Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History Project

Interview with Janet Stoppard

Interviewed by Leeat Granek
Boston, MA
July 20, 2007

When citing this interview, please use the following citation:

Stoppard, J. (2007, July 20). Interview by L. Granek [Video Recording]. Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History and Online Archive Project. Boston, MA.

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

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

©Psychology's Feminist Voices, 2010

©Psychology's Feminist Voices, 2010

Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History Project
Interview with Janet Stoppard
Interviewed by Leeat Granek
Boston, MA
July 20, 2007

JS: Janet Stoppard, Interview Participant
LG: Leeat Granek, Interviewer

LG – So, I'm going to start out by asking you some very general questions about how you first developed a feminist identity.

JS – Ah, interesting. Like me, personally?

LG – Yes.

JS – Well, I think I would link that to – well, you know, I'm originally from England, and I was in Belfast in Northern Ireland, and then I immigrated to Canada. And just around the time when I was doing that, the books were coming out, like Germaine Greer's book, *The Female Eunuch*, you know, those kinds of books. And it was just capturing the interest of a lot of my contemporaries. And then when I went to Queen's [University], Kingston, in Canada, there were lots of groups. There was a group putting together a women's centre there and it just seemed to make sense. And then in psychology, the group that I was kind of part of, in terms of my supervisor and everything, we were all interested in the social psychology of gender. So we just simply brought our extracurricular interest to our work in psychology. So, it was a very interesting time actually, [being] able to do that, to bring the two things together.

LG – That was going to be my next question, but before that, when you say "extracurricular activities," what kind of involvement, if any, did you have in the feminist movement? What kinds of things were you reading? You mentioned Germaine Greer.

JS – Yeah, I mean there were, what were called then, CR groups, consciousness-raising groups, and basically they were just groups of women meeting. I know there was one that was popular in those days. It was kind of a feminist analysis of housework. You know, women just beginning to question all of these assumptions about what women did, or should do. And we were at a university, so, in some ways, it was much easier, already, for us to begin this kind of questioning. So it was happening both in our lives and in the academic material. I mean, it was a period when, I don't know if you've heard of Ingrid Broverman, the Broverman study, and Sandra Bem's work on androgyny – I mean, now it just seems like old [inaudible], but at the time when this was just being published… I mean I can remember going to hear Sandra Bem speak at UBC, I forget why I was there, but it was in a huge auditorium and it was absolutely packed. You know, it was just like, this was so different than the way people had been thinking!

LG – Yeah. Was there an active feminist movement on the campus as well?

{4:20}

JS – Oh yeah. I mean, the women's centre, it wasn't just students. There were people from Kingston involved, in the city, but it was really inspired by students. For instance, the sign for the centre that we had outside on the door was provided by the Dean of Women from Queen's. I have a photograph of her, the Dean of Women, standing outside the women's centre with some of the women who had been very, very active in getting the centre going. And, as I think about it now, many of them were psychology graduate students. So yeah, and we wrote letters to the local newspaper, tried to… I know we were interested in health, women's access to women-friendly health services, and we would put on talks around things like violence against women. I remember somebody came from the local police and she started out by asking how many – she couldn't understand why we were so interested in this topic of violence against women – so she said, "How many women in this group have experienced some kind of assault?" And virtually every woman in the room put their hand up and she was just, kind of, she really didn't appreciate the extent of the issue. So there was a lot of consciousness raising stuff like that.

LG – Okay, so what attracted you to psychology in the first place?

JS – Psychology?

LG – Yes, and then how did you merge this feminism, this activism that was going on at the time, with the work that you were doing?

JS – Well yeah, with psychology you have to go a little further back.

LG – Okay.

JS – To know something about the English education system. The way it worked then, it's not so much now, you had to make a decision basically around when you were 15 or so on whether you were going to do science or languages and humanities. I decided to do science. So I did maths, physics, and chemistry until I was 18 in what here would be called high school. And the expectation was that you did one of those subjects at university and I absolutely didn't want to do physics or chemistry. I wouldn't have minded math, but I wasn't super excited about it. I was lucky enough to go to a thing in London, it was an international meeting of people who were the same high school age, from all over the world. And because it was in London that year, lots of us who were in England got to go.

LG – Yeah.

JS – And it was just very, very exciting. We all stayed in the residences at the University of London. So, since we were all eventually [going] to university, we were in that stream. And it just was the case, this was probably around 1964/65, the thing that everybody was talking about was psychology. And I looked into it and realized that I had the background you needed to do psychology at that time in British universities – you actually needed a science background. It was very much seen as a science and so I thought, "Great, here is something that would get me out of the physics and chemistry and sounds a little more appealing." I mean, when I look back now, what I really should have done was history and geography, philosophy, but, you know, I didn't know anything about that.

{8:50}

LG – Yeah, you were 15!

JS – And there wasn't good advice in schools then. So anyway, that's what I did. I applied to do psychology. My feeling doing my undergraduate degree in psychology was, when are we going to get to the good stuff? You know, if we did just one more thing on Skinner, operant learning, and physiology. I remember the class I liked best was social psychology. So yeah, that was my reaction doing my undergraduate degree; it was too science-y. I didn't understand then what the problem was. Then when I finished my degree, of course there's always this problem of what do you do next, and I finally got it down to three criteria: whatever I did next, I had to get another degree; I had to get a qualification that would enable me to earn my living; and, ideally, I'd be paid. And it worked out that in England at that time, if you trained in clinical psychology, it was an apprenticeship approach through the National Health System. And in your master's program, you were actually employed by the National Health System; they called it a [inaudible] grade. So I got paid a salary; I ended up with a degree; and at the end I was qualified to work in the National Health Services as a clinical psychologist.

LG – It's a good deal.

JS – That was my rationale for choosing that route, but I really basically wasn't interested in clinical. I didn't want to be a clinician, but it was a way to move on a bit. And I didn't like experimental psychology, so that eliminated that side of things. Then I immigrated because I was in Belfast and it was getting a bit noisy. I had landed in Halifax and had a job as a clinical psychologist and I quickly realized once I got to Canada that I just had to get a PhD. I applied right away, as soon as I had gotten settled in Halifax. So, I arrived in March of '71 and I got accepted to Queen's and I was off! I started in September of '72. So, of course, at Queen's I was accepted into the clinical program because that was my background, but luckily it was one of those programs where you could do your research with anybody, so I was able to work with a social psychologist, so that was nice.

LG – And so who did you work with?

JS – A fellow called Rudy Kalin.

LG – And how did the feminism piece come up, in terms of the research?

{12:05}

JS – There was a graduate student who was just a year ahead of me and it turned out that we had similar interests and we were trying to do exactly that: how could we explore things using the tools of psychology, social psychology, in particular, around gender? And since we were both clinicians, we were both interested in how things like gender stereotypes, I don't know what the term is nowadays, but how mental health related issues are perceived through this gendered kind of lens or template. And so we were interested in things like bias and discrimination and building on, say, the Broverman idea that women are already judged to be not as mentally healthy as men and the idea that if you behave in ways that violate notions of how women are supposed to behave, then that in itself is seen as a sign of deviance, and is seen as a form of ill mental health or psychopathology. So, she worked on a measure of what was called sex-role ideology, I don't know what the comparable measure would be now, but it was an attitude measure, and the idea was that people [would] try and predict behaviour from attitude information. She was trying to show that if you had a very traditional sex-role ideology, then it affected the decisions you made about clients in a mental health situation, based on sex-role deviance. And then what I was interested in, I was interested in gender stereotypes and looking at the personality traits that are part of gender stereotypes – I mean that's what they are, really – and how giving people information about somebody's personality, or how they perceive somebody, would affect the judgements that were made about them.

LG – Okay, so as you look back on your program of research that you've done throughout the years, it has changed a little bit, but women and mental health is one of the primary ones. What other themes do you see emerging over and over again in your research over the years?

JS – You mean in the area or particularly mine?

LG – Particularly yours.

JS – Well, I mean, the big one, and it's not just in my work, is that it's absolutely impossible as a psychologist to try and understand things without having some information about social context. I think so much of psychology has done that, you know, just lifted things out of context, and that is the strategy of experimental psychology, with the lab, and it is just useless, pointless, to do that kind of work. I mean, when I look at the kind of work I did for my dissertation, for instance, it was exactly that, you know, it's a simulation. It's no good, but we have to, that's the puzzle: how do we try to get things a little more ecologically [inaudible]. And, for me, that's the appeal of a more qualitative approach, participatory, something that's more grounded in people's everyday lives.

LG – And is that how you originally got drawn into qualitative research methods?

{16:45}

JS – Yeah, I would say so; just a growing dissatisfaction with experimental methods. I mean, my own training is very much in a positivistic experimental method approach. I mean, I did my PhD at Queen's for god sakes. So I'm certainly, my interest in qualitative doesn't come out of a 'oh my gosh, I can't do stats.' I mean, I actually like statistics. It's just, I think you have to think about what it is you're trying to study and think about the kind of methods that make sense. And then my frustration with so much of the experimental stuff is that they actually make all of these inferences. Or they do some study and then they want to say something at the end about what this means about people's experience, but they don't actually get that information; they make this jump. So, I think we need to be much closer to what it is that we're actually interested in and to base what we're looking at in people's experience, in their own words, about their experiences. I mean, I think language is very important too.

LG – Yes, you've written about that too.

JS – Yeah, and culture.

LG – I was looking through your publication list and you've published a lot. My favourite book that you wrote is understanding feminist perspectives on depression.

JS – Yeah.

LG – Which publication would you say you're most proud of and why?

JS – Well, actually, what it would be is, I published a paper in the *Journal of Theory and Psychology*, and I think it was around 1998, somewhere like that, and that was at a kind of turning point in my career because I worked on the paper before that – you know, there's always a lag of time, a year or so, before something actually gets published. And again, in terms of my career, I shifted and I became an administrator in the late 80s. I was the Associate Dean and then I was the Dean of Graduate Studies. I didn't like it and I thought I was essentially brain dead after this stint of doing administrative work.

LG – Can you explain what you mean by that because that was one of the things I was going to ask you about, about how those experiences of being an administrator were. What do you mean when you say, 'I was brain dead by the end'?

JS – Oh, it's absolutely impossible if you're doing administrative work to maintain a scholarly life. I mean, you can do a bit. Some of my colleagues, say, who are in engineering or science, or something, I mean they have a whole troop of graduate students working away in their labs, collecting data, analyzing the data, so they get to put their names on papers without necessarily doing very much at all. They might even have a post-doc overseeing the whole thing. But if you're in social sciences, I mean, it just simply doesn't work like that.

LG – Yeah.

{20:42}

JS - And to do work, you have to be immersed in it. You have to know what's going on. You have to be able to… I mean, I did have graduate students, but you have to be able to meet with the students on a regular basis and work along with them, read their drafts, and all of that takes time.

LG – Yes.

JS – And especially when I was Dean, I just didn't have any time. I mean it was very stressful, just doing the work itself. And so there comes a point when you realize you're going to have to choose. If you continue on… because I was being hesitant – because I was a dean they were after me to be vice president – and you realize you're going to have to choose. And I knew that if I kept going with the administrative stuff, it would be utterly impossible to keep anything else going. And also, once you get into the administrative kind of, that sort of network, those are the people that you're mixing with. There is a sense among administrators that academics are just doing their ordinary work, they're publishing, they're fools. They really despise… they just see it as a losers' game. So, it's very hard to maintain that interest when you're surrounded by people who are delighted to have given up on research and scholarly work. And moreover, they think it's just rubbish and a waste of time. Yeah, I mean, that was the attitude.

LG – So you had finished this administrative work and…

JS – Oh, I resigned. I couldn't take it anymore. I had a sabbatical – they called it an administrative leave – and I took the opportunity basically to do a complete kind of renovation of my approach. So, I picked a place and I was lucky; I was able to go to the University College London and I affiliated with Jane Ussher. And there was a group working with her and through that I came into contact with other psychologists in Britain whose work I had been reading, like

Paula Nicolson and Lucy Yardley were at UCL then, and I really liked Lucy's work. So, I just made a lot of contacts and felt like I was more connected with what was going on. And also, because I was affiliated with Jane, she's editor of this series that Rutledge publishes –

LG – Which is the book…

JS – Yeah, and – this is along answer to your question – so I got the contract to write the book. And what I was trying to understand out of this whole thing of women and depression, that had been sort of a central [inaudible], and Jane and Lucy were working on this idea of material discursive ways of understanding things. So, I was stuck on how do we explain depression, because I wasn't happy with the biomedial approach, biochemicals in the brain get all out of whack. So, I brought in this material discursive approach, which I thought I had sort of gotten a handle on it, to try and understand this whole business of gender and depression, particularly focused on women. I wrote this paper… I think I started out with a conference paper and kind of elaborated, developed it, and I was just really pleased with the paper. I mean, I was amazed. I sent it off and it was sort of one of those, "well if you make these changes," which I did and then it was accepted. And I was very happy with that.

{25:25}

LG – This is the *Theory and Psychology* paper?

JS – Yeah. And it was like the culmination of my efforts to really bring myself around because, through that year in London, I became much more knowledgeable about, say, the work of the group at Loughborough. I sort felt that I had a much better feel for what the ideas were, who was doing what, and the various critiques of mainstream psychology. And out of that I started to teach a graduate course in qualitative methods at UNB. I just made a decision; that was it. I wasn't doing that kind of mainstream kind of research anymore. And so ever since then, all of the students who have worked with me have done qualitative work.

LG – Do you have a teaching philosophy?

JS – A teaching philosophy…

LG – You've had lots of teaching experience and students, as you've said.

JS – Yeah, well, it's one thing to work with graduate students. I don't know what the philosophy would be there other than it is an apprenticeship. What I try to do is to work at the pace of the student. So one might need a lot of help around this… For instance, I can think of one student who was very much afraid of public speaking. Well, obviously, you have to be able to do that to some degree. So, I worked out with her how we would help her get so that she felt confident, and she did. We started small, a lot of support and feedback, and by the end of it she could happily do conference papers. So, it's just a matter of helping them get a sense of what is the skill set you need here. And including them, so if I was doing a paper review for a journal, doing it with a graduate student. Just making sure they get exposure, like showing them how you do submissions for conferences, and helping them make decisions about journals, and understanding all of those aspects of the publication process, and not getting spooked by letters from journal editors, you know, understanding what they mean. It's not the end of the world if they say, "will you change this," or, "it's too long," or some aspect of it. I find that students are usually spooked.

LG – Yes. Well they're insecure.

{28:30}

JS – So, that's with graduate students. With undergraduates, I find that's been, again, I'm not sure about teaching undergraduates because with age, there is this thing for women that as you age, it doesn't matter what you do in the classroom, the students are probably not going to like it. Because I know that my own teaching evaluations were wonderful when I started, and I hadn't a clue what I was doing, but I would get very good teaching evaluations. And then as I got older, and I felt like I knew what I was doing, my teaching evaluations kind of dropped off. So I think, unfortunately, I think women are somewhat handicapped in the classroom because I think there is definitely gender bias. It's been empirically shown, people doing research in this area, where it doesn't matter what you do. I think a woman teacher has to be nurturing and they don't want you to be the bad mother. You can't correct them or give them a nasty grade because then you're a nasty person. It's very, very difficult.

This year I co-taught one of my undergraduate courses with a graduate student because we require our students to do a teaching apprenticeship and she was terribly, terribly nervous. She was teaching my course, so she had my powerpoint, my class notes – I mean, she prepared a few classes, but basically she was teaching my course. The students did a little evaluation of her, just writing comments, and there was the usual evaluation, but this was separate. And I collected the comments and the agreement was that I would keep them until we were done with the course and had finished the grades, and then I would give her these. So, I just had them there in an envelope and one day I had nothing better to do and I thought, "Oh, I'll just have a look at these and see what they say," because I was expecting they would be fine. Anyway, they were. The students all thought she was wonderful and then basically there were a few comments about me, along the lines of, "Oh, I should have let the graduate student, Susan, teach much more and what she did was really interesting..." and that really it was time, basically, that I just went away and retired. And it was my course, you know?

LG – Yes.

JS – So when you read these kinds of comments, you realize that there's just nothing… there's nothing you can do. They just don't understand that they're getting the benefit of all of this work that you've done over the years, to put this course together in this particular way, interesting material, you know. Oh I don't know, it's very difficult.

LG – Have you had mentors yourself?

JS – Not especially. My supervisor at Queen's was nice. I mean, he didn't make my life difficult, but I made the mistake of finishing just as he was going on sabbatical. He was originally from Switzerland and he took the year and went to Europe. So, the very time when I was on the job market, because I did a post-doctoral year after my PhD at UBC, so that was when I was kind of applying for jobs, and he was in Europe. And I realized after a little while that that had not been a very smart move. I could have dragged out my PhD a bit longer because I had a SSHRC. I ended up giving money back because I finished before I said I was going to.

LG – Wow.

{33:00}

JS – So, I could have hung around a bit longer until he came back from sabbatical and then he would have been there…

LG – To help.

JS – Yeah. So, I think that was not a smart move on my part, but I was new to Canada. I didn't really understand the academic world at that point, didn't know how things worked.

LG – And was there anyone else that mentored you along the way?

JS – Not especially, I wouldn't say. Not as far as I know.

LG – Okay. I noticed on your CV also that you were awarded the distinguished member award in CPA, the Section for Women in Psychology.

JS – Yeah, yeah.

LG – Can you tell me a little bit about what that is and what the award was like and receiving the award.

JS – Well, it's an award that the section has come up with. I don't know, it's just one of those rewards. I don't know what to say really.

LG – Okay. Well, what your experience of receiving it was…

JS – Well you know, you just go to that meeting and pick it up. I mean, what can I say?

LG – Okay. What would you like to see happening in the field of psychology in terms of the research that you do?

JS – I would prefer to answer the first part of that, what I would like to see happening in psychology.

LG – Okay.

JS – People have been (34:55) [inaudible] on about this for a very long time, just when is North American psychology going to catch up with the rest of psychology? I mean, I find most of mainstream psychology just so irrelevant and uninteresting. And I'm coming to the end of my career and it's kind of disappointing to see the way the field is. And yet the mainstream stuff just keeps going. That, I think, is the real puzzle to me: how is it that the mainstream stuff just keeps going? And yet, so does the more critical, interpretive, humanistic, phenomenological. There always seems to be these two streams. And I know there has been research looking at the personality of psychologists, according to their epistemological commitments.

{36:15}

LG – Interesting.

JS – Yeah, Coan did the work quite sometime ago. So clearly it links in with other aspects of who we are, how we gravitate to – but I can see looking back that I never was, I never did find the experimental stuff appealing. You know, just as an undergraduate wondering when are we going to get to the real stuff and get away from all this lab stuff. This isn't what I thought psychology was. That's a real puzzle to me. See, I don't see what I do as somehow just this area. I mean, I see it as really just a different way of doing psychology and I'm disappointed that we seem to have had so little impact. I don't understand it.

LG – Okay, well let me ask you some questions building on what you've just said about feminism and your career in general. What kinds of barriers, obstacles, discrimination have you experienced because of your feminism in the field or being a woman in the field?

JS – Barriers – I think, certainly, early on in my career when I got my PhD and I was on the job market, I had some quite unpleasant experiences that clearly were gender linked. I [learned], kind of after the fact, one job were I applied and then they had gotten back to me and said based on your publications, you know, that kind of deal… They seemed very interested and I was rushing around and putting together a package and then I heard not another thing. But I learned some years later from somebody I had run into at a conference, who had been at that department, that what had happened was that there had been a real split in the department about hiring a woman.

LG – Wow.

JS – And they didn't hire a woman. Then another job I applied for, and it was only a one year contract, I talked to some people in the department and they strongly encouraged me to apply, which I did, and then I didn't hear anything and I wondered what's going on. So I called the Chair of the department, who had been away when I met with some of the people in the department, and basically the chair yelled at me on the telephone, "Why did you apply for this job? You're not qualified! Why did you apply for this job?" And that was it. I wasn't considered. I never heard another thing about it. So these were, you know, as a new PhD, these were a bit puzzling, these experiences.

LG – Yes, I can imagine.

JS – And this is where I think I should have waited. This was when my supervisor was on sabbatical. I think if maybe I had waited until he was in the country, I might have had better luck. So that was straight discrimination.

{40:23}

LG – Okay. How have you balanced the demands of your personal life with your professional life?

JS – I would say, and this, again, is another problem for younger women, I haven't. I don't have a personal life. To spend the time (40:45) [inaudible], it makes it very difficult to have it. I mean, I had a very long time relationship with somebody, but we were both academics.

LG – Do you think it's possible to balance both?

JS – I see women who manage it. I think it probably was, I don't know, I mean, I look around and some of the women I know, their husbands are not academics, so they're maybe a bit more flexible. Or they're from the local area and they have family around, whereas I'm an immigrant. I don't have any family in Canada. So, that's my answer to that. It's not a very satisfactory one, you know, often I'm not very happy with that either. I mean, it's true; you're trying to get tenure and promoted and it takes time. And I was already a little older because when I immigrated to Canada. I had been working in Britain for a while before I immigrated, so by the time I had gotten my PhD I was in my early thirties.

LG – So what advice could you then give to a feminist woman working in psychology now?

JS – Around what? Balance?

LG – Around whatever. It could be about balance, it could be about just advice in general.

JS – It's difficult. I mean, I really think that academia has lost the concern with social justice and the kinds of things that feminists are concerned about. I think it's actually getting harder to be a feminist in academia than it was when I was at that stage in my career. I find with the academics I see now coming in that they're very concerned about not rocking the boat and keeping their politics hidden. So, I don't know. I think you would have to be very tough to be a feminist who is willing to let people know. If you kept it under wraps, then yeah, that's probably okay.

LG – What about inroads that feminists have made? What about the positive things made in psychology?

JS – Well again, it's a two-edged sword. I mean, there are a lot more women in psychology than when I was a graduate student. Faculty – I mean, when I was at Queen's as a graduate student, there were maybe two women on faculty in that department. I'm sure it's changed a lot since I was there. In my own department, I think more than fifty percent of the faculty now are women, so that's always been a concern over the years. Women have gotten much more involved in the professional organizations, things like CPA, and indeed, women now predominate in psychology. But see, then the downside is that psychology is now feminized. So what happens when you have predominately women in the field? The salaries go down, status goes down, you know, it's happened in other fields. The men in the field still gravitate towards experimental psychology, so you get a gender thing across the – look at this conference, most of the participants are women.

{45:30}

LG – Right.

JS – As I say, it's a two-edged sword and I'm not sure what we want to do about that, if anything.

LG – Have you noticed any other changes in the discipline in general? In psychology as a discipline, since you've started?

JS – Psychology as a discipline. Yeah, it's very fragmented now.

LG – What do you mean when you say fragmented?

JS – Well, I mean with things like the split in CPA between the people in cognition, physiological psych, and bio…

LG – So like specializations?

JS – Yeah, and more than that. You know, there are these new kinds of fields like cognitive science. Well, I thought that used to be part of psychology. I think it's this gender thing of men not wanting to be affiliated with what is a very feminized field now, so cognitive science sounds much better than cognitive psychology or neuropsychology. So the (46:53) [inaudible] people are moving into things like cognitive science. Developmental science, you know, it's like the whole field is pulling away. There are people who really want to be seen as scientists, who don't have any critical perspective on what that means.

I can remember when I was first at Queen's and those of us in clinical psychology, you know, we were more concerned with people's experiences and some of the people that were there at the time in my class have been very successful. Like, you've heard of Pat McGrath, he was in my class, and Janel Gauthier, who was president of CPA. I mean, we were not willing to just take (47:48) [inaudible]. And one of the professors turned to us and said, "If that's what you want to do, you should go to English literature." You know, this tension has been in psychology for so long, but I've seen it's becoming more of a pulling away. Maybe this will change and it will come back together. And it's a shame because I've seen sociology, I have a lot of connections now with sociology, and that's (48:25) [inaudible] to psychologists. Sociologists really need psychology because they make so many assumptions that involve psychology. So it's like, if we're not careful, we're going to lose it.

{48:41}

LG – Yeah.

JS – Lose what's really valuable about psychology. And it's been tagged, like most people who are not in psychology see what we mean as like Freud, psychoanalysis, and they don't know there's this whole other set of things that psychologists look at. And that's a change. That's a real change.

LG – Is there anything else that I haven't asked you about, about psychology or feminism or your career, that you feel is important for me to know that I may have missed? Or anything at all you want to say?

JS – Well, if part of the purpose of this is a kind of (49:36) [inaudible], I mean I've done a variety of things in my work life. I mean, I did work as a clinical psychologist for a number of years in a variety of settings, and I very much prefer academia. To my mind, it's the best job I could have ever had because I'm bookish. I love reading. I like ideas and scholarly stuff; it's very flexible. I mean, you talk about balance – well, you can get balance in other of ways, in terms of time for yourself. I hate nine-to-five jobs where you have to kind of work according to somebody else's schedule and one of the big advantages of an academic job is that you can set your own schedule. And things like, my reaction is, "I'm getting paid to do this? There's this really interesting book I want to read and I'm being paid to do this?' You know, that's kind of my reaction.

I love sitting around talking about scholarly things, listening to people talk about scholarly things, you know, some aspects of this conference, I'm being paid to do this. I mean, I think it's fantastic. So, in that sense, I'm very glad I have an academic job. I can't think of a better job and, plus, you do get these other opportunities. Although there were aspects of being an administrator that were very unpleasant, there were other aspects that I just loved, the variety. I mean, I would go into my office each day and I literally never knew what was going to happen. I could be called up by the president and there would be a delegation from somewhere in Africa, visiting the university, and would I spend some time with them, you know, you just never knew.

LG – Yes.

JS – Or will you come to this lunch? I love the variety, I love that, the unpredictable. The idea of having an office job, day in and day out, when you have to do the same job, I would absolutely loathe that. So from that aspect, yeah.

LG – And anything else that I have touched on or haven't touched on?

JS – I don't think so.

LG – Well thank you so much.