

Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History Project

Interview with Elizabeth Scarborough

*Interviewed by Alexandra Rutherford
Honolulu, Hawaii
July 31st, 2004*

When citing this interview, please use the following citation:

Scarborough, E. (2004, July 31). Interview by A. Rutherford [Video Recording].

Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History and Online Archive Project.

Honolulu, Hawaii.

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 Elizabeth Scarborough
Interview by Alexandra Rutherford
Honolulu, Hawaii
July 31, 2004

ES: Elizabeth Scarborough, Interview participant

AR: Alexandra Rutherford, Interviewer

AR- Okay, Elizabeth, I was wondering to get us started if you could give us your full name and your date and place of birth.

ES- Okay, you want the year too.

AR- If you're willing, yes.

ES- Of course. Elizabeth Scarborough. March 30, 1935, Ruston, Louisiana.

AR- Oh.

ES- And we say, '*Loosiana*'.

AR- '*Loosiana*, okay. Alright, well, I'm going to start us off by jumping sort of right in the middle which is...I want you to tell me a little bit about the impetus behind and the background behind the writing of '*Untold Lives*'.

ES- Okay.

AR- If you can start there, and we may move back and forth from there, but...

ES- A lot of this, of course, I don't remember

AR- Okay

ES- It's too bad in a way that we didn't write it down, or that I haven't checked with Laurel recently about it. But, I do know that it started when Tom Cadwallader wanted to submit a symposium to EPA. And that must have been, the symposium must have been 1975, something like that.

AR- Okay.

ES- And he wanted to do it on the first three eminent women: Christine Ladd-Franklin, Mary Calkins, and Margaret Floy Washburn. Now, Tom and his wife at the time, Joyce,

had been working on Christine Ladd-Franklin. And Laurel had just expressed interest in psychology, had just attended Cheiron. And so, he asked her, with her being at Wellesley if she would do Calkins. Nobody had done anything with Washburn. But, because of Cheiron, Tom knew me, and he knew that I was not employed, had time. So he called and said, you know, “Would you do a paper on

(1:49)

Margaret Washburn?” And I said, “Well, I don’t know a thing about her, but sure, I’ll do it”. So, that was a symposium that the three of us did.

And then the idea was that following that, we should collect these papers and submit them for publication. And I don’t think I’m too far out of line here, to say that Tom just couldn’t seem to produce his paper.

AR-Okay.

ES- Laurel and I were the two that really wanted to get this done. And, you know, we kept prodding Tom, saying “Send us the paper, send us the paper so we can publish”. And he just didn’t.

AR- Okay.

ES- And so then she and I said, “Well, we’ll have to do Ladd-Franklin.” And somewhere along the way there, and I don’t remember just how, we became aware that, yes, there were other women. And we had an interest in seeing who they were. And I don’t remember exactly how we came to identify, as we did, the timeline that we would use. But, we were both aware of ‘*American Men of Science*’, and the starring system. And we were also interested in APA records. So, what we did basically was go back through ‘*American Men of Science*’, the first publication, 1906, and pull out all of the women who identified themselves as psychologists by way of their area of research or where they had their degrees. And then we compared that to the APA membership records up to 1906. And that’s what we came up with. And we worked on it for about ten years, a bit at a time, collecting the information.

AR- How would you describe the state of the field of the history of psychology as it pertained to women’s place in that history at the time you were formulating...

ES- Basically, there was nothing.

AR- Yeah.

ES- There was no interest. You see, we were sort of riding the wave right at the good time. Because, no, there was some awareness of these three, and particularly of the two who had been presidents of APA. So, occasionally they would be mentioned here and there.

AR- Right, right.

ES- But, of course, the women's movement was coming on strong, and so that just helped to support what we were interested in doing; got us a publisher without us having to go looking for one.

AR- I see. So, there was receptivity to kind of addressing some of the gaps. (4:18)

ES- Oh yes. There was a woman editor at Columbia University Press.

AR- Okay.

ES- Vicki Raeburn. And, I'm not sure she was a psychologist, but she had some background in it. She came to, it must have been an APA meeting, either APA or EPA, and spoke to several people. She said they (the press) were interested in doing something on women in psychology. She asked, I think, Mike Sokal and Virginia Sexton, and I don't know who else. And each of them knew that we had been collecting material and had been talking about doing a book. So, they gave Vicki our names and she came and said, "Hey, do you want to do it? Just write up an outline." So, we didn't have to peddle the book with the prospectus or anything like that. So it was very easy.

AR- And at what point did you, kind of make the decision that it would be important to understand women who perhaps didn't achieve eminence?

ES- Yeah, see that's the part I don't really remember. But, as we identified the group and then as we started trying to find out who they were and what had happened to them, I think it was at that point that we became aware that some of them were quite different from those who had made a name for themselves.

AR- Yeah.

ES- And I think that realization made us aware that, hey, it's really important to look at the whole group and to consider more than just...None of them had, as far as we could tell, a sad story- other than Woolley. She had a bad time. She ended in a sad way. But, as best we could tell, the others lived fulfilled lives, but not necessarily as psychologists.

AR- Right, right. Well, can you tell me, you mentioned this was in the mid 1970s, this was starting out.

ES- Yes.

AR- And you mentioned that you were at a certain place in your professional career. Can you tell me a little about where you were at that point?

ES- Where I was at that point was unemployed.

AR- Right.

ES- I was living in DeKalb, Illinois. I had gotten my degree in '72.

AR- Okay.

ES- We had moved from New Hampshire to Illinois because my husband had a position then at Northern Illinois University (6:47)

AR- Okay.

ES- The employment situation in New Hampshire was really bad. It's still not that good in terms of support for higher education. But the downturn that came, the tightness in budget that came for most schools around 1970 hit New Hampshire in the mid '60s. And so the idea was as soon as I completed my degree we needed to move.

AR- Okay.

ES- And so we moved to Illinois. And there was nothing for me there.

AR- Yeah.

ES- I taught part-time in the department of Home Economics. I taught Child Development, Adolescent, Life Span. And then I taught at Aurora College. I taught Physiological, of all things.

AR- Oh my goodness.

ES- One semester of that. And then, so I was just sort of bumming around. And I was very active in Cheiron at that time.

AR- Okay, okay.

ES- I was executive officer for Cheiron. And so there was a lot involved in that. That kept me in touch with people who were doing things. It sort of [inaudible] that way. And so I was ready for this when Tom came- "Yes, you know I'll do what I can on Washburn." And then when Laurel and I started working together it was really good.

AR- Okay. So, I want to ask you at some point about your involvement in Cheiron and the founding of Cheiron and get some of that history. But, before we do that can you tell me a little bit more, personally, about your decision to go into History of Psychology. What motivated that? How did that happen?

ES- Well, it's one of those things that, it's the kind of story you often hear from women.

AR- Okay.

ES- As if I just fell into it. But this was true. In my case I think it was true. I did the degree at New Hampshire because that's where my husband was. And I had started Master's degrees at two other places and had had to move before completion because of his moves. So, having an undergraduate in Psychology, once he decided to go to University of New Hampshire, and I saw they had a Master's program there, I said "I think I want to get a Master's degree." And just to get the completion on this thing. So, one child was four, the other was one when I started. (9:04)

AR- Okay.

ES- So, I took two courses a semester, and I was not in any hurry. And while I was in the Master's program there, the department was planning to introduce a PhD program.

AR- Okay.

ES- And I was enjoying having that time away from the house because I really did enjoy the work that I was doing. So, as the department was getting ready to introduce the PhD program, I thought "Hmm, maybe I can just continue with this." Now, the interesting thing was that the department did not want to overload their graduate program with their own Master's students. So they limited the number of their Master's students that they would take into the PhD program. They wanted to bring in outside people. But, they did admit three of us to the third year of the four year PhD program- three of us who had completed our Master's. We had completed our Master's just the year before-

AR- Wow.

ES- the PhD opened officially in the fall of 1966. And that was Barbara Ross, and myself and Jaylene Tilton.

AR- Okay.

ES- Now, about that time the department was courting Robert Watson and he was playing the dance with them because he really wanted to come to New Hampshire, be a part of this new PhD program, and to institute a History of Psychology at the doctorate level.

AR- Right.

ES- So he let them know that he would be interested in accepting a position. And the president of the University of New Hampshire at about the same time gave a challenge to the departments and said, "If any of you can attract a top-level person, someone nationally known, you'll get an extra presidential appointment, there would be an additional faculty line." So the Psychology Department came up with Watson, and he agreed. And that's how he came to New Hampshire...

AR- Wow.

ES- ...from Northwestern. And at about that time, I was really wondering what I would do for my dissertation.

AR- Okay.

ES- I didn't know what I wanted to do. (11:18)

AR- Because your Master's had been in...

ES- Just general.

AR- Experimental Psychology.

ES- Right.

AR- Right, right.

ES- And I wasn't drawn to any particular field, I wasn't drawn to any particular theoretical position.

AR- Okay.

ES- And the other thing, I think in choosing a dissertation director there's a personal element there that's very important. And the interesting thing is my husband was an associate professor, he was older. I was as old as many of the professors in the Psychology Department. In terms of, you know, academic status, though I was a spouse, I kind of outranked them. It was very awkward. I didn't know how I could really function in that sort of, you know, master- student relationship with any of those guys.

AR- Was it mostly guys at the time?

ES- Of course. Yeah.

AR- Yeah.

ES- The wife of one of them had a Master's in Child Development and she taught something, not on a regular tenure-track line. So, no, they were all men. As I was trying to decide where am I going to go with this, I thought about Social, because I had interests in social good. So I actually subscribed to the Journal of Social Psychology for a couple of years. And I could not read the stuff. You know, the journal would come and I would look at it and say "Oh God, I can't spend the rest of my life doing this."

AR- What about it turned you off?

ES- It was just so picky. They were dealing with such insignificant variables. And just doing the same thing over again. You know, modify this little bit and this little bit and publish a study. And I said, "Oh God." In terms of what I think of Social Psychology, it it's really something very different from this.

AR- From what you thought it would be.

ES- Yeah, right, and I can't do that. (13:07)

So the Chair of the department called me in, this was Roy Erickson and he said, "You know, we have a top man coming next year, and he's going to be head of this History of Psychology program. We need some good students, to work with him." He says, "How about you doing History of Psychology?" I said "Well, I don't know a thing about History of Psychology, and I don't know much about History either." But, I thought about it and, okay, this would be a way of maintaining a generalist's stance. I at least knew enough to say, okay, if you're going to be dealing with history you're going to have to deal with the whole spread. And that will get me out of this bind of having to commit to one theoretical orientation, as well as to one content area. And this is a top guy, and I already knew getting in on the ground floor in a new field is the place to be. So I said, "Okay I'll work with him." And I think **Roy Erickson** probably said a similar thing to Barbara Ross. Because she was in the same spot I was. She didn't quite know what she wanted to do either, I think. And I suspect that he recruited her for Watson. So when Watson came, he had two students waiting for him.

AR- Well, I was just going to say, the first two students in the History of Psychology were women, which is interesting.

ES- And the first three that they took into that program were women.

AR- Wow. Who came next?

ES- No, the first three for the PhD program were Barbara and I and Jaylene Tilton who did her stuff in verbal learning with the Chair of the department, Roy Erickson.

AR- Okay.

ES- And I've questioned that, because after we three were admitted, I'm pretty sure there were some difficulties with later women getting admitted.

AR- Oh.

ES- And this, sort of behind the scenes, what I would pick up here and there. The three of us were a sure bet for them.

AR- Okay, right.

ES- We had gone through the Master's program, they knew we could do it. We were also place-bound. Each of us was married.

AR- I see.

ES- We weren't going to pick up and move off, because we were stuck there. Each of us went to the University of New Hampshire because that's where we had to go. We didn't have any choice. And, I think from the department's point of view they thought: Oh yeah, we can count on these three, they're going to make it. But as far as later women, (15:13)

they didn't. There was one man on the faculty, George Haselrud, whose wife also was a PhD in Psychology, she wasn't working. She hadn't been considered. I don't know if she was interested in teaching or not. But I'm pretty sure that he was one who probably did work behind the scenes to support women. He had been Edna Heidbreder's student, and later she acknowledged me as her "academic granddaughter."

AR- Okay.

ES- But, I also have an idea that a couple of others didn't.

AR- I know I'm asking you to maybe conjecture here,

ES- Yeah, a lot of this is.

AR- Was it a matter of feeling like women weren't capable of doing it, or?

ES- Okay, again, I'm not sure, I can't pin it down. But, my impression was that they weren't sure that the women would stick it out and would make it. And they wanted to admit people who would go through the program. And indeed, I think some of the early women, even in that program didn't stay. Why they didn't, I don't know. But, it was a while before they graduated another woman. I mean, before they gave the degree to another woman.

AR- What was it like to work with Robert Watson?

ES- I liked him, and felt comfortable with him and felt that he was very supportive. He was not a good teacher.

AR- Not a good teacher, but perhaps a good mentor?

ES- In a way, yes.

AR- Okay.

ES- But he was not intrusive. He was sort of hands off. And the interesting thing is, he didn't suggest a topic to me. What do you want to work on? While I was wallowing

around trying to finding a topic. And he says fine. Sort of like, go and do it. He didn't give much direction.

AR- And that was fine with you.

ES- Yeah, that was fine with me.

AR- Yeah.

ES- And so, he was there when I needed him but...

AR- And what was your dissertation? (17:18)

ES- The history of research in marriage counseling.

AR- Okay.

ES- A quantitative study, because that you see was back in the mid 1960s when historians were getting all excited about quantification. And so I did a content analysis of every article I could find since the beginning of marriage counseling in the late 20s. So from 1929 up to about 1968, so I covered that period. Everything that had to do with marriage counseling, and looked at to what extent they might have used research methodology.

AR- Okay.

ES- Because the issue then in marriage counseling was: is it an art or is it a science?

AR- Okay.

ES- So if it's a science, there should be some research to support the stuff they were doing. Well, there was practically none.

AR- Right, right.

ES- So I had four levels of research. So I identified each article as being one of these levels. And none of them ever got to the highest level. But it was a quantitative study, which really had nothing to do with his theory. You see, that's why I say he was okay. Now, Barbara did hers using his prescriptive approach.

AR- Okay. So, she kind of took up his ideas.

ES- Yeah.

AR- What led to your interest in marriage counseling research?

ES- My husband was a marriage counselor.

AR- Oh, I see.

ES- Yes. He had been a minister. When I married him he was a Baptist minister. A short time after we were married he realized he couldn't stay in the Ministry. And this was a common thing at that time. There was, amongst Protestants, a dearth of new people coming into this Ministry, so there was a big push to get him in and to get him to seminary. And then many of these men went into it without a firm commitment of faith. And so, of the seven or eight friends of his in seminary, only one of them stayed with it. They got out, they all left. So as soon as he went to a church, got married, and went to Church, he realized, I can't do this. Then the question is, well, what next? And so a number of the men who were in marriage counseling had started as ministers. (19:40) It was an easy move to make, because part of their motivation was to help people. And so there was almost a regular pathway. So that's why he went into marriage counseling. He trained and moved to New York City and got his EdD from Teachers College at Columbia. So I was aware of what was going on within marriage counseling: this debate about art versus science.

AR- Right.

ES- And, I don't remember just why I got turned onto that. But I said, okay we can settle this by looking at what they've done. And Bob Watson said that's okay, go with it.

AR- So you were doing your PhD at New Hampshire at the same time as you were raising fairly small children.

ES-Yeah. My daughter was four when I started, my son was one.

AR- Okay. How did that all fit together?

ES- Well, the deal was that I only took the two courses a semester. And at first I had a woman who would come to the house to take care of the youngest one, because Cathy was ready to go into nursery school. So she was at nursery school in the mornings, and I had a woman who would come to stay with David, who was the youngest. And I had to do it in that time when they were busy as if nothing should interfere with the family life. And so that's the way it went all along- oh yes, you can do this, but it shouldn't interfere with...

AR- So that was kind of the deal...

ES- Right, that was the deal, yeah...

AR- ...the conditions

ES- Yeah- you can do this, but stay up with everything else. And so it meant that...it was when the kids were in school. I never...the only time I had a full-time baby sitter was when we had that NSF [National Science Foundation] summer institute for six weeks.

AR-Okay.

ES- So I had the full-time baby sitter then. The kids didn't like that, that didn't work out very well. So, it was working around their schedules. (21:42)

AR- Okay, okay.

ES- But, it was good for me because I needed that break, you know.

AR- Yeah.

ES- It was a way of my doing something that I really enjoy doing.

AR- Yeah, yeah. Tell me, you mentioned the NSF Summer Institute, is this the institute that led to Cheiron?

ES- Yeah.

AR- Can you tell me a little bit about how that came about?

ES- Well, let's see. Bob Watson came in fall of '67. And I don't know just what on between him and Josef Brozek. But, the two of them submitted to NSF this proposal for a six-week summer institute on teaching the History of Psychology. And to talk about something like that now its, my word, how did something like that get funding? But in the 60s, the federal government was just throwing money at colleges. I had a NASA traineeship for one year, of all things, in graduate school.

AR- Wow.

ES- The only graduate school support I got was that one-year traineeship, NASA. But, okay, they submitted, and they got- the thing was funded. I don't know what the funding level was, but it must have been very good because it supported thirty people: their travel to the campus, their room and board while they were there, they could bring families with them and some of them did. And then it supported bringing in outside speakers, five of them for a week at a time, others were single lecture. So it was Brozek and Watson.

AR- And what was your role in the Institute?

ES- Okay, well basically my role was just to be there.

AR- Yeah.

ES- Barbara acted as the secretary of the group, so she was sort of assistant to Brozek and Watson. But, mine was to be there and be part of it.

AR- Right. And how many students were there in the program at that time.

ES- Okay, it paid for thirty people. It was designed this way, twenty five of them would be faculty, already had degrees. And then five graduate students.

AR- Okay. (23:46)

ES- And the interesting thing is, I've just recently gone back and looked at that list, and done the paper for *JHBS* [Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences], and I have in my possession the printed list of the participants from that time and they're alphabetically listed in two columns. And my name, Elizabeth Goodman, is at the very end, stuck off all by itself. And I had been wondering about this, because I knew that there were six graduate students that attended. But, I also knew they only funded five. And I think what happened is, I forgot that I wasn't funded.

AR- Oh.

ES- I think that's why my name was...I wasn't funded. And I again, I think that was a common thing. Only recently have I come to remember, or to think of this- all along I was a faculty spouse. And I think the notion was I didn't...

AR- Didn't need the money

ES- I didn't need the support. Because one year I saw the published list, the fellowships, the scholarships, the granting the department had provided to the graduate students. I was the only one that didn't get anything. My grades were better than most of theirs, you know?

AR- Right, right.

ES- But, I said, you know, okay it's because they think she doesn't need it.

AR- Right, right. There was a perception that as a married woman to a faculty member that you were kind of there just for...

ES- Right, right. Or that, you know I didn't really need the support.

AR- Didn't need the support, you were taken care of.

ES- Yup.

AR- Right.

ES- So I think that's what happened. I think there were actually six of us who participated, but only five who were under contracts.

AR- But, of course that has a pernicious effect of making it look like you've never gained funding.

ES- Absolutely. Yes, yes. It's a little bothersome.

AR- Yeah, yeah. (25:41)

ES- And you ask what my role was there. It was a little different from the others, because I had to go home, you know, and take care of the kids. I had the babysitter for certain hours but then I had to go home and relieve her. So, I went home to fix the dinner. Most nights I would be at home where a lot of stuff was going on in the dorm, amongst those who lived in the dorm, and the informal sort of interplay that went on there. And the same is true in graduate school. I think often some of your best experiences come through interaction with the other students. But that was quite limited for me. Because I'd go to class, and then I'd have to be home.

AR- Yeah, very different experience.

ES- There wasn't a whole lot of hanging around the building and...

AR- Right.

ES- ...you know, discussing things with friends.

AR- The informal kind of social interactions...

ES- Yeah, right. So, I know my graduate school experience was atypical in that way.

AR- Yeah. So tell me a little about how the summer Institute was transformed into, the decision to found Cheiron.

ES- Okay, well ...I don't remember why, but one night I was on campus for some sort of informal discussion that was taking place after dinner. And we were sitting around in the lounge, and talking about what a good experience it had been for everyone there to find other people who were also excited about what we were doing. Most of them had been the only person on their campus who appreciated or cared at all about history. And then they came together and found, hey, there's a group of people who care about this. And part of our work at the Institute involved each of us devising a research project that we would work on. So, we put together some literature background and, like a research proposal, and presented to each other and got the criticism and so on. And the idea was we would go back the next year and conduct the research, and we'd have something. So, somebody, and I don't remember who, suggested, you know, we should get together a year from now and see how we've done, see how this had worked out and keep this going. Well, somewhere along the way there Julian Jaynes, who was so excited about this, that he had come for his one week as a lecturer and he'd stayed on the second week, because he was enjoying it so much. He said, "Hmm, we could come to Princeton; let's

meet at Princeton with me next year.” So, it was hey, you know, this is an interesting idea. Now, some of us realized, because this was 1968, and Division 26 had only been formed in '65, quite new in APA, and we said, oh boy, we're talking now about maybe starting a new organization for History of Psychology- and well, what will that mean for Division 26? Brozek was with us while we were talking about this, Watson was at home. (28:46)

And, Brozek said, come over to my apartment and let's talk about it some more. So, the group moved over to his place. In the meantime somebody, I think Barbara, called Bob and said- there's something going on and you better come and be a part of it, you know? And so the story was that he was in his pajamas ready to go to bed. And he realized, uh oh, I better get over there.

AR- Something big was...

ES- So, he got dressed and came over. And so a lot of the discussion centered around: is this feasible to start a new organization? Will it be competitive, with Division 26, will it scuttle Division 26? And then, well, how can it be different from 26? How can we make it something different so it won't be in direct competition? And we had had a couple of guys attending the Institute, not as regular, I don't think they were funded, but their name was on the list and they were there the whole time, who were international. So, we had a couple of Canadians; the two I'm talking about one was from the Netherlands, and one was from Israel. So we said, oh- what makes us different from Division 26 is: it's international. And it's interdisciplinary, because even though the Institute was to be teaching the History of Psychology, somehow or other, one of the persons who came was a Sociologist, and another one was really more in Sociology than in Psychology, really more in History of Science. And so we said, ok, international and interdisciplinary. And that will add something quite different from what Division 26 is. And Bob Watson accepted that.

So then there was an organizational meeting called for October of that year to meet in New York City. And I wasn't able to attend that. Barbara did go. And that pulled in some people who were interested. Bob and Brozek knew that there were others. So, I'm not just sure who attended that. I don't think there were any minutes taken of that. But, then in the meantime Julian had made contacts and we had the meeting the next May. We met at Princeton. We had a very interesting meeting; that was the first.

AR- That was the first meeting you ever had.

ES- Yeah, '69.

AR- Right, right.

ES- And, again at that point people said, “Wow, let's do it again. Where might we go next year?”

AR- Oh, ok, so it took on a life of its own.

ES- It did, and it was just sort of year by year.

AR- Yeah. (31:18)

ES- Can somebody provide a place for us? And in those early years, it was the host who also took care of the program.

AR- Okay.

ES- You know, so sent out a call for submission of papers, and received the papers, and did the whole business. So, we met in '69 in Princeton, and then we went to Akron in '70, and then '71 in New York City with three schools hosting. And then in '72 we were out at Calgary. And by then it was beginning to feel like this is something that might carry on. But, everybody really appreciated and enjoyed the informality, didn't want to tighten it up, didn't want to move to officers and all that kind of thing. So, the decision quite early on was to try and maintain as much informality as possible. But, nevertheless after a while, you know you had to charge dues, because you had mailings, and you know. And then we decided, okay, we need to divide the program responsibilities from the hosting responsibilities. So then we went to having program chairs in addition to the host.

AR- And at what point was it decided that there needed to be an executive officer?

ES- Well, the first year or two, Barbara served sort of as secretary. And so she kept the address list. And then in '72, I guess it was, I was elected secretary, secretary-treasurer, really. And, I got the stuff from her. And at that point we were almost bankrupt. We had practically no...

AR- Running on empty.

ES- Yeah, we had a list of people, I forget how many, probably two hundred names, which surprised me that that many people would want somehow to identify with this group that they never attended a meeting for. And somewhere along there also came the notion that we should get incorporated so that people could make contributions and have them be tax deductible. And so I'm in DeKalb and I did get papers incorporating us there. But when I moved from there to New York in 1977, the incorporation required that there be someone in the state since it was incorporated in Illinois, and we had nobody in Illinois, so this had to be done again. And at that point we decided, well, let's become incorporated in Ohio because that's where the archives are, and that'll be a stable home for this. So, John Popplestone went through getting the papers done there. Okay, so about that time then, I have looked back at the minutes recently, and I do want to write this up, as to the titles; somehow it shifted from secretary-treasurer to executive-secretary, and then executive officer.

AR- Okay.

ES- Without any big thing.

AR- Right. (34:28)

ES- Along about that time in '75, Bob Watson was retiring and leaving New Hampshire, and was ready also then to turn over the editorship of *JHBS*. And he first appointed Bob Weyant who was at the University of Calgary, so that Bob for a year acted as editor. But during that time the owner of the journal, Fred Thorn, was talking about instituting page charges. And Bob Watson was adamantly opposed to that, feeling, you know, that would do away with the rigor of the scholarship and prestige and the status of the journal, and so on. So, he and Weyant were both very concerned about that. And about that time we met in New Hampshire, Cheiron met in New Hampshire. And Bob pulled me aside and he said, "You know, *JHBS* might go under." So he said, "You start a newsletter for Cheiron and that then will become a possible organ to expand into a journal if *JHBS* folds." So, he was very political.

AR- Right.

ES- Okay. So that's when I started the newsletter, which was just two, three, four mimeographed pages, you know, at first...

AR- Right.

ES-... it started going out. We had volume one, issue one, and basically it was two issues a year. And we would print the minutes of the meeting in the fall issue, and the treasurer's report in the spring issue. And then any other news I could get. What I often printed was the new members and their addresses. And the strange thing was people kept joining, you know, to get this little newsletter.

AR- Yeah, yeah.

ES- So again, it was Bob realizing that. And then, of course, this never happened to *JHBS*. So it went on.

AR- And who was after Bob?

ES- Then it went to Barbara.

AR- Barbara Ross.

ES- Yeah. And this happened at an APA meeting that I didn't attend.

AR- Now, the current stats that I've read about the membership and divisions of APA by gender indicate that Division 26, History of Psychology, if you take that to be representative of the field of the History of Psychology, which of course it isn't, it's

representative of APA members, that women are still really underrepresented. And History of Psychology, even though the composition, the face of Psychology has really changed in terms of there are more women now than men. Was that ever, did that ever feel to you like it made History of Psychology sort of different? Was it something that you paid attention to, that you...? (37: 29).

ES- Yeah, no.

AR- No.

ES- I don't think so. Because here was Barbara and I- we were fine.

AR- Yeah, yeah, you had each other.

ES- Well, not exactly.

AR- Okay.

ES- We were both there. But there was Marian MacPherson, a very strong woman, Mary Henle, very strong woman, very active, Virginia Sexton. I didn't have...you know, there were these strong women, and others who had been part of the Institute and who came and presented. So, I never felt at a gender disadvantage in that way.

AR- Okay.

ES- Now, in terms of APA statistics and so on, what's happened, I think, with this balance flipping toward more women members is that these are women who are going into clinical, applied areas. And History is still an academically based area.

AR- Yes, right, right.

ES- And in terms of our leadership in Division 26, we've elected women presidents...

AR- Yeah, yeah.

ES-...women council representatives. And nobody's made a big thing about it.

AR- No, no. Well then, let's flip back now to where you were personally as it related to where you were professionally. You mentioned being in DeKalb and being out of work at the time. How was it for you to get back into academia after, post-PhD, you know?

ES- Yeah. Well, these were tough years, because I had that degree and I wanted to use it, you know. And my husband and I had thought, this was one thing we talked about; since he was trained in marriage counseling and he was conducting a marriage counseling practice in addition to his university responsibilities when we were still in New Hampshire, that once I had the degree, I could get the academic job, and he could go

wherever I got the job, and he could set up a marriage counseling practice. This made good sense, you know.

AR- He could be portable. (39:41)

ES- Uh-huh. Yeah, that was the plan. And then when we got right down to it, though, two things became clear: one, he didn't want to be dependent on me as to the major position. You know, if I had the academic position that would mean that would be the sure salary, and his would be less certain. And I think that was a situation he just couldn't be in. And at the same time, he now was an associate professor, and could get a better position and a better salary than I could starting out as an assistant. So, when we moved it was for him to get the advancement to DeKalb, you know, and I went along. And there were really no jobs for me there.

AR- Yeah.

ES- I found there another group of women who were in the same situation, women with PhDs married to faculty- that was one unhappy group of women.

AR- Yeah.

ES- Really frustrated, you know. We didn't get together officially, but, you know we'd run into each other, and we were aware that we were all just... And I applied there at the Psychology department at Northern to teach. And they had one opening and the specialty was Child Verbal Development, or something or other. And so I applied. And the chairman of the department wanted to know if I had conducted research in the area and I said, "Well, no, but I taught Child Developmental, and I can do this." "Well, we will only hire people who have conducted research in the area." And I'm thinking, yeah, because I knew who was teaching History of Psychology on that campus. And I knew this person had no degree in it and doesn't know... but of course he was teaching. But, you know, I kind of kept my mouth shut. It was funny because one time I was teaching there - one of my courses. Across the hall was the guy teaching History of Psychology. And at one point while my students were taking a test and it was quiet in my room, I could hear what he was saying over there and I was thinking "Hey, hey, hey, I could do better than this. He doesn't know what he's talking about." But, that's the way it was. So, it was frustrating to not have that.

AR- Yeah.

ES- To be able to use it.

AR- And once you were back in academia.

ES- Okay, yeah. When I was in that tough situation where I knew I needed to get a divorce, I knew I needed to get a job. But, I couldn't get a divorce until I got a job, I couldn't get a job until I got a divorce, because it meant I had to travel. But finally we

got to the place where my husband said “Okay, you know, go on the market and see what you can do.” So, that spring I went to EPA and Midwestern and interviewed, and sure enough, I was offered the job at Fredonia.

AR- Okay. (42:32)

ES- And as soon as I got that job I came home and filed for divorce, within four weeks we were divorced.

AR- Yeah.

ES- And I picked up and moved six weeks later. I loved it. It was tough in a way. And I think the divorce coming at the same time, I was sort of like a walking zombie, probably for about a year. I look back now, and I thought I was functioning well at the time, but I don't know how I got through that.

AR- It's a big change.

ES- Yeah, it was a big change.

AR- Many changes.

ES- Right. Because I moved from DeKalb, Illinois to Fredonia, New York- you know- left the kids because my daughter was eighteen, went to college at the same time, and my son didn't want to move so he stayed in DeKalb. My daughter and I joked that we both went away to college at the same time.

AR- Yeah, right.

ES- But, I liked it once I got there. My teaching, I'm sure, in my first year was disastrous. It's amazing that I survived, you know. But once I got through that, it was okay.

AR- Right.

ES- And the interesting thing there in that job is I went into a department of fourteen but, I was older than most of them. By that time I was forty-two. And the only people older than me were the full professors. There were three of them, you know.

AR- Right.

ES- And I had been around colleges and universities all my life.

AR- Wow.

ES- So I had one the heavy advantage of maturity and two much more academic experience, even as a faculty spouse you pick up a lot of stuff, you know about how...

AR- things work (44:12)

ES- Right, how things work. And so I had that advantage. But, it was at a time, 1977, when because my husband by then was an associate dean and we interacted a lot with deans, I knew what was coming. I knew that this downturn was coming, that that enrollment drop was coming, and that campuses were going to be really hard-put. Because all the administrators were talking about this. And that's one reason why I felt under a lot of pressure to get the job now. Because the openings were squeezing down during the '70s. And I was aware that if I don't get something now I'm not going to get anything.

AR- Yeah, yeah.

ES- And I went to Fredonia thinking this department, they're going to be cutting their tenure lines.

AR- Okay.

ES- And I'm not going to be able to make it to tenure here.

AR- Okay.

ES- But, this will be the place for me to be for a little while, while I kind of get my feet on the ground and decide what I can do and where I can go. So, I really did not expect to make tenure there. But the way it happened, you know. I was there, I hung on, and within three years the department was going through a bit of a division, a dissension, and the lines were drawn. They needed a new chair because the chair went over to be acting dean. And he says to me "You can be chair of this department if you want to be, and you'd be good at it." And part of it was because I was neutral; I hadn't aligned with either of these camps. I was a little older, I had a little more experience, so bingo. It's not necessarily the thing to do to become the chair of a large department without tenure. But, I didn't feel I was going to get tenure there anyway. So, I had nothing to lose. Yeah, I can do this, I can make the hard decisions.

AR- Was it a natural turn then for you to go an administrative...?

ES- Yeah, it was very comfortable for me.

AR- Yeah, yeah.

ES- Yeah, I really enjoyed it. And I went off that first summer, after I'd been appointed, to a one-week training session sponsored by one of the national educational groups. And it was for training administrators. Yeah, I really got with it there, so...

AR- Yeah.

ES- That was fun. (46:39)

AR- Yeah, yeah. I want to ask if you had any role models as you went through academia.

ES- No.

AR- No.

ES- Not at all. I had one woman professor, psychology professor, and this was at SMU, I started college at Hardin-Simmons University in Abilene, Texas. And then I was a stop-out. I started in summer there because I knew I had to work my way through, which was unusual in the mid '50s. My finances were very limited so I knew I had to work, so I went in the summer. I figured I could get a job in the summer before I was competing with other students who would come in the fall. So I started in the summer, I went through two full calendar years, and at that point had enough credits to be junior status. But I was pooped, I was tired. I knew well-enough to know I'd be pushing too hard, I needed a little time off. So, I went to work in Dallas for the summer, taking a secretarial job. And I liked it there, and I ended up staying there for two years, and taking some courses at SMU. And then I went back to my campus and graduated in the summer, four years after I graduated from high school, having had fun as a secretary in the city for two years.

AR- Yeah, yeah.

ES- But it was while I was in Dallas at SMU, I had this one woman who was just a Master's level in psychology. I had a course with her, but I wouldn't call her a mentor.

AR- Yeah.

ES- So, no. But, again, it didn't...it wasn't a part of my radar. To be concerned about this, you know. I can be a college professor, you know...

AR- Right, you just kind of had an internal, a well-internalized sense that you could kind of do this.

ES- Yeah.

AR- Yeah, yeah. So, when you started researching the lives of the early women psychologists and unearthing certain themes and interconnections between personal lives and professional lives and the impact those had on each other, for the early women psychologists, was this the kind of thing that you identified with, were surprised by?

ES- To some extent, not to a great degree. But, the conflict between marriage and career and commitment to family, yeah, that was there. But by the time, you know, I was on a

tenure-track job, I was really operating as a single person then, and I could give it full attention. I didn't have that divided...it was during my graduate school years that I was feeling that being pulled both ways. (49:35)

Ar- Yeah.

ES- But, once I went to Fredonia that was total immersion, career dedication.

AR- Yeah, yeah.

ES- You know, at that point.

AR- How did your children react to that?

ES- Well, I'm not sure I know. It didn't seem to bother them. This is funny: I remember one time- as I said I had to sort of work around everybody's schedules so that it didn't interfere; you know, do the laundry, do the three meals a day, my husband always came home for lunch even, and all that, plan the social life of the family etc., and do whatever part-time teaching I did or class work or whatever around the edges - one year when she was in high school we were sitting at the table for dinner and I said something about something that happened in my class. And my daughter says "Oh, are you teaching this semester?" You know, they didn't even...

AR- You must have been doing a pretty good job if they didn't even...

ES- Yeah, right. Doing it without it having much of an... But that was, you know, that's what I had to do.

AR- Wow.

ES- So I said, "Yeah, I'm teaching this semester."

AR- Yeah, yeah. Wow.

ES- That was something.

AR- Wow. Well, you know, I was very inspired by some of the things you said in your talk earlier. And I wanted to get you to talk a little bit more about that on tape for me. You mentioned the idea of moving beyond just telling women's lives to using that information in a more interpretive...writing a Women's History. Can you elaborate any more for me on what a Women's History would be?

ES- Yeah. I've just really begun to think about it, recently, in a different way. Because I really had sort of stepped away from all this, because when I was, you know, dean, I was involved in administrative things. And I was consulting evaluator for the regional accreditation association. So you know, I was really into that. And then when I retired it

was, okay, I really left that. But the Psychology bit was still there. So, I haven't, until I started working on this thing. But, it began to pull from other things I've thought about from time to time. (51:53)

And it's, yeah, just reporting the stories is not enough. It's, alright, what can we do with this? And there's more than talking about women *in* the History of Psychology. And I don't really know what we might be able to do in terms of Women's History of Psychology, really looking at the field from a women's point of view. It's worth exploring, but I'm not sure where I would take it now.

AR- Yeah.

ES- But, you know, I get a lot of my inspiration from Cheiron, and from listening to the papers and listening to the critique of the papers. This is funny, because going all the way back to the Institute, Mike Sokal, bless his heart, he was the cutest little thing there, you know. He had these long, dark curls, these big, brown eyes, and he would sit there, and he was a graduate student there at Case Western, and somebody would say something and he would say "But that's not history, that's not history." You know how long I've been listening to Mike define what is History and what is not History. "That's not history." And so I guess I've had that out, okay, what is it? What is it that makes it different from just chronicling or reporting? What makes it History?

AR- Right.

ES- And I think I'm interested now in kind of working on that.

AR- Right. Yeah, definitely.

ES- Or encouraging other people to work on it.

AR- Right, turning their thoughts to that.

ES- Okay, you go do it. That's one thing I've wanted to do, is challenge other people to do it.

AR- Right, right. Well, do you think that Women's History will de facto have to always be done by women?

ES- Okay, I don't think it has to be. I think men can. Now, that's been an issue in Women's History apart from Psychology. Just as Black Psychology- do you have to be Black? Do you have to be Black to teach Black History? And the same question was raised occasionally by my students of me, you know. How can I teach Adolescence when my kids aren't adolescents yet? I said, "Well, I can't teach Abnormal and I'm not crazy", you know. I think men can. But, the thing is most men, I think, aren't interested, I mean, they've got their own thing. It's women, I think, who tend to be interested enough to dig into this. Now, can the men understand the women's position? Well, let's

think about literature. The male authors who've written in a woman's voice. Some of them have done a darn good job, you know. Just as you have women authors who write with a male protagonist. Some of them do a good job at it, some of them don't. (54:46) So, yeah, men can do Women's History, but I think it's women who are going to have to probably lead the way there. In Psychology of Women, Division 35, only one man has really stuck with it. But, he's hung in there, you know. And I don't know what motivates him or why, but he's fine.

AR- Yeah, yeah.

ES- So, I'm sure others could. But, I think they're most likely to feel very uncomfortable.

AR- Do you think that keeps men from doing it who might otherwise be interested?

ES- I suspect so. And they may feel, as I know some women feel, this is our turf, thank you very much. You know, you've had your playground all this time, this is our playground and we don't want you coming into it. And they're bounded. And that is real with some women, I know. Just as the Blacks, with the racial boundary.

AR- Yeah. And even thinking about historians, just trying to think how many men have been interested in women's lives. I know Ben Benjamin has done some recent work on, well he's been interested...

ES- He's been interested in Leta Hollingworth, that's the Nebraska connection, because you know that's where he was.

AR- Yes. That's true.

ES- He discovered her in Nebraska.

AR- I know recently he's been interested in a Black woman's...gosh...I can't believe I'm blanking on her name [Inez Prosser]. But, anyways, but, yeah, you're right, I think there are a number of reasons men may be less likely [to do work on women].

We've only got a few more minutes, but I want to ask you about... I think this is a kind of a hard question to answer, but I'm going to ask you anyways, because it asks you to kind of reflect on the broader social and cultural context of a certain time and place that you were just living in. And I'm not sure if that's an easy thing to do. But, it seems to me that you were going through your graduate work and raising a family and dealing with all of those issues at a time when we were really going through the second wave of the feminist movement.

ES- Yeah, yeah.

AR- What was it like?

ES- Well, I can tell you because I had a very emotional experience about that time, which really turned me on. (56:57)

I thought maybe you were going in a little different direction with that question because I was very much aware in the '60s that I was really as busy as I could be taking care of the family and doing my school work. But that was the time of the student uprisings, Vietnam, the whole Civil Rights Movement, and I was kind of seeing that happening and saying- I can't deal with that, I've got as much as I can deal with right now.

AR- Yeah, yeah.

ES- But, in 1971, I did get involved in the McGovern presidential campaign, that was my turn on to political activism. We were in New Hampshire, the first state, you know, and McGovern started coming there a year ahead of time. And I don't remember how it is, but I got connected with just a handful of other people who were also committed. Well, you know, it was our opposition to Vietnam and to Nixon that made McGovern look attractive. And so I became treasurer of the local McGovern committee. And we had a fundraiser. And at that time Gloria Steinem was supporting.

AR- Was supporting...

ES- McGovern. And so she came to Durham to raise money, to give a talk. And before the big talk on campus we had a special thing at somebody's house, you know, refreshments and everything, as a fundraiser. And so I was busy helping with that, you know, making the refreshments to take there. And I told my husband, get the kids, you know, take them to hear this speech, this is really an outstanding woman. But, I was separated from everybody because he took the kids and I finished up the stuff at the house, and I went late over to where she was giving the talk. And so I was by myself, and I was up sort of high looking down on all this, and all of the sudden it just clicked. And it just hit me like a load of bricks, you know. That lady knows what she's talking about, this is important. And this is me. I had avoided dealing with it because not too much before Betty Friedan had come out with the *Feminine Mystique*. And at that point I hadn't even started on my Master's, I mean, I was really stuck at that point. And I started reading that thing and I couldn't finish it. It was one of the few books I ever had to put down, because I just couldn't read it. Because that was me and I just couldn't handle it. But here's Gloria Steinem, and I said- Wow. So that was my turn on to feminism.

AR- Yeah.

ES- And in a way it was totally unrelated to any of this Psychology, professional stuff. But it was a very moving commitment for me. So that began...the ground began to shake a little bit, you know...

AR- Right, right.

ES-...at that point. And I think too that's what helped me, I know it is. I finally said I can't stay in this marriage. (1:00:03)

AR- Yeah, yeah.

ES- And later my daughter said to me that she appreciated that I had the strength to stand up and to do what had to be done. So you asked already what did this mean to your children. Well, in her case, it was, yeah, you did what you had to do.

AR- Right.

ES- And you did what you could do, so.

AR- Okay. Well, why don't we stop there.

ES- That's a good place to stop.

©Psychology's Feminist Voices, 2010