

**Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History Project**

**Interview with Janice D.Yoder**

*Interviewed by Alexandra Rutherford  
Akron, OH  
April 28, 2008*

**When citing this interview, please use the following citation:**

Yoder, J. D. (2008, April 28). Interview by A. Rutherford [Video Recording]. Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History and Online Archive Project. Akron, OH.

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

Alexandra Rutherford, PhD  
Project Director, Psychology's Feminist Voices  
[alexr@yorku.ca](mailto:alexr@yorku.ca)

**©Psychology's Feminist Voices, 2010**

**Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History Project**  
**Interview with Janice Yoder**  
**Interviewed By Alexandra Rutherford**  
**Akron, OH**  
**April 28, 2008**

AR: Alexandra Rutherford, Interviewer

JY: Janice Yoder, Interview Participant

---

AR – Could state your full name, and your place and date of birth for the record?

JY – Janice Danna Yoder. I was born in Reading, Pennsylvania in 1952, December 31<sup>st</sup>.

AR – We will start with the question that I have asked of almost every participant in this project – to get us rolling – and that question is: Can you tell me about the development of your identity as a feminist?

JY – It's funny! I was thinking about this question and it is actually somewhat embarrassing! Because if I go back far enough, I would not be a feminist. The first thing I thought back to was in college. I went to a College that had a ratio of two men to every one woman, and there was a movement at the time to equalize that ratio.

AR – This is Gettysburg?

JY – This is Gettysburg College. And I actually remember coming out on the side of wanting to keep things the way they were! And, I really did not have the tools to think about it back then, this is 1970 to 1974 when I was in college; there were no Women Studies courses. So, you did not think about these things that way but – in retrospect – I really liked the privilege of being one of a smaller group. I mean, the admission criteria for us were higher, and so you felt that you were more select, in terms of heterosexual dating it was a nice ratio. Now I can look back on it as trading on some privileges. So, my awakening comes very slowly over the course of kind of growing up, by growing up I really do not think I grew up out of that nice safe network until graduate school. It was in graduate school that you started noticing that male faculty would take male graduate students to convention and introduce them around, and women were attracted more toward teaching jobs and things that would balance family.

I remember a faculty [member] introducing me to Neal Miller as one of the graduate student who was accepted for her looks! He meant it as something that was flattering but it really just diminished your professionalism. I remember crawling away from that introduction and feeling, you know, very underappreciated. So, it is something that developed over time, and if I really think of any one event that kind of galvanized my feeling of [being] a feminist, I mean, I will be hard-pressed to. My first job out of graduate school I found myself severely sexually harassed. I mean, a senior faculty [where] I was in a visiting appointment basically said: “Go to Mexico for the weekend” or “Your job is not going to last beyond the year”! And so, it was this slow kind

of, associating with different people – one of whom is my partner, he is a sociology professor who studies social inequality – and so now you can start and see some of the structural kind of components of feminism. So, without that kind of infusion of women studies classes in any kind of formal thinking, clearly it was not something that would have been discussed in my family. Really, it is something that had to evolve over time and experiences, and finally kind of putting things together that: “Being female is a kind of oppression”. {04:07}

AR – During this process of kind of coming into your feminism – you mentioned it is the 70s, right – you started off an undergrad in 1970, go through your undergrad and then go through your graduate work mid to late 70s. There were a lot of things going on in terms of the second wave of the women’s movement, was that in your consciousness?

JY – Probably not! In all honesty, I mean, I went to a small school – Gettysburg College, Pennsylvania – where I was pretty insulated, then went to University of Buffalo for graduate school, which you would have thought would bring more involvement, but graduate school was kind of getting through graduate school. I went through a divorce in graduate school. So, there were just, you know, I think...

AR – That was a pretty self-contained world right there!

JY – Exactly! And again, there was not anything that, there was no coalescing point around where I was that would have kind of brought those things together, which is really different. Now looking back – what is it, 30 some years later – I mean, I have a strong feminist network, both locally and nationally, and these issues are really top of mind, and you are teaching, there is this whole body of material out there that gets you thinking along these lines. There is that kind of networking in collaboration, none of that existed and I would not have gone to seek it out.

AR – Tell me then what attracted you to, or how you got into psychology. And specifically – of course, then – social psychology. But where did your interest in psychology come from, how did that work for you?

JY – And again, kind of baby steps! I mean, you know in college you were required to declare a major when you started in. I started as a sociology major, took a sociology course, did not like it, and next semester I enrolled in an “Intro to psych”, which I liked. And that it gets to be just stumbling on to things that were really provocative for me! I mean, one of the first courses I took was “Research Methods” with Bob [D’Agostino] (06: 34), and Bob just got me thinking, it was a new way to think about things. He was also a very strong mentor, told me that I had capabilities that I never thought I had. And so, it was somebody who thought that I could go somewhere that made this big difference. I mean Bob really is the first person who told me that I could do something. And then, I enrolled in Thane Pittman’s social psych course, loved the content! But then, regressed back, and actually started graduate school at Buffalo because it was the one place where my first husband got into dental school! So again, I mean, not a very [planful] (07:25) approach but more finding oneself in kind of evolving situations, that I look back on with some embarrassment!

AR – Well, you certainly made it work! No matter how it happened, you made it work! But, tell me a bit about SUNY Buffalo, who did you work with there?

JY – I did my Masters project with Barbara Bunker, and then moved on to work with Ed Hollander on some leadership issues.

AR – {07:55} I saw his name somewhere on your CV, or on an article you have written.

JY – We wrote an article together, and I did a totally unremarkable dissertation. I mean, I just found myself in fourth year of graduate school, knew that I was falling into the trap of teaching all over the place to kind of put together the finances, and finally decided that I needed to do a quick and dirty dissertation and move on with my life. And so, within nine month I completed a dissertation that – again – was completely unremarkable, never published, and went from there.

AR – And when did your involvement in *Project Athena* kind of get going?

JY – That actually (again, you are just talking about opportunities), [was] happenstance. I started graduate school in an NIH internship and that lasted three years. And then, there was a budget crunch and the university stopped funding more advanced students thinking that we could find employment elsewhere, and that is when I started teaching at all these small schools, making a pittance and falling into that trap of – I think – potentially being ABD forever. And so the opportunity came along to do some statistical analysis for *Project Athena* – that was through Bob Rice.

AR – And for the tape, can you say what *Project Athena* is or was?

JY – *Project Athena* actually turned into, I guess, about a nine year study of the integration of women into the United States military academy at West Point. So, it began in 1976, I became involved in 1977, again doing some data analysis. Based on these analyses, Jerome Adams who headed the project wanted to bring in some women to teach at West Point, because West Point faculty were all military personal. So, given that there were not any women who would come through the ranks – West Point also liked hiring people from West Point – so he was looking for ways to bring women in and so, I had an offer to be one of the first two civilian women to teach at West Point. So July 1 1980, I show up at West Point, I am given a cadet jeep, and drive around and start seeing basic training. I did the “Confidence Course”, I repelled down a wall, I did “Recondo Training”, which is a parachute simulation where you jump off a 60 foot platform although I am convinced I was pushed! And you ride this cable across a lake and fall into the water at the end. So, it was exciting but also extremely stressful. I mean, I was one of eleven civilian faculties, I was 27 years old. I was approached by the head of my department and told that I needed to wear a bra when I was teaching. I mean, it was living in a fishbowl. I started twitching, and after six month of a two years contract, I left West Point.

AR – Ok! And, what had you been hired to teach, what were you teaching?

JY – Intro to Psych. One of my favourite stories is that the way that West Point taught Intro to Psych was they had small classes where students were seated around a horseshoe, and down this

long hallway all these classroom were covering the same material at the same time as they did Intro to Psych. And so, if a movie was being shown that day, the movie would suddenly appear in the T.V. screen in the corner; and so it was very uniformly taught down this hallway. And students actually knew this; they used to refer to teaching as “passing the poop”, so you were supposed to just pass on the information. So, one of my favourite stories: I went to teach the first day of class. And this class of poor first year cadets has this young woman walk into their class and they are totally primed because this is their first class. 7:30 in the morning, and they are supposed to stand up, I guess they say “Good Morning M am” – and I did not know the second part they were saying – “May we please be seated”. But they barked it! {12:33} And I had no idea of what they were saying, and I was standing and looking at this group of people who were standing as my colleagues are laughing out in the hall! And finally, there was a woman who was – I do not know if she was the sergeant of arm – but she was the main person for the class and she whispered to me: “There are asking if they can seat down”! So, it was an amazing experience in a lot of ways. And then, I mean, one of the things that I found really disturbing about it as a researcher is that they very much control the data; they had censoring rights over what we published, and so I found myself not being able to do some of the research I wanted to do and found it very limiting. So, although it was a great opportunity on some levels, it actually turned out to be very disappointing on other levels.

AR – So you were hired to teach, and – of course – do research on the experiences of this first cohort of women.

JY – And I had this wonderful title: “I was a Distinguished Visiting Professor”! 27 years-old, they like doubled my salary, I lived in a bachelor officer’s quarters, met General Westmorland and argued with him about whether women should be in the military. So, it was an amazing experience.

AR – In anyway, did your experience of “being in the fishbowl”, so to speak, did that inform or influence your subsequent work on tokenism?

JY – Oh very much so! And in fact, I wrote a paper that appeared in the “Journal of Social Issues” talked about tokenism form an individual’s perspective. And, it was actually the publication of that article that had me removed from *Project Athena*.

AR – Really! Can tell us a little about that?

JY – I talked about how difficult it was to be living in a fishbowl, of the visibility of being one of a few. The whole thing I found really appealing about the theory of tokenism is that it looked at some social processes for women, like their marginalization and performance stresses as being structurally based. And I found that very, very appealing, and also explained to me that what I was feeling as personal failure was really pretty much predetermined by the structure of the context that I was in. And so, as a social psychologist, that made a lot of sense to me. And, I think also feeling the consequences of that stress – you know I had a series of health problems, I did a lot of self blame: was I too immature for this position? All of these kinds of things, I think I could easily internalized those, and really had, I think, a serious kind of self-esteem issue. Kanter’s theory then became very attractive to me because it started to talk about those feelings

as being part of a larger social structure, which then led to my first really major strand of research as feminist psychologist, that is – I think – what propelled me to actually being able to think at a very resonating level about what it was like to be a token.

AR – And you have written a bit about that, about Kanter’s work. Although her work was, in terms of xs and os - although she talked about men and women – she did not necessarily bring an appreciation of the gendered nature of social structure.

JY – Exactly! {16:28}

AR – And you, of course, did. That is what you brought to this. My next question is, how did you merge your feminism with your work as a psychologist? How did you bring feminism to bear then on your emerging kind of research?

JY – I think have had that personal experience really helped do that for me. Because, again, there was not much literature at the time, and Kanter’s work was very path breaking in that it did take a look at social structures that did have application to gender. And she clearly used the situation of women being underrepresented relative to men, which she then framed though in this kind of gender neutral way in terms of proportion.

AR – Add more women and it will all go away!

JY – And it will all go away, exactly! And so, one of my favourite studies that we did in the mid 80s – because I went from West Point to teaching in a small school in St. Louis – this is when John start entering the picture, and so now we starting into dual career kind of partner issues. So, he was at Washington University and I went to Webster College, which then turned into Webster University. And, I had a student who worked at the St. Louis zoo and what she noticed is that there were these different sites around the zoo of concession stands and gift shops that had different staffing. So, the gift shop was all women. There was an isolated concession stand where they only put men because it was isolated; it would a hard place to put women they thought. Other than that there was a main concession stand that was pretty mixed. We threw Laura Sinnett who, last I heard, was Dean at Grinnell College – she has launched this great administrative career – but Laura was able to convince the zoo’s administration to let us randomly assign the first year seasonal workers. So, we put two men in the gift shop with all these women; and they started being invited to baby showers and became very popular! We took one woman and put her out in that isolated concession stand, which – in retrospect – was horrible! And, she was very isolated out there, she was very uncomfortable with the men, she felt all the things that you would expect her to feel. She felt isolated, she felt that everyone was watching her, she did not have good relationship with the men, and she would always spend her breaks at the main concession stand trying to be in the mixed group. Low and behold, by the end of the summer, probably the most telling thing we saw, is in that whole cohort of incoming worker, two of them were selected for promotion. And those were the two men we randomly assigned to the gift shop, and our poor woman token quit.

AR – Did you debrief her after? It was not you, it was the situation!

JY – Exactly! And, we did not, you know. Part of it was that we were doing unobtrusive observation; people did not really know that they were participating in our research. And part of the I.R.B. consideration was not to make people aware that they were being studied. So, no we never debriefed this poor woman; and I always feel totally guilty about the fact that, I am sure, she had a horrible summer. {20:18} It really kind was a precursor for a lot of subsequent research that Christine Williams did, looking at how men rise in female dominated occupations as well as, I thought, really highlighted the impact of gender, that it was not just proportions. Why is it that our two disproportionally represented token men did better than fine? They actually advanced! And how is it that our lone token woman had such troubles? So, I think it really did – in my mind – coalesce my ideas about the gender in tokenism.

AR – So many things come to mind, I will try and keep them in mind. But, one of the things you mentioned earlier, this was kind of the start of negotiating this whole dual career issue in your life. Do you want to talk a little about that, and the challenges of being a dual career couple, how you have personally managed that?

JY – Or not managed that!

AR – Yes, either way!

JY – You know, it is funny again I had enough time to kind of think through some of the question that you were going to ask. And, if I would summarize my main kind of feeling about having to deal with a dual career situation, it would be always making lemonade out of lemons! You never really – and I think that is probably my biggest kind of career regret – is that I never had an opportunity to just do what for me might had been the best thing to do. It always had to be in the context of, you know, what works for the kid, what works for my partner and so on. And you know, I would not give up the fact that you made that sacrifice to have things work out but, I would really love to have a job where I was recruited, and they really wanted me, and I was bringing something that the department truly valued. I just think it would be wonderful to have that experience, I have never had that opportunity! And, I get the sense from a lot of women I know that I am not alone in that regard. That is a really common – especially those of us who do gender – it is almost like a perspective that is tolerated rather than actually sought after. And, in fact, I look at my teaching load and I kind of feel that I get to teach “Psychology of Women” because I also do the service work of teaching “Research Method”. And so, it just never seems that it is valued for what it is and I what I really value.

AR – Why don’t we add race? So, going back to your work on tokenism, going back to the kind of trajectory of your research, can you talk a little bit about what came together so that you added this other component?

JY – And again, you know it is capitalizing on opportunities that present themselves. As the Zoo opportunity came about because of the student and Laura Sinnett, this came about because of a graduate student, Patricia Aniakudo. Patricia’s sister, Maureen, was an African-American woman firefighter, which got us talking to Maureen about what it is like to work in firehouse where not only are you different from the majority based on your gender, but also on your race. And, you know, this again is about at a time when the people were talking about double-

jeopardy, I mean, people did not have really the concept of intersectionality down. And that is what our research, I think, started to show is that you could not really say that this was an additive affect but rather, you know, there is this – everything that Maureen experienced was shaped by the fact that she was both African-American and a woman in a context that was largely white men {24:32}. And so, we started to kind of put together how that worked, it also expanded countless Xs and Os, to now include, you know, her relationships with white men, her relationships with other women, her relationships with African-American men, and so it just expanded the complexity and scope of how we started talking about the social relations. And in firefighting, it was just this amazing way to study this, because you had people who were in intimate contact with each other. I mean, they shared living corners, it is high crisis kind of occupation, and you know it takes teamwork; there is all kind of stereotyping that goes on. And, I think that was kind of one of the most interesting thing that ultimately we found is that, if we compare the experiences of African-American women with white women – and I think what was fascinating about this work is that we started with African-American women, and went from there to talk about white women rather than the reverse – is that the stereotyping that affected both groups was very intense, and if you asked both groups, you know: “do you feel stereotyped?”, you would have gotten a lot of confirmations of that. But, the form that that stereotyping took was totally different! Because the stereotypes that African-American women faced was that they were strong, self-reliant, and did not help, and they were actually left on their own to flounder; while the stereotypes that white women dealt with is that they were fragile, and they needed to be protected, and so people were smothering them with unwanted help so that it actually kept them from doing their jobs. So, you have two diametrically opposed kinds of reactions to stereotyping because the stereotyping is so different for the two groups of women. So, and again things got more complex, more nuanced, and I think it became a much more interesting area of research as we kind of took it through the 90s.

AR – Well, tell me about the evolution of method in this story as well. Because, you have got a couple of more or less naturalistic situations – although you did randomly assigned in the gift shop scenario but, nonetheless, more or less naturalistic – but then it sounds like you take this (looking at your publications and everything) into a more experimental mode.

JY – And that has been true of my research throughout my careers, that we go back and forth between the lab and the field. We hopped on, you know, interviews and surveys, and a field experiment and some laboratory work, and you know, all kind of triangulating on the kind of same idea that this process is gendered, that gender intersects with race, so these kinds of big picture ideas evolve, I think, out of this program of research that draws on, I think, a richer way of methodology so, that has always been. I think the challenge and the fun of it is that it has been this kind of interplay between the field and the lab.

AR – And, you have written on the kind of different definition or different levels, I guess, of context, right. Going right from kind of, you know, individual and dyadic kinds of contexts, all the way up to social-political contexts. It strikes me that one way of being able to get at all these levels is to go between sort of experimental laboratory based situations out into the world and, you know, so that you get at different kinds of context, right?



JY – And it also speaks, I think, to the role that feminism plays in this, because instead of, you know, you do this kind of crossover between psych. and soc[iology].; and the lines start to blur because the glue that holds it all together is this feminist approach. If you are really going to understand gender, its full context, then you cannot just focus on the dyad, or you cannot just focus on the large social structures {28:56}, you need to look at all these kinds of gradations of context. And again, I mean, it is that richness that I found so interesting.

AR – You can tell me, you mentioned Kanter’s work as being influential. Can you think of any other works – I am thinking specifically writings on gender and/or feminism – that had been influential to you as you have been kind of building your research and building your work?

JY – I mean if we go to the kind of theory end, I love bell hooks’ *Margin to Center*, it really gave kind of a definition to feminism for me about ending sexist oppression that, I think, has held up over - you know, it was published in the mid 80s - and it has held up very well over time. In the 80s, I was part of a reading group and it was multidisciplinary, it was in St. Louis, and that really helped kind of broaden my perspective, and so it is working with that network of women from different disciplines that, I think, really kind of broadened ... I also had an opportunity – one of my favourite opportunities in Milwaukee is that I got to teach – co-teach – an Into to Women Studies class with Gwen Kennedy who was in the English department. We use to laugh at each other, I mean, back then we were doing overheads and, I would come in with overhead with data and she would come in with essay or a poem. But there would be this convergence of ideas that just came from these two different disciplines, and so having that richness of a women’s studies network, I think, was really important. So, there is the network itself, there is writing like bell hooks’, and then – within psych. – I do not know if there is one thing that I would point to as like a seminal reading that really changed the way I see things. Again, it comes from just having this network of people that you listen to, and then... I guess, the other opportunity - reading broadly in the discipline for a textbook actually helped me kind of read across [areas] and, you know, there is Alice Eagly’s work, and Rhoda Unger’s work. It is hard not to think of Rhoda’s work as being, I mean, “Through the Looking Glass”, I mean these are really amazing. Carolyn Sherif’s “Bias in Psychology”, I mean, they are so much a part of the way we think now, I even forget how influential they were at the time that I read them, they are amazing papers.

AR – Well, tell me a little bit about your relationship to Women Studies, because you have been director of Women Studies at a couple of places, but I guess through the longest period of time at Wisconsin, Milwaukee. From your perspective as a psychologist, what was your involvement in the women studies like?

JY – You know it was broadening, which I think is – again – really important in that, you know, suddenly you are sponsoring talks from people in the humanities, and people in history, and reading Paula Giddings’ book *When and Where I Enter*, I mean, those are things I wouldn’t picked up if I had not had that women studies network. There are so influential in the way you kind of think about things, I mean, Giddings’ book is just this great understanding of the impact of race and ethnicities on women’s lives. And so, I would not have gotten that if, I think, I had stayed kind of narrowly focused within psychology.

AR – In your experience, how was psychology – how was and how is, I guess, also kind of coming into the present – is psychology viewed in women studies? I know that there have been some people who have kind of observed that maybe psychology does not have prominent a role now in women studies as they might like it to have; I am sure different programs are different in that respect. But, what has been your experience in terms of being a psychologist and bringing psychology to the table, how has that gone over in women studies, and where do you see it now?

{33:45}JY – Because, I know one of the things that psych. can get very insular about is this idea, you know, we do this strongly empirical, strongly statistically oriented...

AR – Even, quantitative...

JY – Yes, which I think gets exclusive and then we do not talk well across boundaries with other people if we kind of focus too narrowly. And so, you can see how there is almost elitist dissociation that psychology can get into within women studies, which I really think is not in our best interest! And actually coming into being an editor of PWQ, it is one of the things I want to try to work on; I want to see if we can kind of expand the discourse in the profession. The downside of that always is that, then you are outside the mainstream of your discipline! So, you no longer – you know, I have never had a PSYCH. BULL. article or JPSP article, and I must admit, you know, what it takes to do that kind of work sometimes is not really appealing to me! Because, it does get too narrowly prescribed, and kind of loses the sight of the “why you are doing this”!

AR – It loses the sight of the context sometimes!

JY – Yes! And I think, you know, as feminist scholars – I mean – we really do want to make a difference with our work! So, we have a reason for doing it other than, I think, you are studying some theoretical nuances or taking some, you know, rigorously applied experimental approach, I mean, there is really some cool stuff going on, but sometimes it just seems mechanical! And that is again, if you look at my record I am all over the place in what I have done. I have never really focused on one methodology or one way of doing things, so I like that breadth, I like that kind of cross-fertilization of ideas, which I do not think it is appreciated in the mainstream as much as it should be.

AR – I think you are right! I mean, feminist psychologists have certainly made an important contribution here, but mainstream psychology has not been exactly revolutionized, yet, by that notion of coming out with different methods, with the importance of context.

JY – Which means, you know, Carolyn’s *Bias in Psychology* is still there. You still get the hierarchy, you still have the idea that there is the rigorous experimentalist and, you know, I like doing experiments, I like manipulating variables, I like being able to do a two-by-two and be able to make causal statements. I think that’s cool! I do not need to do SEM, I do not know how to do SEM but you know, on the other hand, if there is no value or no meaning to what you do, I mean, then I think you are losing track of your feminist self, and that to me would be really disappointing.

AR – Yes! Well, let me switch gears a little bit and ask about when you first became involved in Division 35 – The Society for the Psychology of Women – and how did that happen.

JY – {37:38} That goes back to Janet Hyde! You know, I like how you can always mark things by people, because so much of everything we do is been people who have really shaped our opportunities and our ways of thinking. And so, Division 35 is Janet – actually Pam Reid reached out to me before that – but I had just had a baby and I know that, I look back on it kind of regretfully because I basically told Pam: “I can’t juggle this right now!” And, she was very nice about trying to be persistent and trying to get me involved; I am terribly grateful to Pam. But, Janet actually called me at a time when my son – who is my second child – was two-years-old and for some reason I agreed to be her program chair. It was exhausting! It was really exhausting, but I went to the executive (38:31) meeting in Madison and found myself sitting around this big table of big names that I have always heard about and seating to me it was Paula Caplan! And I was starstruck, and there they are clapping for me for the work I did as program chair! I was totally hooked, I mean, that was it I was totally hooked! I would have done anything to be able to come back to an executive committee meeting; I did not care which work, I did not care how much sleeplessness, I was coming back! So, the next thing I did was, I guess I was newsletter editor for three years; went on to be secretary, then President. You know, I swear, if there is a committee I have probably been on it: membership, fellows, you know I’m just ... I’m hot!

AR – Tell me what hooked you, elaborate on that for me! What hooked you about being there?

JY – Again, part of it was this kind of [being] starstruck! It means being seating next to Paula Caplan, I remember taking a cab to Janet’s house for dinner, because we actually had a dinner at her house, and in this cab was Lenore Walker. This is during the Lorena Bobbitt thing and, you know, we had this wonderful dinner – too much wine – and all these incredible jokes based on Lorena Bobbitt, which I actually made the mistake of going back and telling one to one of my colleagues and just forgetting that I was out of that context! You know, it had to do with penis size and he was appalled!

AR – Oh oops! I’m not there!

JY – I’m not there! I’m a social psychologist - I should understand context matters, and this isn’t a feminist context! But just to have that freedom to be with this group of women who saw the world through similar lenses, and you could just kind of get rejuvenated, reinvigorated. I mean, it made up for this whole year long of sexist jokes, constantly being marginalized, so you could just be yourself in this wonderful place! I mean, 35 has my undying gratitude, I would do anything for the division.

AR – That is amazing! Tell me a little bit about your presidential year! What was that like for you, what you wanted to accomplish, how did it go? Funny stories, anything...

JY – I had kind of a memorable presidential year. It was during the second multicultural summit that we had our executive committee meeting, and so there had been these terrific presentations, a video (41:28), Claude Steele gave his seminal presentation on stereotype threat, and aversive

racism and sexism, and people had done difficult dialogues, I mean, people were really pumped about being open and forthcoming about whatever issues were going on. And so, there we were - Saturday is our executive committee meeting, and the executive committee I purposely expanded. And, what I wanted to do was honour the years of service that we had and people who had been involved in division 35 for a long time, and at the same time bringing in some new people. So, I purposely expanded the executive committee shamelessly, I mean {42:16}, I practically doubled it, because what I did it was appointing co-chairs to all kinds of things! So, I kept the senior people and brought in more junior people; so we had this amazing mix of people around the table. And, it exploded! I mean, it just totally exploded – I must admit, I have repressed a lot of it – things were said that were very difficult. I know, feelings were hurt, I mean, it was a very, very, difficult meeting. And, my biggest memory is when the meeting ended it was 5 o'clock and, there had been all this discussion and there were several point that were in discussion that I tried to bring us back to the agenda and finally I gave up and figured that this needed to go where it was going to go. When it hit 5 o'clock, I remember everyone in the room turning to me and looking at me and, there I was having to bring this meeting to an end and I remember saying something along the lines of: “You know, I did twelve years of parochial education; I was raised as this very dutiful catholic girl and you totally got me off my agenda, we didn't accomplish anything that we were supposed to do today, but I am so glad we did, so let's all come back and we'll carry on from here, you know, I think we just laid some groundwork to move forward in some very productive ways” – which I guess everyone really laughed at in retrospect because suddenly there was this kind of very personal confession of “Oh, my god!” “We are off the agenda, we didn't have anything accomplished I “Miss ‘compulsively organized”” person, we didn't do all these things”.

And then, I had arranged for us that night to go to the Santa Barbara Faculty Club and have dinner together in this nice little kind of reserved space. And, we were taking the bus over; we all had to get on a bus together after all this stuff went on. And then, I had planned for the end of it what I still think was this wonderful slide show where I asked people to send me pictures of themselves as children because, I realized, we did not know each other. We see each other once a year but we have no idea what our home lives look like, who we are and so people would, you know, stand up and have a picture that laughs at themselves and – ironically – mine was of my first communion looking very angelic! And people just said things about themselves! And, you know, I remember someone came out and showed us a picture of her partner and we suddenly found out that this – most of us did not know she was lesbian – and now all of sudden now we know: “A partner, that's interesting”. So, we started to know things about each other – it is not that anyone had any problem knowing these things, we just did not. But, here it was coming out after this context, this incredibly rough meeting and so, I remember once everyone left, laying in the hotel pool kind of half drowning myself and just not knowing if we had totally blown out a division or if we had kind of established a place where we could go on and be bettered. And I think it is the latter – I really do – I think it is the latter, I think we moved on in some really productive ways. I mean, I look at the presidents that have come after my term, and there are a lot of the people who were co-chairs, with the new blood – not necessarily younger, but with the new blood – that was brought into the division. I think that kind of had a lasting legacy for many years to come! And now, I go to the E.C. meeting and do not even recognize some of the people around the table, which – I think – is a terrific sign. It is younger, it is newer, it is vibrant, there are still some of the old timers in the room so it is not devoid of its history. But, I like where the

division is going! It is rocky rather than ... It is still growing, has growing pains, but I think it is stronger and better for it. I don't know, you know, I mean that is my view of where my presidency fits in that. It is probably an overblown view because, like most people, I know my piece of it but I think it was a turning point year. {47:05}

AR – Let me ask you not only now about the division and kind of, of course, the important role it plays in feminist psychology, let me ask you about your kind of point of view on feminist psychology more generally. What do you think have been the most important things that feminist psychology has accomplished, and then what has it been not as successful at, that you hope it would be successful at doing? And, I am thinking in terms of its impact on psychology, that kind of thing.

JY – Or if I could, I mean, what I would say its biggest impact has been, it has been in the classroom. If I look at my own history of changing jobs, you know I always taught psych. of women classes wherever I went. And so, it was a matter of convincing colleagues that this was a viable course and usually you could always sell it because students would be interested in it. You in Milwaukee it went from a brand new course in the books to – when I left – being offered five times a year and always fill into capacity. And then I started over here in Akron with the same thing, I mean, it started out as a special topic course, then it became part of the curriculum, this year it is being offered three times – and again fill into capacity. And so, I think that to me is the most exciting thing we do, it is what we do in psychology of women classes because we are really taking the discipline and taking it to our students in a way that, I think, is really meaningful to their lives. I think students come out of that course seeing the world differently, and we have data now to show that. I mean, you know, one of our most recent papers is looking at the impact of psychology of women courses on moving people away from essentialist thinking, this is the way women and men are to thinking more in terms of social constructionism – and not only in terms of “this is the way women and men are raised to be”, but more in terms of the present social context. And to the extent that we can do that, we can also enhance feminist identification among our students. So, I mean, those data as well as just kind of you got sense of what is going on in your classrooms, I think is really important. I mean we are doing what Laura Brown calls “subversive feminism”, which I like – I think that is lots of fun.

My biggest disappointment – the flipside of the coin – is that we still have not worked out a way to do work with family conflict, I mean, we just haven't! And I thought, you know, when I was women studies' director in the early 90s I said that I thought that was one of the most pressing issues in terms of women's day to day lives, and I still feel that. You know, I am watching a 22 years-old daughter go out there and really face a world that is no different than the world I faced 30 years before her in terms of, you know, lack of support, in term of trying to work out her relationship with her partner, and trying to juggle all that kind of work-family conflicts, which plays out so differently for women and men. You know there is no conflict between being the parent breadwinner and being the person whose job is primary and who makes more, as opposed to being the trailing spouse, the person who has to be good enough to be hired after he is hired – all of these kinds of issues. I am still at a university that has a very bare and bones maternity policy, has not been able to work out the reproductive clock with the tenure clock.

AR – Going back to the notion of teaching and the contribution that psych. of women has made. I mean your career, you have had this amazing research career, but you also have had an amazing teaching career. I mean, you have written on teaching, published research on teaching, you have written textbooks, your classroom teaching is award winning. Tell me a little a bit about that! What has it been for you? What is it about the experience of teaching that gets you going? And, tell me a little bit about the circumstances that led to your writing of your textbook too. {51:50}

JY – Ok! Well, first of all, one of the things I really like about what I have been able to do is I really have done this kind of blending of research, teaching, and service. So, I am not wedded to any one of them, but I have kind been able to blend the three I think in some really nice ways, so I like that. In terms of teaching kind of like, what turns you on?

AR – Yes!

JY – It has to do with kind of getting people to think outside the box they came in with. And so, if you can just shake up people's world a little bit, I think that is exciting! I really think that is exciting. My class the other day was so funny; there was something in there we were talking about and their point was: Well, other people see it that way but we have had this class, we know better! It just like, "thank you, what a gift you have just gave me", because that is exactly what I want to hear is that, it is just not as simple, and as easy as it used to be – I am seeing things differently! And, I think that is really exciting. The fact that you can do that and they do that to me, you know, teaching is the best way to learn something. I am always learning, I am always challenged. You are always thinking: "Is there a better way to present this or more meaningful way to present this?" What are they thinking, what are they saying to me? And, you know, "what is their perspective? I just had this in my research methods class; I did this silly little thing at the beginning, you know, first days are really important, and so I was trying to get them to think about how research impacts their everyday life. And, I did this silly little thing with, you know: "Listerine basically said it was the closest thing to the cure for cancer". And, so we looked at the actual data from their website and how believable their statements were. But, what started to hit me in the middle of the conversation with my class was, I just asked them out of the blue: "What data could they present that would make you think this was a reasonable product? Because there is some compelling data! I mean, it reduces tartar; tartar is bad for your heart! I mean, you know, I brush my dog's teeth every week because of this problem, right! There is something there, and their response was "nothing"! Nothing! They are so sceptical of research, of intellectualism, of elitism, that there is nothing you could present that would make them believe that these are credible data and that to me is really sad! Is this really where our discipline is? That the opinion of a friend is more valid than a systematically well done study, that actually does contribute something! You know, I think it went from my generation where we needed to learn to be sceptical of authority to now this generation that believes that there is no basis and even no respect for the process, which I am floored by. And, it is making me kind of think: "Oh, my goodness, I really need to start teaching methods differently!" I need to rather have people be critical of research, I need them to think about how they could design a piece of research that would yield something they might believe. And that just turns your whole thinking on its head!

AR – It does!

JY – And gives you a whole new challenge, and reinvigorates you, and that is the hook in the process, right! It never ends, it never stops challenging. Says what is fun about teaching, and the fact that you could do that – your other question about the textbook – you could do that on a broader level than your own classroom, is very exciting.

AR – Well, when you set out to write your textbook – and, I am just going to pan over here so we can get the cover of it.

JY – Isn't it a gorgeous cover?

AR – It is beautiful!

JY – I love that cover!

AR – This is the third edition, right?

JY – Yes!

AR – When you wrote the first edition, there was other textbooks – psych of women textbooks – in the works. How did you make yours stand out, be different? What did you want to bring to writing a psych. of women and gender textbook?

JY – You know, I think it has kind of evolved to the most recent one. What I have discovered again in kind of teaching and working with this, is that I really want to lay groundwork at the beginning that drew on two major points. One had to do with power and privilege, and the other had to do with kind of the intersectionality of gender with all, you know, other forms of privileges and oppressions. And, I think once students have a really good feeling for that and think in those terms, it translates over to everything else that we talk about. So, really seeing gender as a status indicator and that is really hard for people to think, because here we live in this culture where supposedly status does not matter. There is equal opportunity, it is a meritocracy, you're really getting at some fundamentally held beliefs that people have, and so to try to get people to start thinking about the status implication of being female, the status implication of being male – which is in some way even a harder thing to do, because who wants to admit the privilege – I mean, patriarchy so brilliantly teaches us. It is very difficult, and so I think I finally came to a point with this third edition where that groundwork gets laid early in the book and I do it in my class, so that when I start tackling the hard issues like, you know, gender biases in the DSM and male violence against women, these things are not jarring, students are there, they are ready to talk about you know, the oppress status of women and how that makes them vulnerable to detachment and the objectification of that lays the groundwork for violence – you have built out to that in some really fascinating ways.

**DVD #2**

AR – What are your hopes and goals as editor of “Psych. of Women Quarterly” - incoming editor of the “Psychology of Women Quarterly” – what do you hope to do during your term or terms?

JY – It is funny, I am excited, I am honoured, and I am scared! It is amazing that kind of combination of emotion. Excited, because you really have a chance to shape the direction of your discipline in a very powerful way. Honored, I mean, you look at the people who have come before you; it is amazing that – I cannot imagine that I count myself among those folks. And then scared, because you are just like: “Oh, my goodness! You could also really mess this up!” But, “Psych. of Women Quarterly” has a really well established reputation, it has got a good impact factor, I mean you don’t want to fix when it ain’t broke! On the other hand, I would like to expand its scope; I would like to see more in there that has interest to a teaching audience, more to a practitioner audience. And, I think probably expanding to some more qualitative work may kind of pique the interest of practitioners {01:32}. I think right now we do a really great job of speaking to researchers and scholars but, psych. of women is broader than that. You know, I was really disappointed, there was a paper that I had rejected by PWQ on teaching the psychology of women course, and it ended up in “Teaching of Psych” and it was not the audience I wanted to address with it, I really wanted to speak to a psych. of women audience and I wanted to talk about the importance of doing active learning in psych. of women classes. And so, I would like to – and I actually had a couple of calls in to people that I would like to actually be a little bit more proactive about trying to get people to submit some papers that are related to teaching, maybe just even teaching ideas. And, the same with practice, I do think that people have fascinating cases that talk about gender issues and how they applied feminist practices to dealing with those issues that can make psych. of women really appealing to a group beyond the audience that we currently address. So, I would like to think about these things without jeopardizing the core of the journal. I mean, I understand that we need to maintain a scientific rigour, we need to maintain the impact factor – we would be foolish to jeopardize that – but maybe some sections that are similar to the book review section that may have a broader appeal. And we have pages, we have pages we can use and then, we will also see what happens to the journal industry. I think we are at a time where things are going to be changing. Hard copy is getting more and more, you know, I am actually thinking of dropping [membership in] some associations because I just do not want to get journals anymore. I would rather have the PDF. So, we will kind of see what is going to happen over the next – I guess this is going to take up the next seven years of my life, which is rather intimidating but also very exciting.

AR – What advice would you give to feminist women entering psychology now in 2008 – I guess we are at – what advice would you give them on the basis of your experience or where you see the field now?

JY – Yes! You know, people matter! If I look over the course of my career and the ideas that have had and my ways of thinking, and all come from interacting with a network of scholars, of students and colleagues, and you know again there is nothing to my career that I cannot traced back to a person! I still teach research methods because I loved Bob D’Agostino’s class when I was an undergraduate. I am involved in 35 because of Janet Hyde. I had incredible mentors from, you know, Arnie Kahn and the mentoring program, which we were actually matched by division 35.



AR – Really, I didn't realize! Because, I mean, you and Arnie have published together and done all kinds of stuff, so I didn't know that you were matched up!

JY – {05:22} We were matched in 1986, it was the year my daughter was born. So, yes, we were part of that matching program – it has been a great relationship for me. Rhoda Unger and I shared a room together when we got caught in airport and, you know, had a wonderful opportunity to make a connection with her. I mean, those connections are just critical. So, if you are starting your career, choose to work with someone, pick your graduate school based on who you can apprentice with, get involved in their research because they are going to teach you so much. Do not think you can reinvent the wheel, learn from the people who came before you and really build on those connections – they are fabulous! The other think about feminist scholars is that they are so willing to do it! I remember mustering all my courage and walking up to Alice Eagly introducing myself, and I thought she was just going to sit there and say: “Who the hell are you?” And she did not, she is just this really sweet, nice, wonderful woman. So, gather up your courage, meet the people, you know, find yourself sitting at the table after doing all this work next to Paula Caplan, and you know, know she is going to talk to you! It is just amazing what you can do building on these connections. Do not miss an opportunity to build them.

AR – And, is there anything that I have not asked you about, any aspect of your life or your career that you would like to make sure that we talk about?

JY – I just implore someone to make it better for my daughter. I have this wonderful connection with my daughter; she is twenty-two, starting graduate school next year which should be interesting – in economics.

AR – Now, that is a challenging field.

JY – It will be interesting! We have this wonderful connection now, you know, she understands kind of where you are in the field because she is starting to do these things.

AR – Does she identify as a feminist? Would she say she is a feminist? I am curious!

JY – Yes! It is funny, it is something I have never asked her but I cannot imagine that she would not! She clearly acts like one! She is even strong willed with me which I am really glad about. She has never let me kind of dominate; we have a wonderful story about not wanting to shave her legs for prom and it drove me nuts! We started having this wonderful argument that went back and forth. I was saying, you know, things like:

-“Oh come on! It just does not look good!”

-And she goes like: “What do you care, you are not going!”

-And then, it was: “Well, it is the cultural norm, you got to do it!”

-And she is going: “What! You are actually arguing that I should do what is normative!”

So, she was wonderful! She shaved in two weeks after prom! But, I just wish that rather than having these empathetic talks and we go for a walk in the woods, you know, that she could actually find an easier path. And so, somebody figure this out!

AR – Well, let me ask you one more thing. Which of your accomplishments are you the most proud of?

JY – That would be my kids! So, we will start with that one!

AR – {09:21} You can bring more than one, it does not have to be just one!

JY – But, in terms of work, it is back to that earlier thing. I mean, I really like the fact that I have done research, teaching, and service. I feel comfortable in all three areas. I love that I won the Heritage Award for Teaching, I just think– in term of legacy – what a wonderful legacy, because it is teaching and mentoring. And the fact that you go on beyond yourself is really cool. I am very excited to be the incoming editor of Psych. of Women Quarterly, I think that speaks to having had a successful research career and now being able to kind of shape the whole kind of nature of scholarship in your field is just really exciting. And then, having done the service piece, being president of division 35 was really a cool experience! You can never kind of take away that you had that opportunity; made amazing connections through that. I kind of look across, there is this whole line above my little award that I am proud of, that are behind me. And the fact that they run the gamut from teaching research and service is something about which I am really proud.

AR – I am just going to go and zoom to this other one that is right behind you, because it is a mentoring award.

JY – Oh! That is a cute one! That was just a few students who worked that one off.

AR – Oh! That is nice!

JY – And that was a really special, because that is just spontaneous and nice, and then you got the formal ones that are on the plaque thingies.

AR – I am going to actually do a pan of the office in a second! But, let me ask you one more thing, I promise this is the last thing!

JY – No, that's fine! I'm having fun!

AR – Ok! If you look back at your research, and I know you are still doing research. But, when you look back at your research to date, can you distill one or two kinds of conclusions – and I am talking about broad conclusions - based on your work of tokenism and so on, things that you have concluded about the way gender kind of operates or...

JY – Matters?

AR – Yes!

JY – And that, if you had to sum it up, it is: “Gender matters!” It really does, it shapes who we are, it shapes the way we see things, it really does matter. And that gender is so multifaceted.

You know, we have this idea that when – like I am back to actually studying gender differences which I know is, if you look kind of at the history of psychology of women, is pretty much the beginning. But yet, gender differences used to be simple but then they were attributed to gender so that the cause was gender, not simply sex. I think kind of decomposing gender, deconstructing gender, looking at what it is about gender and in particular – which now takes us into the most recent stuff and why I think gender differences still matter – is understanding the power differential that comes with gender: status control, and all of these kinds of issues that are part and parcel of being male and being female in a culture. But, to kind of understand that gender is not just male and female, we found the difference, we are done! But, going on to dissect what it is that underlies that difference. I think it is really, really important.

©Psychology's Feminist Voices, 2010