Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History Project

Interview with Florence Denmark

Interviewed by Wade Pickren
April 7, 2008
New York, NY

When citing this interview, please use the following citation:

Denmark, F. L. (2008, April 7). Interview by W. Pickren [Video Recording]. Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History and Online Archive Project. New York, NY.

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 Voice Oral History Project
Interview with Florence Denmark
Interviewed by Wade Pickren
April 7th, 2008
New York City, NY

FD: Florence Denmark, Interview participant

WP: Wade Pickren, Interviewer

WP- We'll start off by talking about your training at the University of Pennsylvania, and how you arrived there, some of the challenges that you faced there as a woman student, and we'll go from there, if you'll begin there.

FD- Well, when I went to Penn, I really had my whole career there all the way through as an undergraduate through my doctorate. And I guess you've heard of people who are co-eds; we called ourselves 'co-ords', because we had coordinate education. So, we didn't have a special name for our school but I went to what was then the College for Women where we took a lot of classes that were women-only classes and then later they became truly co-educational as we went through our majors. I don't know that I had any thinking as an undergraduate, if you're asking about undergraduate, my background was only, I was a history major, completed, not History of Psychology, but American History actually, was completing that major in my junior year but I took Psychology and fell in love with Psychology so I did Honors in both. And then at that time I was set to go away to graduate school. I had been accepted in various programs for Clinical Psychology. But I got engaged- it was a first marriage, I have a second marriage which is a very good one- but at that time…

WP- Notice the qualifier.

FD- Well, I mean, you don't end a marriage that's a great marriage.

WP- That's true, that's true.

FD- But, at that time my husband-to-be was in the dental school at Penn, so I applied there belatedly and got in and started in a Clinical Psych program.

WP- Now, I don't want to date you too much, but what era was that?

FD- In the fifties.

WP- In the 1950s. So what was happening, when you look back on it now, what was the bigger picture in terms of what was going on in the United States, what was happening in Psychology, what was really being privileged at that time in Psychology?

FD- Well, in Psychology, I don't know if you're asking about the picture for women, but in Psychology generally there were all the controversies with Hull and Skinner. I remember taking orals in my Honors, to get the Honors as an undergraduate and they asked to compare and contrast them, things like that. So, a lot of the learning theories were important(3:07). And in terms, I mean there were things…I was in one sense, basically naive as far as the status of women. I just, some of that might have been good, I just plowed along and didn't worry about what was right. I mean, for those women who graduated with me as undergraduates, at the time there were only two of us who went on to graduate school right then. And everybody else was concerned with, you know, with sort of like, "Well, if I have…"- you know, they were going to get married then- "…if I have to work, then I'll worry about choosing, going into a career." But, it was sort of the time when you married, for most women they stayed at home and had their family. Only, God forbid, if they had to work, they would.

WP- Right, right.

FD- But, I went, as I say, I went to Penn for graduate school then, and I started in a Clinical program. And there were two things that made me want to switch into Social Psychology. And at that time, that was a very fortunate thing in that you could make changes, you weren't in a program- you were, but everybody took the same basic courses so that I was in classes with Social psychologists, Experimental, whatever they could take then. But, the two things that made me want to switch. Well, one: the only research I was exposed to or heard about relating to Clinical Psychology was hooking up Schizophrenics and doing physiological measurements and doing things like eye-lid conditioning and all. And, again, this is where the naivete came in, and I thought, "if this is what…"- and I always wanted research- but I thought "…if this is what Clinical psychologists do, this doesn't really interest me." The second thing was I took a course in Projective Techniques, and up to a point learning the Rorschach and we scored it with Beck's system; I did a beautiful job then. Then came the interpretation. Well, I didn't know what I was doing. And I was writing these beautiful stories about people. We had to give it to someone and administer it. And when I got back, I think if someone said "This is stupid, this is terrible, you're not doing it right," I might have stayed with. But, I got back "You have the makings of a fine clinician." I remember that phrase was on the paper. So this made me think, boy, I didn't know what I was doing and if I go through life not knowing what I'm doing, it's pretty bad. But I also liked what I was…I had a graduate class in Social Psych and I loved it. And I loved it because that was the kind of research I was interested in doing so I made the switch.

WP- Was the professor Al Pepitone?

FD- Al Pepitone.

WP- And, was he from Michigan?

FD- Yes.

WP- I thought so, yeah; part of that cohort that came out after World War Two.

FD- Right. (6:40)

WP- You entered your PhD, if I remember correctly, in 1958. Were you working at some point as well? I mean, by the time you got close to the end were you already doing some teaching, or…?

FD- Well, I was a, I started… when I went to Penn I had a graduate assistance-ship which was teaching and research, both. And it was interesting too because, like, maybe the first barrier that I experienced personally was I wanted to be...They, at Penn, they had: the assistants did not teach, you assisted. And, there were what they called Assistant-Instructors; you could be promoted to that as a graduate student. And I went into the Chair and asked, told them I wanted to do that. Well, they weren't sure I could handle a class. So, I finally got to that, but it was after my third year that I was able to teach. Others were getting, the men were getting there before me. But, I did become an Assistant-Instructor and actually right after my degree I stayed on and said I wanted an Instructor-ship which was the first grant, and I got that. But, there were relatively few women in the group and one woman who wanted to major in Industrial-Organizational Psychology wasn't allowed to. There were no women. This was well-known - Morris Viteles wouldn't allow women in to get their doctorates.

WP- So, did it really stand out to you that this was because you were a woman that you were experiencing these barriers?

FD- Well, I didn't have that one, but yeah, that was very clear that it was another woman. And the other, I think it was; that I couldn't become the Assistant-Instructor when other people were.

WP- So you were kind of already, if you will, beginning to be sensitized to these barriers.

FD- Yeah.

WP- I'm leading up to, of course, the 60s and this kind of explosion of activism that occurred. Afterwards, I remember you've written that you moved to New York City, back, or up to New York City, your husband was practicing here at the time. And what was your involvement then in Psychology? This is prior to going to Hunter, but in the period before going to Hunter.

FD- Right, well I was… I had children, I had three children pretty close together: an older daughter and then twins, and a year and a half apart. But, I was an adjunct at Queens College, because I lived in Queens, it wasn't far. And it was the person who hired me,

Mary Reuder, you know Mary. Mary, she had gotten her degree earlier from Penn and I was told to contact her, and I did. And so I was able to teach. There was another barrier which she experienced as a woman there. She got pregnant and she was told- she was on a tenure track, she was on the line where she could get tenure- but because she was pregnant she was told she had to stop right away. And then later she had to start the clock all over again. She couldn't pick up like she had several years there, she couldn't resume, let's say, in the third year; she had to start again. So she asked me at the time to take over some of her classes like Statistics, which I taught. And I said, "But Mary, I'm pregnant too." (10:46). This is when I was having twins. She says, "Well, don't tell anyone." She said, "If anyone asks you, if it begins to show, don't tell them." She says, "Say you have a tumor." So my classes knew, but they didn't say anything. But, I was wearing one piece maternity dresses until I was that big; didn't want to look like it was a two piece at that time. But everything there was fine.

And then Mary had wanted me to apply at Queens for a teaching position, but she said "There's no lines here", and that's how I got to Hunter. She says, "There's a position at Hunter. Why don't you apply for it?" So I did. And then I learned another bit- later- another bit of discrimination. I mean, I was hired. And I was placed at the rank, at that time with a doctorate and several publications, so I was an Instructor, not an Assistant-Professor. And someone who became a very good friend of mine but who was a man who was, we had very comparable backgrounds- he was hired as an Assistant Professor. Well, one of the questions I was asked when I was interviewed was "What does your husband do?" At that time there weren't any rules against asking that and I was too naive anyways, still a certain naïveté. And in my mind I thought: "Oh, they want to make sure that my husband is not in business where he might be transferred to Colorado or someplace the next year." So I said, "Well, he has a practice as a dentist." So, I thought that was a good answer because it meant that I was not going to move all around. And as it turned out, that was used to place me at the lowest possible rank and lowest salary step. And Ed, the person who was comparable, no one asked him what his wife did and she was a biology faculty member. So, you know, it just was the kind of question that was asked of a woman and not of a man.

WP- Yeah, I've gone back and looked at some of the old job ads that were placed with APA and many of them said- definitely they were looking for a man, and that the man may need a working wife, thus implying that the salary was low. And this was very common in the 50s and up till the end of the 60s, early 70s, this kind of job discrimination toward women.

FD- Yeah, it was very…and as another aside which didn't impact on me but was a thing of… One of my students and some other colleagues did a study at, it was at EPA that they did it, at the time where there was placement. And they were looking at, they were studying the placement situation there. And they interviewed people who came out from being hired and they were told, the ones who were white men were told "Oh, you did a great job in the interview but, you know, because we have to show affirmative action and hire a woman or a minority, man or a woman." And then as they studied the follow-up, and all those positions that said that to these men, ended up hiring white men. They

probably already had them targeted just to a candidate. But the other men who were rejected, turned their minds on women and minorities, so it persisted certainly at that time.

WP- I wanted to ask you about a colleague who has died since, Marcia Guttentag. Did you meet her at Queens? (15:02)

FD- We were both there together, yeah. And we…she became a friend at the time. We were in the same boat, so to speak, with young children, married, and working part-time. And we did research together. So that's some of our early research, was with Marsha. And she died. It was very tragic, how she died, very young. She was young; at the time she died in her forties and she died alone in a hotel room. And they didn't…she had apparently had a heart attack. She had gone into the room to rest and locked the door, put the latch on and, like, the do-not-disturb and so no one…she wasn't discovered until several days later. Tragic.

WP- She had quite a distinguished career.

FD- Yeah.

WP- You know, after your collaboration as well, she went on to do a number of things.

FD- I realize, that's right. But interesting, we ran against each other for several offices, but I was fortunate to win. But that's not…that was before.

WP- Sure.

FD- I don't take anything away from her.

WP- No. When in the 1960s, as you look back on it, when did you begin to get, move towards a more activist stance in terms of women and Psychology?

FD- Well, I credit the person who made me join things and do things, someone else, I credited Mary Reuder, and this is Virginia Staudt Sexton who said to me, and this was very helpful as a young faculty member, a new faculty member, she said "Are you a member of NYSPA [New York State Psychological Association]? You must join. Are you a member of the New York Academy of Sciences? You must join." And so I did. You know, I followed her advice which was very good advice. And it wasn't so much that I was active initially on behalf of women but that emerged from just being active and doing things. So, I'm still an activist.

WP- Yes. Let me follow up by asking a little more specifically. By the late 1960s, I think 1969, the Association for Women in Psychology formed. And I think you were one of the original members.

FD- I was an original member.

WP- And what was, again since this is an archival recording, what was the agenda that AWP was…?

FD- Again, going back to employment. It was like a protest against the unfair employment practices at APA, where, you know, it was singling out jobs primarily for men- things you mentioned. And that was a real…so that there was picketing at the convention. And that…I guess the APA Council got weary about things and they decided that, they formed a Task Force. And the Task Force, which was concerned with the role of women and they did it within APA, and that emerged to an ad-hoc committee, then a committee. And now it's the Committee on Women in Psychology. That emerged several years later.(18:47) And then one of the things that the Committee felt was important was to have a Division on Psychology of Women. So that was established in '73.

WP- Do you recall the 1970 meeting of APA where there was a town hall meeting in which Jo Ann Gardner and Nancy Henley and yourself and others. It was really quite a challenge at that town hall meeting at the convention.

FD- Yeah, this is what led to some of these…

WP- Yeah, can you talk a little bit about what you remember about that. It was apparently quite controversial, the things that were said and raised at that meeting.

FD- Well, I'm trying to…I have a pretty good memory but I don't remember all the things. I know there were just some of these same issues raised. And you have to understand Jo Ann Gardner who changed her name later to Jo Ann Evansgardner because she was Jo Ann Evans, she married Mr. Gardner, so she combined the name. But she was quite outspoken and very much so. Nancy Henley also so…I think in a way, I will speak out, but my style is different. So, that's something I remember. I wasn't seen as… in the same, let's say, negative way as some of them.

WP- Yeah. When I look back on that, look at documents from that period, it's a time of general activism. This is generally the same era that the Association for Black Psychologists was formed and soon after the Asian American Psychological Association et cetera. And it seemed to… I've often wondered- and since you were there and a participant- if it did not perhaps take that kind of activism to begin to change APA…

FD- Oh I think so; they would never have changed.

WP- Yeah. Otherwise, just go in and politely ask them, that wasn't working.

FD-No, it wasn't working. You had to...I mean, sometimes that's the only way things work. And jumping to another, a different bit of activism, this was at the- it's in that same time period- at the graduate school at City University where I was as well as at Hunter, the students wanted to have a course in the Psychology of Women. And they

wanted me to teach it. And they were turned down until they got active. They, as a group, crusaded and went to the dean and to the president and they finally got the course. It started as an ad-hoc course, but they were initially turned down. But, I mean, a lot of times it takes activism to make changes and I think student power can be very important.

WP- And you were the, I think you may have been the first person at the doctoral level to teach Psychology of Women.

FD- I was. That was it then. Yeah. (21:48)

WP- I want to come back to that, the time at Hunter there and the Women's Studies work that you did. But first, since we're talking about APA, and, you know, I think you were the third president at Division 35, the Psychology of Women. Can you talk about some of the issues that the Division was then working on? I know this was a time when the ERA was being talked about, the Equal Rights Amendment for Women.

FD- In terms of the Division, the Division was really and still is multi-faceted. So it's involved with research, it was involved with activism and still is. But, I think even to get itself- and now, it's of course the Society for the Psychological Study of Women- but in order to go through Council and be approved as a Division, it had to, you know, it primarily had to be cast in the light of the research. There was concern with these issues, but a lot of the activism, the real activism was done outside from the Association for Women in Psychology and also the Committee on Women in Psychology. So, it was, I mean, and there's multiple overlapping memberships so it wasn't like it was different people. It was the same people, but using different venues to bring this about.

WP- Was that the first Division that you were the president of?

FD- Yeah.

WP- In your memory, yeah.

FD- Yeah, it was.

WP- And what's your sense now, as you look back, in terms of the visibility that that brought you, because five or so years later you became the president of APA.

FD- Well, I think it was the first divisional presidency. I was on APA Council though as a representative from NYSPA, New York State Psychological Association. And I think it was a good time for someone to be involved in the Psychology of Women. I mean, I'm talking personally, well it was a good time anyway because change was happening, but it was also…so, generally and personally. And with the ERA going on, and APA at that time took a stand not to meet in any state which had not ratified the Equal Rights Amendment. So that meant conventions at that time had to be cancelled in Louisiana and Florida, in other places where…Chicago, because Illinois didn't pass it. But, being on Council, I was seen as a leader of the women. And a lot of the men on Council would

ask me, "We'll vote for something that you want, what do the women want and we'll vote…" Well, it was a good feeling of power, because, not that I could command the women's votes for certain other issues but I said I would try. And I got a lot of votes for various things including childcare in conventions, things of that sort.

WP- Right, right. And that had been a longstanding issue, the childcare issue at conventions.

FD- Yeah. So we did get that. (25:39)

WP- When you were president, someone said that you were thought of as the most effective President of APA and sometime, in terms of getting an agenda actually through Council…

FD- Oh, I don't know who said it, but it sounds good.

WP- What do you think were your characteristics that allowed you to do that, facilitated your doing that, accomplishing so much as APA President?

FD- Well, I don't always know. I can only…I will tell you what Jo Ann Evansgardner said. She was on Council when I was president. She said, "You are like the iron fist in the velvet glove." So, it's a matter of I really, you know, would stick to the things I believed in. But I think its style. I mean, the substance was there but there was…I guess having been brought up where qualities like, whatever, femininity, gentleness were perceived as valuable. I was stuck with them, but they were good.

WP- Right. And it may well be that then you served as a model for others who came after you who saw that your style was effective and imitated that.

FD- That may be, I don't know.

WP- Because some APA presidents, frankly, are not very effective. And then others can be. And I think those that know how to work with people are the ones who tend to be the most effective.

FD- That's true.

WP- I think you modeled that. Back in New York, you're at Hunter. And can you talk a little about how the Women's Collective is formed, was formed at Hunter?

FD- Oh, the Collective was formed much later. And that was a title, that's actually a title we gave ourselves. There were about, the membership sometimes varied up to about ten people who were writing this Women's Studies book which is now just about ready to come out in its third edition. Since there were so many names we couldn't just say X and Y, so we just gave ourselves the name, The Hunter College Women's Studies Collective as the author of the text.

And it was a time of a lot of activism when the Women's Studies program got formed. I mean, people didn't want to have a Women's Studies. And Hunter was divided at that time, it's not anymore, but it was divided with four different deans for Social Science, for Science, Arts and Humanities, and Education. And they said, one of the arguments against Women's Studies, "Well, you have people from many disciplines. You can't belong to one dean, therefore you should not be a program." It was quite funny. But, finally it got settled and I think the group reported to the dean of Social Science. But it was a big fight on the Senate. At that time they had what was called Faculty Council, which they have here, but it later became a Senate involving students also. And it finally got approved. I guess I was active in that. I mean I'm very, besides writing the book, I'm very close to the people that I worked with there. (29:12)

WP- Can you give for the tape the title of the book, and perhaps the students would want to know as well.

FD- *Women's Realities, Women's Choices*. So, if anyone here teaches a course in Introduction to Women's Studies, that's a book to use.

WP- It's been kind of a landmark book.

FD- Yeah, it was the first book. What we did, this was very nice in the sense that we had …there was a grant that we had which enabled us to teach each other. We'd take a topic and teach each other from our discipline. And so it might be, it wasn't topics directly from the Psychology of Women, but you might have a topic like, say, Health. And you could talk about mental health, and you could talk about other issues. We had a nurse who came and talked about nurses. You know, so you got a lot of…literature people brought in things that were in the literature about it. You know, so we all taught each other. And then the book, now in its third edition, is not a book that says 'The Psychology of Women' and 'The Sociology of Women' and 'The History of Women', but it was a blend. So I think it's maybe the only Women's Studies book that does that.

WP- Now just again, for the context of it, somewhere in this time period too, maybe just before this, is the quite influential book, *Our Bodies Ourselves*, which continues to be…I would imagine a number of the women in the class know the book and perhaps have read it, used it, et cetera. And of course the Roe v. Wade decision, kind of in the same general period. So, this is a time of profound change, or beginning of a reorientation vis-à-vis women's role in society. And yet, sometimes I look around now, 2005, and it still seems like there's still some barriers there for women, and not just Psychology, but in other sciences and in society. Any thoughts on that, on why those barriers remain?

FD- Yeah, I think some of it has to do with, well, the current leadership at the top which has moved into a very conservative era, we've been in that. And that doesn't help the picture. And then you get someone like the president of Harvard saying, you know, maybe there are genetic differences why women aren't the scientists, the mathematicians." And I thought, when I read that, I thought, "Gee, I'm back forty years

ago or something." It was not, you know, something that you….But, you know these attitudes, the beliefs are still there. Except now, action at Harvard was taken to produce change. And I could answer, you know, a lot of the reasons why women may no be as prominent in math and science at Harvard and other schools but it's not genetically based.

WP- Right. And so there's still work to be done.

FD- Oh yeah. (32:25)

WP- One of the things that you've also worked on over the years is ethnic minority issues in Psychology. Can you talk about that a little bit, how you, kind of, were pulled into that?

FD- Well, I think I got pulled into it…well, first of all when you mentioned Marcia Guttentag- I didn't get pulled into it, my heart has always been there- yeah, but Marcia Guttentag and I did a big study in Manhasset Schools, and it was the time when they were integrating schools in Manhasset, a town on Long Island where they had had two just basically white schools and one basically African American school. And integration came along. And we were able to do a pre and post-integration study, showing the benefits of integration at that time, not only for the minorities, ethnic minority students, but also for the white students. So that was like an early thing. Then, when I was at Hunter- Oh, before that when I was at Queens College, I had also worked in the Testing and Counseling Office and worked as a consultant there to the SEEK Program, which was a program for, it was primarily minority, but it was designed for people who came from poverty areas. And it stood for, I mean, they just had the acronym SEEK for Education, Elevation and Knowledge. And you know, showing how…by working there, showing some of the positive changes that occurred after even one semester for students. And then when I came to Hunter, Hunter then developed its program and I was asked to be the Director. So for two years I was the Director of that SEEK program. And I felt good about it, but I also felt that it was time that they have an ethnic minority to be the Director, not me, after a while. So I felt I got it established and now we move on. So, and there were things, you know… it was very interesting work because many of the students who came there were under-prepared. It was actually a forerunner, it was prior to open admissions; it was a forerunner of that program. But it was very nice in the sense of power. It wasn't power over people but power to make change and do things. And I was able to arrange courses so that I could have someone take it end of a year or a semester and get three credits of English, let's say, by having… well, if it were one semester they could have three regular English hours and three remedial hours, or even nine remedial hours over year three. And then putting students in classes where they could excel, such as Speech classes and they'd get the credits. And it was a really good- and that's what I meant by the power, to arrange these things. And I had…the departments hire the instructors for the remediation, I didn't do that. And that got a lot of the regular departments on board because they didn't want me hiring someone to teach English.

WP- Again, you were in the position of facilitating change.

FD- Yeah, that's what I meant. It was good. So, and the students did very well. I mean, it was amazing how… I mean, in regular classes people didn't know they were SEEK students particularly. And some of them came out after a semester with all 'A's. Many of them not, but one of them transferred to Yale, I remember that. A couple later on came and talked to me years later, and had their doctorate in Psychology. So it was a good feeling too. But that was a, you know, so that was a lot of my early career and history there and today I'm still, you know, a member of the Division 45, the Division of Ethnic Minority Psychology, happy to be there. (37:09)

WP- You know, one of the areas of research that you're very well known for is research in Leadership, and especially Women in Leadership. And I think you actually began this work as an undergraduate. Can you talk about how your thinking and your research kind of evolved over the years?

FD- Well, the early work that I published later but I started as an undergraduate had to do with Leadership. And this was done at Penn where there were, what Penn called women's fraternities, I mean, other people would say sororities; but with fraternities and women's fraternities, sororities. And it was taking a group where there were leaders, the president of each group, and then the question that I looked at and the hypothesis was whether women were conforming more than men as the followers to the leaders. And that was kind of a belief in general at that time, coming out of some of the work of the Authoritarian Personality and the idea that women in general would conform more. And that research showed that they didn't; they were equal. So that was some of the…that was, I guess, my initial work. And then I just got interested and did various studies in the area and looked at Styles of Leadership, meaning whether there were people who raised Authoritarian Leaders, Social Emotional Leaders, and got into some of those things and worked on from there. You know, so it was an interesting… I still sometimes get involved in it.

WP- Well, I think your work is still cited in terms of women's leadership styles…

FD- Yeah.

WP-… the key differences there. Another area that you've worked in, maybe more recently has been on international issues: women in other countries. You've written about this and some Israeli work, if I remember correctly.

FD- Oh yeah, I worked with…that was with a student who was Israeli so she…But that was, yeah…I mean, how did that happen, it's…I think I attribute my initial interest in international activities to APA. Why APA? Because there's always international meetings and I think, not the first, but one of the earliest experiences was going to Lima, Peru. I was President-elect at the time and Nick Cummings who preceded me either couldn't go or didn't want to go, or whatever. So I was asked to go. And then I went when I was President itself, I went to China, [inaudible], you know all this as President,

Israel then for the Women's Congress and then later Santa Domingo when John Conger couldn't go. So it was like I'm filling in. And then I just, you sort of become a junkie. So I'm like an international junkie and I stayed with it.

But that was not just travel…it is great to travel and I joined the International Council of Psychologists, which my husband calls our travel club. You see the people- the same people go and it's a very nice thing. But I did get interested in issues. And then there was also the- it's still going on- the International Interdisciplinary Congress on Women. So, it's academically oriented, not completely academic, but not only Psychology but a lot of studies done with women. And I'm still pursuing some. And Michelle Marcez, who's next to you there and is in the class, involved with me. And I want to ask the class- good opportunity- we're looking at things that are found basically in textbooks or what's taught about, in this case, about women, but internationally.(41:48) Do the studies, I mean there's a lot of women's issues now in, say, introductory Psychology texts and others. But how much of it is international, we want to find out. So I turn to the class and ask you to please let me know, or let Michelle know soon: for your own experience, your undergraduate or your prior-graduate work did you have courses that not only dealt with women, and tell that too, but was there any international component in there? So do let us know. And they have your e-mail, Michelle? Yeah. Good. So let her know within a week.

And that's one thing we want to do and talk about for EPA.

WP- One of the…something you've published fairly recently was some work on Muslim women. Can you talk about that a bit for the recording?

FD- Okay, this is- I guess it was the September issue although it just came out- of *Sex Roles* the journal *Sex Roles*. And that was a volume which I co-edited with Phyllis Katz. Phyllis Katz had been the first editor and we decided to do this together and Joan Chrisler who was the editor of *Sex Roles* agreed that it was an appropriate thing. And we dedicated it to Sue Zalk who had died recently and was the second editor of *Sex Roles*. And, well, we were talking about Muslim women. And we reached out to get people as authors of various articles in there who- not that all were Muslim, but many were- and including people from other countries so that a good friend of mine from Egypt I asked [her] to contribute a chapter. And I think we did…you know, these things take a lot of work especially when people from other countries don't know APA style and it has to be in APA style. We had to do a lot of editing. So, I don't know, I think it's a good, I think it's a very good issue.

WP- So salient right now, the…

FD- That's why we picked that topic, because it's salient. And anyone who wants to see it at all, I have a copy in my office, you can look at it.

WP- Another area is your work on aging. And this is… it seems like there's just, you know, you've done so much, but this work on aging is…

FD- Yeah, I think I move into things by serendipity in some ways. No, it's true, that's the way things often happen, at least they happen to me that way. I mean, it all ties in together; I would say if I had to look for an overall tie it would have to be social issues. But, that happened…well, as a representative to the United Nations- which I am, an NGO, non-governmental, no pay, it's volunteer- but in doing that, I went to a meeting when I first became a representative. I went to a meeting which was sponsored by the Committee on the Status of Women there, but it was a co-sponsored meeting with the Committee on Aging. And the Chair at that time of the Committee on Aging said, "Oh, you must join us." So, I joined Aging as well as the Committee on the Status of Women. And also there was a subcommittee on older women, so I belonged to that. And then through that, I went to Madrid as a…when they had the Second World Assembly on Aging, (45:57) and just got very involved in that work. I mean, not only work but the point that, you know, it's very interesting because most of the older people around the world are women; they live longer than men in every country, there's not one where they don't. But there's a lot of things that you find with the poverty that exists, some of the issues and…and the fact that women are not always allowed to make decisions about their own fate- they have it made for them-and men too, older men, but more women. And it's…so you just learn a lot about what's going on around the world. And we're especially in countries in Africa where the grandparents are taking care of the grandchildren because of the devastating effects of AIDS. And how life expectancy in many of the countries has, let's say, dropped from the 60s, age sixty, to 40s; it's very much, you know. So in certain countries it's rising and the older population is increasing, in general, around the world. And the UN defines older as sixty and over. So, there's just a lot that goes on there.

WP- And that's of course a part of your current work, this is what you're doing now.

FD- Yeah, it is, it is.

WP- You know, since you've traveled so much and you've written about Psychology internationally and all, I'll ask you a question that…I've talked to some psychologists who are from other countries and some psychologists who are American but who are not white and some are not male. And there is a kind of a sense among some psychologists in other countries as well as here that there has been- not necessarily as strong now as it was- but there has been a kind of psychological imperialism practiced by American psychologists that in order to have say, Psychology in Korea, it has to be a kind of American version of Korean. Have you experienced that when you've traveled?

FD- Well, I'd say yes in the sense…well, what would I say? I think because APA particularly is the largest, not only the largest psychological organization, but maybe larger than all the others put together, or just about. And then, of course, the fact that all, basically everything…meetings that are international with the exception probably of the Inter- American Society of Psychology- the meetings are always in English. So, there's that dominance and the fact that APA produces- or its divisions and so on produce- most of the journals, and that's APA style. So there is this dominance that occurs. But, I

almost, well maybe it's the people I'd meet or deal with; I don't get this effect that "Oh, the imperialistic American psychologist." So, rightly or wrongly at least I don't sense that. But there is, I mean, there is that kind of dominance. And perhaps worse than that, I think many of us have to really go out of our way to help, if it's publication, we have to really help people. If their native language is other than English, to really help…it's their paper and all this, but we have to help them rewrite it and help them with APA style. I mean, it's not doing the research or the basic idea, but to do the editing and rewriting before it goes to the editor.

WP- Right. Well, it will be kind of interesting to see how this plays out in the next twenty years or so in terms of the globalization of science and practice and that sort of thing. (50:38)

FD- And of course with the globalization and use of the internet and things it's become much easier to collaborate with others.

WP- I want to open it up to student questions; if any of you have questions, we have time for that.

FD- Come on, this is participation. You're not a student, but you can ask.

Audience- As a travel junkie I'm curious how many countries you've been to.

FD- Oh, God.

Audience- I know it's a lot.

FD- It's a lot. It's over a hundred, about a hundred and fifty. So, my husband and I , we belong to the Century Club which is a hundred or more countries. But, it's great. That's one nice thing, I think, that psychologists really started…me on a lot of these trips. So, like I mentioned the Inter-American Congress- I think I've gone to, my husband and I have gone to, nearly every country in Latin America, and others.

Audience- I was just wondering, when you realized, as you said before, the discrimination- there were certain differences in applying for jobs as a woman- was there any action that you were able to take at that time, like, for example, when they gave you the lower…?

FD- I wasn't at that time, because I didn't know it until after I was hired. I mean, now, I mean, I think, actually I've said to people: well, if they ask me now, I mean then, not now, if I knew what I know now, if they said "what does your husband do?" I would have said "He's a bed-ridden invalid." That's not taking action for others, but it led to some of these things where…You know, it's a matter then of getting on the committees that hire; and when you see anything occurring like that, speaking up and fighting against it. And, again, mentioning aging, there used to be a belief that… what was older- if you were applying to graduate school and you were thirty, you were old. You'd never consider this

old. I mean, you fight for those things. So when you're on admission committees or other hiring, you do. And I will always fight for things like that where it's, you know …when the barriers are really not important, you know, they're just that: barriers that are discriminatory. That doesn't mean you take somebody in a job who's not qualified, but there's, you know, there's so many qualified people that you don't let those barriers stand.
You had a question…

Audience- Yeah, I just wanted to ask what's the best way going about getting involved with an organization like the UN, like as a student?

FD- Well, it's hard as a student. You can go to meetings where you can get a badge. So that Michelle has gone, she's been on a list; she was my, is still my graduate assistant, so she went to some of these meetings.(54:14) And there are ways to get there. It's hard to get directly, but if you have that interest, talk to me, or anyone who does. And other meetings, if you have an interest, you know, there's plenty of places you can join. I mean, APA, for example, has a lot of, and its divisions have student affiliates. So if you have the interest in, let's say, International Psychology, you can join there and be active. We have student groups, people who are active. There's APAGS. You're probably indoctrinated into Division 16, but there are others, if you're interested. There are so many divisions that you can meet your own interests. And if anyone has these interests and you don't know how to get started, see me, I'll help you. It's easy.

Audience- I was wondering what our role might be in the future in terms of International Psychology, just thinking of natural disasters like the Tsunami and people who've gone to help with the relief. We talk about imperialism and how our view of Psychology might be different than their view of mental health. How do you see…you have all the people trained here…

FD-Yeah, I think help is always welcome. But the wrong thing is to go in and, you know, be this 'I know everything because I'm an American who got my degree, got my doctorate. And this country only has people who practice Psychology at the masters level,' and most countries around the world do. So, the best way to work is to work *with* people, not coming in to tell people what to do but to, you know. And the same thing for those who…I was on a program at the UN with people from African who were talking about AIDS program, and they said, you know, they welcome the help, but not to tell them what to do, to work with people. And that's one of the best ways to find help. And of course, there's also work in disasters like 9/11 where people- you didn't have to worry about working in terms of other countries- but a lot of people in NYSPA took a role there. There are others who worked to help people through suffering, had the effects of the disaster there. [inaudible]. And the thing is, you can work… if you join something like the International Division, you establish contacts with people. It's easy enough to do and then, you know, they'll tell you themselves [inaudible].
Sorry, didn't see you there, didn't turn around.

Audience- Just thinking about your story, and thinking about how Psychology used to be dominated by men, it's funny I don't know if the term is [inaudible]. But School Psychology is definitely a field that's dominated by women, or becoming that way. Do you have any thoughts about why that might be or if that's solely a good thing, or if there's any negative implications to that in terms of pay?

FD- Well, one thing, I would raise the question to you, and you as a group would know better than I, because when you said School- I don't know the answer- you said School Psychology is dominated now by women. I don't know if it is or not, and that means who are the leaders, the quote leaders in this country. I mean, who are the presidents, like, of Division 16 and so on. So, I don't know that answer. But, if you're asking, you know, it's getting more and more women are entering the field; like I felt happy when I came to this class and said "Well, we have four men, that's a lot." But, I would like to see more men enter the field (58:50), not instead of women- both, but to have it more balanced. But, you know, I think there are reasons to explain it, to some extent. I think some of it, overall, is pay. But, I don't think just because women are now not a minority that the pay has gone down. But what is seen as…you don't find…you find people in the undergraduate schools, like, what is it? Roughly, I don't know now, a lot, but two thirds or more of the majors in Psychology are women. And because other fields outside of Psychology in terms of pay seem desirable to men, whether it's business or whatever. So, and then of course things like those who are going into practice deal with managed care and things like that which has an effect on who goes in. So, but I think that the…you know, things that are true today aren't always true tomorrow. And it doesn't mean that because more women are in the field that pay is going down. In fact, many places I know the pay is pretty good, very good. So, but I think it is a matter, there's a big concern at APA not only to increase the numbers in Psychology of ethnic minority, as students, but to bring more men into the field. So, it is a concern. But, for balance more. And I think that the problem might be- less directly in the schools- but if you were practicing in a private practice or in a hospital setting, there might be a lot of patients, clients who might need a man therapist; just it used to be the problem the other way, where there weren't women [inaudible] men. But you don't want to see that imbalance either way if it's going to affect treatment. So, but we just have to…something to work on, and not disparaging anybody- men or women- in the group, make it a more balanced field.

WP- Well, thank you so much for doing this interview.