Singapore looked like Iceland in terms of the attitudes, the roles, and the rights of women in those places, Singapore girls would score like Icelandic girls. So, there is tremendous place for exquisite quantitative research and I love it.

A lot of the studies that I have learned the most from, or many, have been qualitative. I think my favorite technique is really participant observation. I think of my favorite studies of all times [are] Elliot Liebow's "Tally's Corner" and Carla Stack's "All our Kin," studies that really give you a sense of how life is lived. Robert Wise, whose research I adored, I think it was Bob Wise, who said, "Ask me no questions; I will tell you no lies." Even interviewing, because you are getting people to frame and make it sound nice, you are intervening. Being with them, hanging out, I think the moments when I was walking around the housing project with my respondent, meeting her neighbors, those were some of the most illuminating moments for me.

I think there are issues of when and where you do – what is the state of knowledge? The reason that we did the qualitative, not entirely qualitative, but partially qualitative, study on poor women and depression was that there had been quantitative studies that isolated this population. But from there, where do you go? How do you then write a first choice questionnaire? I think we were correct to say that the state of knowledge does not allow us to write a good first choice questionnaire. What we really need is some in depth groundwork, that earlier phase. And I, of course, am bothered that there is not more respect for qualitative research, that it is very difficult to publish, and that this first step is just missing from so many research endeavors and from the training of so many students. So, I think that is a shame.

And, of course, qualitative research varies enormously and I think, just as you need an exquisite methodologist to design an exquisite quantitative study, you need a really special person to carry out qualitative research that is illuminating. And there is bad stuff out there. I assigned my students one paper, which actually I would like to have loved, written by a black man tackling the issue of why in poor neighborhoods some kids are dropping out of school and predictably getting pregnant, having babies when they are not married. And it is qualitative. There are all these long interview segments that he gets from his respondents and the paper just nagged at me and nagged at me because I felt that it presented a horrifying vision of these young people. It talked about baby clubs in which young girls are showing off their babies in pretty clothes and that they actually try to sleep with handsome guys because then their babies would be prettier.

{7:26}

It just presented them as utterly materialistic and soulless and awful, awful people that you would never want to meet. And I thought, "could this be true?" And then I went back and looked

over the paper and every single quotation that he gives you is not by someone who has had a baby, [but] by the upstanding young women in the neighborhood who look down upon these other girls and are telling you about this. So, you have there the illusion that you have been brought into understanding. It has all the trappings of a qualitative study and, yet, all you have got is more external observers keeping scorn and contempt on these people and I think probably quite unfairly so. Just as we discovered, what, a decade later, that these black boys that were accused of raping and nearly killing that central park jogger never did it; it was someone else entirely. But, you have these horrifying images of very poor people that stick in your mind and I think that paper is a net-loss for society because it plants very firmly these very horrible images and gives you the notion that you have somehow understood the interior workings. I do not think you do. So, I think qualitative methodology can be abused [and] I think quantitative methodology has its limitations.

AR – It is something that still is an issue. In what way has it affected your career, the fact that you have done qualitative work in psychology?

DB – I am sure it has not benefited it. When I was a Grant Foundation faculty scholar ,they called us. We had an annual meeting and they always had several external experts in the field who were asked to give talks about things. And, one was asked a question that I think was more like, “What do you think would be the exciting issues in the future?” But he answered instead with fundamental career advice, which no one had ever given me. And he said, we were pre-tenure people, and he said, “Do not write chapters; do not do longitudinal research; and do not edit books,” and I forget what else. Every single thing he said not to do, I was doing. I just have always done what I wanted to do and it often has been clearly the less effective in the career building sense. But, I have had the career I wanted, in a way, and the stretches of it when I made those decisions were stretches that I was quite happy with.

But, sure, I think another piece of advice was, “Do not do qualitative research. You cannot publish it and it takes so long,” and that is reasonable. I think being involved with these women in science issues... I realize also, that my own experience, in going through tenure and worrying about my career in its earlier stage, that life today is so much more difficult and tenure is so much more difficult. The bar has been raised at B.U. and many other places and the difficulty of getting federal money has heightened. So, I feel often just inadequate and I would not advise younger people about these sorts of things because I feel that my own experience is increasingly irrelevant to a younger person. But I do know that I have an official mentor relationship. I am mentoring a current Grant Foundation scholar. We then had mentors and they now have mentors and I am now a mentor, who does qualitative research, gorgeous qualitative research. You know, she struggles and she does get things published. Sometimes reviews have just broken my heart. I mean, I have been a reviewer on a paper and, I thought “Wow!” I remember writing back and saying, “this is just so superb and I cannot wait to see this published,” and, “you have really revolutionized the way we think about such and such,” and the other reviewers were totally negative and it was not published there. It was sent somewhere else and maybe eventually it was published. So, I think a lot of the work [that fully deserves to] is just not seeing the light of day or is coming out in much more obscure journals. Another thing that I did was, in the work that had to do with how kids are doing when their parents are working full time, I was invited to give a paper at a conference that was meant to then turn it into a book on parental monitoring, which is a slightly a different way of coming at this issue, but sort of, ‘how are parents keeping knowledgeable about what is going on in their kids’ lives?’

I was the only qualitative researcher and I think what we had to say added something very important. These other papers were good; they were quantitative, but I often find that a qualitative approach adds something and, given that it is so punishing to the career of the person who does it, typically the incentives are not there.

AR – Yes, you have to be committed.

DB – You have to be committed, yes.

AR – Well, I noticed on your CV that you also have been quite involved in community service over the years in different capacities. Can you tell me about the role of community service in your career?

DB – I have not been as involved as I wish I had been, but I have done some things. I was invited early on to join the board at the Elizabeth Stone House Organization, which I admire inordinately. They provide shelter for battered women, brief term, but their major program is in the longer term, for women, as I say, in emotional distress and their children. This could be women coming out of prison, or who had been homeless, or who had been abused, or who had mental health problems and may have been institutionalized. It is in a pure support model. The women live in the house and staff go home at five and the women are there with their children. They have some shared communal areas as well as private bedrooms. They have done so well over the years. Then they developed a follow up project, partly because women in the Boston market often could not save up enough in the period of their maximum stay, simply to have first and last month's rent to rent an apartment and partly because some women needed a longer period. So, they have a supported residency program elsewhere that you can stay for a longer period, the private space is a bit larger. They have won an award on the design of the building, which incorporates such sensible features. It is built around a courtyard and the kitchen windows overlook the courtyard so the kids can play outside. It is just great.

More recently, I got involved with a program in Cambridge, which tries to have women who are experiencing depression work on depression and, sort of, help each other. Also, with help from a law student on legal issues and a psychology student on psychology issues, [it helps them] move themselves to a better place and help each other and provide peer support and then provides mentoring support to newer women coming into the program after they have been there for a while. So, to the extent that I can offer any useful suggestions, I am very happy to be involved in that kind of thing. That is certainly what I envisioned – that our work would contribute to something effective that would help people.

AR – Let me ask now about some of your other organizational involvements. You have spoken a bit about your involvements at B.U. and about your community service. But, you talked earlier about the task force on women and depression, the APA task force, and the one that stood out to me in your CV was one that was late eighties, the one that you had listed on your CV, between eighty-seven and eighty-nine, and I am not sure which of those was the first one that you were involved in. but it does not really matter.

DB – No.

AR – Tell me about your involvement.

DB – Okay, I cannot remember the years, except to say that this more recent one must have been... I want to say it must have been around the year 2000, something like that.

AR – Okay, right, because the article then appeared in 2003.

{17:27}

DB – 2001, 2000, something like that. Oh, I can date this precisely. The second meeting was in the fall of 2000 and the earlier one was maybe fifteen years earlier. The first meeting I remember as quite wonderful and, I think, we met more than once. This was an APA task force starting to look at women and depression.

AR – Can you remember why at that point that task force was struck? Was there a person per se who was responsible?

DB – It was certainly started by the woman who was president of APA then and I remember her first name was Bonnie.

AR – Bonnie Strickland.

DB – Bonnie Strickland began that task force. And what the particular impetus was, I am not sure. But, certainly people had been aware – I mean, why the stress family project was started in the mid seventies – that depression was a mental health problem that women were particularly susceptible to and so there was certainly an appreciation of that. I think that there was exciting research being done on different fronts, so maybe that contributed, but I do not really remember. Anyway, what I do remember, is that the meeting was wonderful. There were women there who did all kinds of research on depression – from people like me who studied depressive symptoms, not the psychiatric diagnosis in community populations of poor women, to people who studied hormonal influences and things. So, we had people who looked at the biology, people who looked at the social context, and everything in between. And we worked on committees, wrote drafts, and I think produced really quite a nice report that brought all this material together.

I was excited when I was invited again to come, I think, to [inaudible] a very nice retreat area to work on a similar report, although it was not a series of meetings and I think that the goal was, in the second case, to come up with recommendations for funding priorities around women and depression and to produce a series of papers that could then be published, not as a volume, I think. I think the idea then was that the groups would be published in periodicals, but the second meeting was a stunning surprise to me after the first. There were a lot of people there, some people were the same people, but some were new. There were maybe three or four people from the group that were studying biological issues and the heritability of depression who were adamant that those contextual factors were irrelevant. And I do remember a particular discussion in which I pressed one of them on what then explains the variance that is not explained in her model by heritability and her response was measurement error. If I understood her correctly, what she was saying was that depression is fully explained by genetic inheritance and measurement error, so if it was measured inadequately. That was pretty stunning and [there were] serious arguments that almost breached typical decorum in their vehemence. It was not in two directions; it was only in the one direction. The contextual people were never claiming that the biology was irrelevant or less important than claimed, but we were also claiming that experiences of family violence and poverty and other social contextual issues were important.

I have wondered in the years since... I am not sure if I can take it as an indicator of the way lines have hardened over time and if the biologically oriented people have become more and more convinced – and some of them have – that there is nothing but the biology that is important, or,

whether, because we were fighting over recommendations for funding dollars that it was more vehement. I really do not know what the difference was, but it was quite a different experience. It was also somewhat disconcerting afterwards. We had produced papers for the meeting and a group of the papers, which I think had to do with contextual things, were submitted as a group initially, I think, to the journal of abnormal psychology, which rejected them instantly.

{22:07}

I think they were not sent out for review. It was simply, I think, the topics were seen. And we had really hoped that issues of poverty, of family violence, of discrimination would get out to a more mainstream audience. We eventually published the papers in the *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, which is fine, but that is reaching an audience that is half convinced of what you have to say, anyway. So, it was undoubtedly a disappointing experience to me.

AR – And so much for the bio-psycho-social model that we keep telling our students is really where it is at. It seems like the bio and the psycho, meaning individual intrapsychic model, appears to be gaining ever increasing strength in the social, at least in psychology, it tends to be.

DB – Yes, I have that feeling too.

AR – I am conscious that we should probably start wrapping up even though I feel like I could ask you a million more questions. But, you alluded to this earlier, would you have any particular advice to, I was going to say, women entering psychology? But, you have a bird's-eye view on other disciplines as well, given your involvement in women in science and engineering more generally. So, I guess I could rephrase my question or you could answer both of them. What advice would you give to women entering these fields and perhaps even to women who have feminist convictions, but may or may not know how to bring those to bear on their work in science or in psychology, any kind of advice or reflections?

DB – In sisterhood there is power, I would say. I think one thing would be to seek out like-minded allies. I think that academic careers, particularly for younger people these days, are often quite brutal. I think it is more difficult than it was in the era that I was trying to get tenure. And I think, therefore, that you need to make sure your networks are up to the task. I think that means that you need a group of like-minded peers that will support you. You need people who are in your corner. They are not going to know everything that you need, [so] you also need a bunch of senior mentors who are knowledgeable. And I think in a lot of what one does, one should keep in mind the importance of network building and that is important work to be done. Information flows differentially and if you put yourself in the stream to hear about these things and you can even start a list of the kind of supports that you know you are going to need.

I think if you were going to start a family, have children, while you are going up for tenure or at an early state in your career, marry a supportive man or partner, a supportive woman, who is going to take a real share of childcare responsibility. I think it is so terribly difficult if you do not do that. It is not enough to marry a wonderful guy who says, "Darling, whatever you want to do is fine. You can leave this job or you can stay with this job and I am happy with whatever you want to do." That is not the guy you want. You want the guy who says, "What can I do to make this possible for you, so we can both achieve the career we want, and we can raise our kids very well?" This new book, *Opting Out?*, I think is very good. *Opting Out* question mark, women are not opting out. They are forced out of fields, largely because they do not have partners who ask that second kind of question and because they hit such barriers of inflexibility on the job. I think that many universities, to be competitive, are becoming more supportive to family life. They are

making more of a serious effort to deal with what in women and science we call the “two body problem.” Maybe they call that, more generally, “my husband needs a job too.” And many universities will take that seriously and will take seriously stopping the tenure clock when you have children and give adequate maternity leave and childcare leave and to your spouse too if he is involved or she is involved in childcare. So, I think, be conscious of what some of the difficulties might be and it is worth giving up a lot of other things, maybe in salary, maybe in location, to get yourself into a department that is truly going to be supportive of you and of your family life if you want to have one.

{27:17}

And, I think, at the various points you do face decisions between doing what would be the most political thing to be successful in your career and something you have a passion about. One woman that I admire very much, that I can think of, I know devoted her pre-tenure years to research that she was not enamored of, establishing her credentials, and then has gone on to have an utterly glorious career in the field of her passion ever since. I think I sort of bumbled along, not knowing what a lot of the parameters were about what makes for a more successful career. But I have, when I was working, done and only done stuff that I wanted to do. So, I think that that works, too, if you are willing to accept that your promotion may be slower and your salary may be lower. So, I think just decide what you want and go for it passionately.

AR – I think that is good advice. Let me ask you your thoughts on the quote unquote feminization of psychology. What do you think, what impact may that have or might it not have on psychology as a field, as a discipline?

DB – I do not know that I have good thoughts about that. I see it as unsurprising, just the way veterinary medicine is apparently overwhelmingly women now. Women, for biological or for socialization reasons, tend to have a very strong interest in other people, helping other people, and animals and helping animals. So, [it’s] no big surprise that we are there in large numbers. I would say, in certain branches of psychology, the influx of women has meant that there is more of the field that I am more interested in than I was earlier. I think, to some extent, that has been counterbalanced by the simultaneous biological revolution, which meant that a lot of people are doing things that, well, I think that they are certainly important wonderful things to be doing, I am not fascinated by. But, I wish that the influx of women had meant more studies of, for instance, the psychological impact of poverty, more studies of discrimination, more studies of social class and race issues. I think that that should have followed. I am not quite sure why it did not.

AR – Is there anything that we have not touched on or that we have not talked about in this interview that you would like to contribute to this forum?

DB – I really cannot think. I think you have covered the [inaudible].

AR – Ok, well, why don’t we leave it there?