

Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History Project

Interview with Jeanne Marecek

*Interviewed by Alexandra Rutherford
Toronto, ON
June 20, 2007*

When citing this interview, please use the following citation:

Marecek, J. (2007, June 20). Interview by A. Rutherford [Video Recording]. Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History and Online Archive Project. Toronto, ON.

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

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

©Psychology's Feminist Voices, 2010

Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History Project
Interview with Jeanne Marecek
Interviewed by Alexandra Rutherford
Toronto, ON
June 20, 2007

AR: Alex Rutherford, Interviewer

TB: Tera Beaulieu, Interviewer

JM: Jeanne Marecek, Interview Participant

AR – Give us your full name and place and date of birth so that we can identify the tape.

JM – My full name is Jeanne Marecek. I was born in a suburb of Chicago, Berwyn, Illinois, on May 28th 1946.

AR – Okay great. Well let's start at the top by having you tell us a little bit about how you developed into a feminist, about the evolution of your feminist identity.

JM – I guess I would say I was a person who fits Abby Stewart's theories of coming of age: what is happening at the time you come of age becomes this kind of stamp of who you are, and you carry it forward. I came of age in the '60s, was involved in - being in Chicago - the tail end of civil rights stuff, I mean not like it's over, but in that particular era. And then in anti-Vietnam-war stuff which continued when I went to graduate school in Connecticut, and I didn't really get involved in feminism, with one big exception that I'm going to say in a minute, until I got to Swarthmore. Ken Gergen asked me if I would teach a psychology of women course.

AR – Wow.

JM – You know, when I arrived at Swarthmore, there were no women in the department, no gender courses in the whole college, only a tiny handful of women faculty members. And I said yes, I mean you don't say no to your chair. I would say that I became a feminist, or got into the literature (of which there was very little) on psychology of women, psychology of gender, feminist psychology, hand in hand with my students through teaching that course. Most of what we did was, more or less, reading mainstream work and traditional theory and working out our critiques of it.

AR – Right.

JM – I mean the first times I taught that course I didn't "teach" it, I just was there working alongside the students.

The exception that I mentioned wanting to talk about earlier, is that one of my undergraduate mentors -- not in feminist psychology then; she was my perception teacher -- was Naomi Weisstein.

AR – Really. At Yale?

{3:00}

JM – No, my undergraduate work in Chicago. Naomi was, I mean I was a working class kid who didn't know anything, and didn't know you could talk to your teachers, didn't imagine they had personal lives. You know, if you saw your teacher in the supermarket it was like ahh! But Naomi was very obviously politically involved, mostly then in anti-war stuff and other political stuff (for example, demonstrating against the HUAC hearings in Chicago). And she was incredibly inspiring. She sort of acted out her feminism.

AR – Right. Was this around the time that she was involved in the Chicago Women's Liberation Union?

JM – And the band, yes. The band may have been a little bit after that. But the CWLU wasn't what was visible to me as a college student. What was visible to me was the anti-war stuff. I still have an image of her standing on top of a car at graduation with a megaphone because the speaker was Robert McNamara, who was then the Secretary of Defence or something. I remember thinking "That woman's really out there! I want to be like her!"

AR – I was going to say, what did you make of this?

JM – I thought it was amazing, absolutely amazing. She was also so smart, I mean just so smart. Her mind ran a mile a minute. I didn't understand one third of what she was trying to teach us about perception, and she was probably teaching us one one hundredth of what she knew. And she was just amazingly inspirational and ran on this high, high, high, energy. I remember much later when she got sick and then just didn't get better, didn't get better, one of my friends, Rachel Du Plessis who is a feminist poet and English professor, said to me, "You know, I think Naomi just burned herself out. She ran at such high energy that she just used it all up and crashed."

AR – She depleted her energy. Well let's go back a little bit further. You said you came of age in an era in which there was a lot of activism. There were a lot of opportunities for activism, given the civil rights stuff, given the women's movement. But did your activism come from somewhere? A lot of people live through that without kind of taking it...

JM – Well, I was brought up in a very strict Catholic family, and went to Catholic schools of the most repressive kind, and in some weird way there was a piece of that that was about social justice. You know there is a kind of radical Catholic movement -- that wasn't what the nuns were trying to teach us, believe me, let alone anything about feminism or gender, nor what my parents were trying to teach me -- but that social justice piece sort of stuck. I can remember being in high school or maybe even 8th grade, having arguments with my parents at the dinner

table about racism and saying, “Well, you say you believe in social justice and this and this, but now you’re saying this, so how do those go together?”

AR – So then you went to Yale for your doctoral work, and you’re trained in clinical and social psychology. How did that evolve?

{6:35}

JM – Well, it didn’t “evolve.” I sort of flipped from one to the other, back and forth. I mean, I guess it did evolve, but it wasn’t some synthetic integrative process. When I think about being at Yale, I mean when I got to your question “Have you ever experienced discrimination based on your gender?” I thought “Oh my god.” It was an incredibly inhospitable place for women then.

AR – Well tell us about that, about your Yale experience.

JM – And it’s interesting that it didn’t exactly translate into my becoming a feminist instantly. It had this effect, I think, of cowing me more, like “I guess they’re right, I don’t really belong here.” My class at Yale was really the first class to have any significant number of women in it. Previous to that, there was the odd woman here or there -- the wife of some faculty member, or somebody’s research assistant who had slipped in under the door, or god knows. But in my entering year, at the height of the Vietnam war, American men were getting drafted, college men were getting drafted, and graduate school men for sure were up to be drafted. There was a lottery, it’s a complicated system of birthdays and numbers and so on.

The psych department had decided, “Well, we don’t want women, but the men are going to be drafted and pulled out of school. Then, who’s going to do the scut work; who’s going to run the labs, and so on? And so they let in women. Maybe a third of my incoming class were women. But I remember the day we were at our orientation. The man who was the director of graduate studies gave the so-called welcome talk to us all, in which he said, ‘Men, don’t worry. As soon as the war is over, we’ll be back to business as usual with the women out of here.’ ‘Welcome, everybody.’ And there were virtually no women on the faculty, just a couple temporary lecturers who were clearly marked to be on their way out.

AR – Wow.

JM – And that kind of stuff just kept happening. I remember the head of the social area saying, “I don’t know, we boys always like to go out for beers on Fridays but now we can’t go; we can’t take you.” You all, you girls, you women. And then I remember my last year, when people in my class were on the job market, the same director of graduate studies, in front of all the final year students, turned to the male students and said, “Don’t worry.” “We know that there’s a sort of premium on hiring women now so we decided that we’re going to jack up all your letters of reference to make sure that women don’t get the jobs that you deserve.” There were three women in social psychology in my cohort and they were all stars, which ran circles around the men. One is still in the field and she is very prominent. The other two dropped out of psychology completely.

AR – Wow.

JM – And I'm not sure any of us, well there was nobody you can protest to when the director of graduate training says that and the others seem to agree. Then what do you do? By the end of my time at Yale, there were a couple of women on the faculty with bona fide positions, not the women who were going to be teaching there for a year and then out of there, but they were brand new assistant professors, so what were they going to do?
{9:55}

AR – Right.

JM – I mean it was just the moment before the time when things cracked open. I remember one senior faculty member (a very eminent clinical/personality psychologist) who didn't allow women in his classes.

AR – Wow.

JM – I mean, officially. And that was okay. I mean people might have thought it was weird but it was legally okay. No one stopped him; to my knowledge, no one in authority even objected. He said he excluded women on the grounds that he did not believe women could be clinical psychologists. And he also said that given that belief, it made him too upset to have women in the room when he was teaching. It made him too upset, and that was that.

AR – Wow. It's like Titchener all over again.

JM – Yeah, except it's almost 1970; 68, 69, 70, somewhere in there.

AR – So how, I mean you got through this obviously

JM – Barely, with some scars!

AR – Yeah. And what was it like to go on the job market at that point for you?

JM – Well, I guess because at least some of us were so completely under-socialized, I mean I was really just blind. I kind of put the left foot in front of the right and so on. I don't think I even knew what tenure was when I went on the job market. Because I was a woman, that's how unmentored, or how much I at least was just left kind of dangling, written off, in some way.

AR – So would it be fair to say that you didn't really have any mentors in graduate school?

JM – Yeah, yeah.

AR – So you kind of hit the pavement...

JM – I mean I was lucky, incredibly lucky. And you know I hadn't positioned myself, or built a portfolio, or been strategic in all the ways that people now do. I just kind of stumbled along.

{12:05}

AR – Right. This is a bit of a tangent but I’m curious as to what made you sort of go back and forth between clinical and social? What was it that kept you kind of doing both?

JM – I think that I always thought that – I mean this may be the sort of presentism, because this is what I now think – that clinical phenomena are socially embedded. I think in some inchoate way I always thought that, and I was always attracted to public health kinds of stuff and so on. Unfortunately, there was no room to do that in the social psychology program at Yale. And there was no possibility to take courses in anthro[pology] or public health or sociology. I mean it was still attitude change and laboratory experimentalism and so on. So I had started in social, and learned about all the fake experiments and the scenarios, and I just didn’t think I had the acting credentials to do it for one thing. And I couldn’t figure out how any of it meant anything. So, I thought, “I’m not ‘getting’ it. I’m just not getting it, it’s me, I’m not getting it.” And so I switched into clinical in my second year. And then I went to do a clinical internship and I really hated it. I really hated it.

AR – Where was it?

JM – It was in Philadelphia at a place called Eastern Pennsylvania Psychiatric Institute, and again, no one sort of told me to go there or anywhere else – I just fell into it. It turned out to be a kind of mishmash of Rogerians and psychoanalysts, and I remember thinking to myself, “I can’t do this for the rest of my life.” Number one, at the end of the day, at the end of the supervision, I still didn’t know whether what I was doing was right or wrong, good or bad, helpful or destructive. And I didn’t have any rules for figuring out what the next thing should be. I knew I couldn’t spend the rest of my life sort of wondering, “Oh is this a good day or a bad day? I don’t know. Did I help this person or hurt them? I don’t know, my supervisor doesn’t know.” I mean my supervisors seemed to take the stance of “Oh that’s okay, and that’s okay too, and that’s okay too.”

AR – Anything goes.

JM – Yes. Good lord! Is everything okay? It can’t be! And also, I realized in that year that I really wanted to be connected to an academic campus, I mean live on an academic campus. And I didn’t want the lifestyle of the clinicians who worked there. They didn’t have any intellectual or scholarly interests -- I mean they would go home and watch television or go to baseball games and so on, and I knew that wasn’t going to make me happy. I wanted to be in a situation where there was some intellectual life around and, as I say, literally to be in a university community. So I went back to graduate school after my internship year and retransformed myself into a social psychology student again, and did a social psychology dissertation. So it was partly my fault, I think, of not setting myself up as somebody’s chosen student whom they were going to invest a lot in, because I was floundering around and flipping around and so on.

AR – And on the other hand, no one could tell you because you didn’t have anyone to guide you in the decisions you were making too.

{15:34}

JM – Right.

AR – Well when you got to Swarthmore and you were asked by Ken Gergen to teach psych of, did he say psych of gender?

JM – No, psych of women. Nobody said psych of gender then.

AR – Yeah I didn't think that had emerged yet. But tell me what it was like to try to put that together?

JM – Well the only book available was Judith Bardwick's book, which I still have on my shelf. Every time I go to throw it away, along with a couple others of that era, I think someday I would like to do a project in which I read these and think about what's changed, what's in them, and where people were at that moment.

AR – Yeah it's become a classical historical artifact now. It's like the first book.

JM – Yeah. That book, and then a book by a woman named Juanita Williams who I think was from Florida, and maybe was a clinician, and maybe was already quite senior when she wrote it. And then a book by a woman named Julia Sherman. But I used Bardwick as a text at first, and then all the other stuff we read was mainstream stuff to be critiqued. So the slant of the course was look at these terrible things that psychologists and psychiatrists and gynaecologists, and so on, say about women, which I still think is an important piece of a gender class, but it's not the whole class. Swarthmore students are very smart and very able to deal with reading primary source material and with thinking critically about that kind of material. And people brought in things from other classes they were taking, and brought in experiences from classes, and so on. At that time there was a very active group of [adult] women who called themselves [but not for long] "Faculty Wives." One of them was Nan Keohane, who went on to become president of Wellesley and of Duke; she was a "faculty wife" at the time.

AR – Wow.

JM - She didn't last long as a faculty wife; she dumped the "faculty husband" she had come with and moved on. Eventually the women in that group all found their footing and did wonderful professional things, but what they were doing at that point was trying to do some organizing on the campus, and do some programming and make some changes regarding sexism in women students' lives. One of the things they asked me to do with them was organize a big symposium. It was big in two senses -- we had a whole weekend of speakers and events, and we had the largest auditorium on campus, and it was just bursting.

{18:23}

AR – Wow.

JM – Yeah, it was really fun. Ruth Bleier came, and a feminist sociologist. Somebody wanted Paul Bohannon who really was a bad choice. He talked about, ‘But people need to raise children! Men need to be men and women need to be women! Otherwise, how can we raise children?’ The title of the symposium was something like Changing Sex Roles: How far can we go?

AR – So his message was “Not that far.”

JM – I’m trying to remember who the other people were. Maybe Carol Smith- Rosenberg, who was at Penn at the time.

AR – Oh neat. So tell us how, you’re teaching this course, so tell us how this might be impacting your research.

JM – Well you know eventually it did. I started doing stuff that I would now call psychology of women, it barely had to do with gender, but I did some projects with students about the kind of ‘70s topics people studied: career aspirations and reports about premenstrual symptoms. I don’t even remember what the rest of them were. And then at some point I got interested, although I was not a therapist, interested in the question of feminist therapy and what feminist therapy is, should be, and should look like.

AR – Right.

JM - Actually at that symposium I met, because she came as part of the audience, Rachel Hare-Mustin, who turned into a long, long, long-time collaborator and friend. And I guess I would call her a mentor. I mean we worked so collaboratively that when I think “mentor,” it seems odd. But Rachel did amazing things for me. I mean, I would be on the street if it weren’t for Rachel.

So I sort of met her in passing at that conference, and somebody said oh there’s Rachel Hare-Mustin, and I’m like yeah, so? She happened to be a Swarthmore alum, she knew some older faculty in my department who also were Swarthmore alums from their school days and graduate school days. She had been married to a Haverford professor, recently divorced from him at that point, in the early ‘70s.

A few years later, I can’t quite remember how, she invited me to be on a task force that had to do with, it was a Division 35 task force on developing principles for non-sexist therapy.

{22:05}

AR – Okay.

JM - I was in the local area so we could work easily together. The other people, there was a woman from New York named Iris Fodor, a woman from Florida, named Nechama Liss-Levenson, Sandy Kaplan, who I think was at U Mass at the time, but Rachel and I really did the bulk of the work because we lived close together. So that was the first project we did, and we did the official report and so on, and then there was a paper that came out of it on ethics and ethical responsibilities that we worked on together. And then we just kept on working together.

AR – Well, tell me a little bit about that task force. What were the kinds of issues that you were responding to, grappling with?

JM – At that point a lot of psychotherapy was psychodynamic, and you know in the '70s, psychoanalysis was an easy target. There were even in the '70s, a lot of feminists clinicians saying, well behaviour and cognitive behaviour therapy are totally non-sexist because, you know, we just do what's right.

AR – Right, right.

JM – But anyway, one piece of that was to talk about the ways that conceptions of femininity (I don't think we said anything about men and masculinity) conceptions of femininity both overtly and tacitly entered into therapy, structured therapists' goals, and then that therapists' claims to be value free weren't justified; therapists who claims to be value free are most likely not seeing their values because they are part of the status quo. We also talked about looking at therapy process as well as therapy content and goals, to talk about ways in which the relationship is power laden, and ways in which that might not be healthy for women who are trying to become more powerful. I think if you looked at the document now, it might seem a little ho hum, because we've built on those ideas in the past 30 years.

AR – Well what do you, I mean just since we're on the topic of feminist therapy, maybe I could get you to comment on what you see as the impact of feminist therapy on the kind of general psychotherapeutic culture that we have now. How would you evaluate its impact?

JM – One thing that I would say is that psychotherapy culture is and has been changing a lot, and not for the better. I see 1980 and the DSM III as a kind of watershed. On our side of that watershed is the dramatic re-medicalization of psychiatry, as it is embedded in the 1980 revision. And then the takeover of psychiatry by Big Pharma and, in the US, managed care. So that the culture of the mental health establishment doesn't leave much breathing space for feminism or any other kind of social critique or attention to social context. So I think that's a real threat to feminism, or has really pushed feminists to the periphery. In a way the notion of evidence-based practice, which I think is a problematic concept that warrants close scrutiny, also alters what therapy is in a way that pushes feminism aside. I'm interested to ask questions like what counts as evidence, what does evidence-based practice mean, who sets up the criteria for evidence, who decides what counts as evidence, and so on. The evidence-based practice movement strikes me as largely about self-legitimation by the mental health professions and I don't think legitimizing psychotherapy by reducing it to medicine is both dishonest and dehumanizing. I also dislike the kind of circular reasoning that evidence-based adherents engage in --I saying this is the only thing we regard as evidence, so therefore only the forms of therapy that can yield that evidence, can be regarded as evidence-based. I think where feminism has had its strongest impact and continuing impact, really kind of reformed the way practitioners do therapy, is in family therapy and in the narrative therapy domain. And that may be in large part because those forms of therapy have been developed almost completely outside of psychology departments and, in the case of narrative therapy, outside the US.

{26:22}

AR – Oh okay.

JM – Particularly in Australia and New Zealand, also in Canada with the group up in Vancouver. They just really took feminism seriously, not only because they work with families, although that's certainly part of it: you see gender relations happening right there in your office, and need to think about family, and then family in context.

A crucial thing that feminists did for family therapy was to say there are families, and then there's a family in a social field that's putting pressure on it, and there is also a cultural institution of "the family" – you need to look at all those. I do think family therapy is different today than it would be without feminism, in ways that are very very obvious.

But it's also true that psychotherapy in general in general has changed in some ways. I mean look at the number of women who are therapists and the sort of transformation from the guy who says, "No women in my class because I know women can't do therapy." I mean that's only 30 some years ago. I can't imagine somebody saying that; it would be ludicrous.

AR – Yeah it would be. There's been an incredible shift over the last 30 years in terms of the feminization of clinical psychology, and psychology generally. Let's get back to that, but I want to ask you about, you mentioned getting involved in the task force with Rachel and it being a Division 35 task force. So that tweaked for me, I wanted to ask you about your involvement with organizations, and feminist organizations in psychology. So you have had some involvement with 35 over the years in various capacities, one of which was serving as a consulting editor and so on PWQ, *Psychology of Women Quarterly*. Can you talk at all about that experience?

JM – Well it was fun to be a consulting editor. My interests in feminist psychology have changed a bit such that *Psychology of Women Quarterly* isn't the first journal I would choose to publish in, or choose to read. I'm much more interested in *Feminism & Psychology*, and other journals that would publish feminist stuff although they're not feminist journals. Plus I have this big interest in Sri Lanka and cultural psychology, which is really inexplicable!

AR – We'll get there

{29:03}

JM – How many hours do you have! But in those days it was certainly fun and exciting to work on the journal and I learned a lot from working with the people who were involved in the journal. Nancy Henley was the editor then, and one of the things that Nancy brought to the journal was a commitment to open it up, open it up, open it up as much as possible. She's a populist, a trade union sort of person. I come from a sort of trade union family too. But there is a tension between the goal of making the journal creditable and respectable and the goal of making it open it up to everyone. Both of those are important goals. Nancy very much wanted to get young assistant professors' work published, so they could get tenure. (Because work on gender wasn't

going to get a hearing from mainstream journals.) But, PWQ needed to be a “classy” journal with “star” quality so that publishing in it would help a junior professor. It takes a lot of creativity to get those two aims to work together. And I saw that as a tension that always had to be negotiated.

AR – Right.

JM – But as I say, I really respected Nancy for searching for ways to do that. Nancy isn’t the only PWQ editor who did this. Judy Worell also did. Judy had a whole system of mentoring graduate students to be reviewers for articles. You wouldn’t say, oh you’re a graduate student; we need “fresh faces,” so review this. You know somebody who was just beginning graduate school—“oh you review this article.” But Judy wanted to devise a way that it could be a good learning experience for them to 1) review an article, as well as get the experience of reviewing it and put it on their resume, and whatever else; get into the pipeline that way.

See at that point in my professional development, I was not unhappy with quantitative stuff, and I did psychology the way you were supposed to do psychology pretty much. I was off trying to learn LISREL; no I guess that was not quite yet.

AR – So how did it happen that you became distant from it?

JM – You know I think the way it happened, there were two things. This is, I’m sure, a retrospective reconstruction. I don’t know how it happened actually, but this is going to make a good story. One thing that happened was that I was on sabbatical. At the beginning, I was off trekking in the Himalayas and spending some time traveling in India, and I came back sort of halfway through my sabbatical, ready to sit down to work, and I said to myself, nothing I’m doing in my research and nothing I know as a psychologist has any relationship to anything I saw, lived, experienced, in the past six months, so what the fuck am I doing?

AR – Yeah.

{32:25}

JM – And I was just paralyzed the rest of that year. I just couldn’t, it wasn’t more formed than that. But I felt as if I can’t walk into a classroom and hand people some questionnaires and pretend it means anything. I mean, what is this about? So the rest of that year was really hard because I’m supposed to be a psychologist, I’m supposed to be doing research. I care about feminism and I just can’t make myself do this stuff that feels completely irrelevant and trivial. So that was one piece.

AR – Okay.

JM – And unfortunately or fortunately, I kept going back to the trekking. Also, two of the social networks I was in then were really important in showing me some different ways forward. One was sort of a feminist salon that Carol Smith-Rosenberg, who was for a long time the head of gender studies, women studies it was then called, at Penn, put together. It was a multi-

disciplinary gathering; a speaker would come, we would read a paper together, and have commentators. This was a large group of people, it was not a small sort of closed group. We would read a paper, an eminent speaker would come, we would have a nice dinner, and then a discussion and so on. And so I got to hear Donna Haraway, that's probably where I first met Donna. If you think traveling in Nepal raises questions about doing psychology, imagine what getting to know Donna and her work do! I first heard Joan Scott, Gayatri Spivak, and Rosi Braidotti there also.

AR – Oh neat.

JM – I mean that was where I learned about the first glimmers of post-structuralism, the turn to language, and so on. It was people like Joan Scott and Donna Haraway, and Sandra Harding, who was down the street at the Univ. of Delaware, who made it harder to do psychology!

AR – How amazing.

JM – I mean I didn't know yet what I wanted to do instead of what I was doing, but I just knew that what I was trained to do was not tenable. And also, I was in much smaller reading group, a social science reading group that met every month. And Carol Joffe was in it, Michelle Fine was in it, Louise Kidder was in it, myself, a colleague of mine named Joy Charlton who is a sociologist, Demi Kurz, who has been co-chair of gender studies at Penn, also a sociologist, for a long time. They were all qualitative researchers, though not post-structuralist necessarily. Ronnie Steinberg who did a lot of gender equity stuff was also part of it. The sociologists were very powerful voices in there. I remember Carol once introducing me to someone saying, 'She's a psychologist, but don't worry. She has the mind of a sociologist, she's just trapped inside the body of a psychologist.'

AR – That's funny.

{35:41}

JM – I know, it was very funny. So the stuff we were reading, we all read Nancy Chodorow together. We were just reading stuff that was very different from psychology articles. And of course Louise and Michelle, Louise was a qualitative researcher practically from birth. Not birth, but her PhD dissertation was a piece of qualitative research. She was a Howie Becker student, Demi was also a Howie Becker student and so was Joy Charlton. We had a little Howie outpost so I started to read Howie Becker.

AR – Okay.

JM – I still had no idea how I could do a project like that.

AR – Was that your first exposure to qualitative methods?

JM – Yeah. In addition, when I got back from Nepal and India I also started reading some ethnography, but I was reading it like a hobby. I wanted to learn more about the culture and society of India, I didn't want to learn more about ethnography.

AR – So when did you make the leap from doing all this reading?

JM – And then Rachel of course, is a family therapy theorist. Rachel came out of the sort of Watzlawick/Haley/Bateson tradition – the “Invented Reality”, cybernetic tradition. They were really proto-constructionists or even proto-poststructuralists. I mean they work with language frameworks in that way. They really think about reframing and the power of discourse to change reality. So Rachel was already thinking about those issues, and then she got me to start reading that literature.

AR – Okay.

JM – And I don't know how we actually started to do work like that. We wrote a paper together quite early on, at her instigation I think, you'll have to ask her. The paper was about the ways that therapists talk about autonomy and what a gendered discourse of autonomy would or wouldn't look like. And the gender relations that make the semblance of autonomy in men's lives possible. I still really like that paper. It's in somewhat of an obscure journal, but I always thought, “I wish more people read that paper.”

AR – Yeah.

JM – And then, I can't remember exactly what stuff we did next.

{38:27}

AR – Well how did the book come about, the *Making a Difference* book that you co-wrote.

JM – It started as an APA symposium, but then you're going to ask me how the APA symposium came about. I'm wondering how we met Jill Morawski. You know by that time Rachel and I were both sort of in the soup together. She was also a member of the Penn seminar I talked about. She was doing a lot of other stuff with narrative therapists, and going to family therapy conferences. I never went to those conferences because I wasn't a therapist. I would just enviously listen to her talk about them and the papers she had heard.

AR – Right. Some of the work that I've read of yours and the things that I have gravitated towards in your work are your writings on theory and on feminist critique, and also somewhat on method. So how did it evolve that you began to become critical of feminist empiricism, a proponent, and I hope I'm getting this right, a proponent for feminist social constructionism and feminist post-modernism. How did that evolve in your own thinking?

JM – I think it wasn't in my own thinking privately in that way. It really was with working through ideas with Rachel and reading some of this Watzlawickian stuff, and then the feminist

extensions of it. Reading Jill's work, and this group of sociologists who all did participant observation stuff. I mean they weren't necessarily social constructionists or post-modernists.

AR – And how is Swarthmore at all of this? The background is that you're still at Swarthmore

JM – Yeah.

AR – How did your colleagues there...

JM – And also actually, this was another formative moment which I can't quite put a date on. One of my most important colleagues there was Mary Poovey, who is a feminist theorist and a Marxist, post-structuralist literary critic. She and I actually taught a course together for quite a few years, which must have been in the early 1980s because we used Chodorow as one of the texts. It was called "Representations of Women's Identity," and then we sort of went on from there. We read a lot of novels - she's a Victorianist, so I know a lot about Victorian literature. So that was another road away from feminist empiricism.

AR – Right.

{41:33}

JM - And of course when she first approached me about doing a course together, she thought psychology was psychoanalysis. I thought, "Well, I don't think I'm going to tell you what psychology is because I know you're not going to like it."

AR – Well, how would you characterize the relationship between psychology and women's studies? I mean I'm asking you to speak both from your own experience and from your assessment of that relationship in general.

JM – Well I think it is certainly one that has changed generally. I'm also pretty sure that there are lots of local differences. But I remember in the early days of women's studies, maybe even the first decade of women's studies, that psychology and sociology were considered the foundation courses. I mean often the first course would be a sociology course, or a course team-taught by a psychologist and a sociologist. And then there was a shift, especially as women's studies or feminist studies took the linguistic turn and most psychologists didn't. There was a lot of pushing around and acrimony because of that. I think psychologists especially got marginalized, less so than sociologists or historians or anthropologists because so many psychologists just really weren't up to playing that linguistic game.

AR – Yeah.

JM –So there was a lot of tension, I know. There were big battles in some places and women's studies sort of split along the fault line. And I know of a few cases of psychologists who "went over to the dark side" and got thrown out of their psychology departments. Sometimes the struggles inside women's studies departments got so acute that any empirical work - even sensible empirical work – was taboo. I mean I remember Barrie Thorne telling me about the

struggles around those issues at Berkeley and saying, “Well, I do empirical work but I’m not an empiricist.” I’m sure that it didn’t help that all this was in the midst of the culture wars and the backlash against feminism.

AR – Yeah.

JM – So I think the relationship between psychology and women’s studies/feminist studies has changed over the years. And I couldn’t tell you what it is now because I think women’s studies is in such flux, and in some places even disarray. Other places I guess it’s fine. I’m more aware of the disarray. I know women’s studies in many universities -- certainly Swarthmore -- was never supported, financially or otherwise, in the first place; never had any positions and so on. So you had a generation of people for whom feminism/women’s studies was their life. They cared about it, it was an expression of their politics, and devoting themselves to the program was political activism for them. So the fact that it was unsupported just meant that they worked a double shift – first in their home department and second in women’s studies.

{44:50}

AR – Yeah.

JM – Well, that comes to a natural end, I think. It’s not sustainable. You just can’t keep up that momentum, whether it’s because the next generation is not willing to keep it up or the original people just burn out after a certain number of years. And so I think at least in that kind of situation, women’s studies, gender studies, tends to be in some difficulty. Plus student interests have changed. Gender seems very old fashioned to students now. Certainly feminism and social justice orientations seem like to young students like their mothers’ thing.

AR – Well I’ve asked you about the relationship between psychology and women’s studies, but what would your comments be on the state of feminist psychology today?

JM – Well you know I collaborate, in addition to my work in Sri Lanka, I collaborate a lot with colleagues in Norway and Sweden, especially Sweden. Eva Magnusson is one. Eva and I are writing together now and every once in a while I will write something about how embattled discursive work is in psychology or how difficult feminist work is and then she sends the draft back and those sentences are gone, and then I put them back in and she takes them out. And it’s true that when I’ve been working at Swedish and Norwegian universities, gender studies and feminism have a very different status than they do in the US.

AR – Right, right. In North America perhaps?

JM – In North America, right, because it’s very much flourishing in the Nordic countries. It’s a very different situation, I mean politically it’s a very different situation. You know one of the things they used to say about Sweden, is that it is a country where you have gender equality without feminism. Sometimes I say to my American students, “Do you know that there’s a minister of gender equality in Sweden and Norway? Get it -- a minister of gender equality? Think about the US government. Can you imagine George Bush having a cabinet position called Secretary for Gender Equality? No? Why not? And let me tell you what difference it can make

when a government takes gender equality as an important mandate for the organization of social life.”

AR – Yeah.

JM – But inside Sweden, feminists have some critiques; it’s not perfect. It may seem like heaven from the standpoint of the US, but it’s not perfect. Also, in psychology, discursive work seems more welcome there and work on gender is taken as a serious topic. So things look quite different.

{48:00}

AR – Yeah. From where we sit here, and in terms of what feminist psychology may have promised or hoped to accomplish and what it actually has, how much of that has transpired in your view?

JM – I think that feminist psychologists have certainly produced some very interesting bodies of empirical work, theoretical/epistemological work, methodological work, and applied work. Many of the feminist thinkers in psychology whom I admire also have shown the positive value of bringing ideas from other disciplines into conversation with ideas in psychology.

In terms of “transforming” the discipline, however, I think we haven’t. I worry about how to keep the past 40 years of work and thought alive and intellectually available. It doesn’t appear in textbooks apart from gender textbooks. It’s astonishing how little has penetrated into the “standard” areas of psychology. I remember an old paper that Michelle Fine wrote about seminal studies and ovular studies or something like that, where she talks about a semi-permeable membrane between mainstream journals and feminist journals.

AR – Yeah.

JM – It’s actually an empirical paper in which she and a student, maybe it’s Meryl Gordon, look at citations, who cites what. And what you find is that work in feminist journals, like *Psychology of Women Quarterly* and *Sex Roles* (I don’t think *Feminism & Psychology* existed then) cites mainstream stuff. The mainstream stuff rarely or almost never cites the feminist stuff. And I’ll bet that’s still true. I’m often stunned by what my colleagues don’t know. I was at a colloquium the other day where one of my colleagues had invited a woman (one of the so-called positive psychologists) who was studying how difficult it is to be an affluent child from the suburbs. And she presented what she regarded as a breakthrough finding: that affluent professional women are not happy with their lives. You know: married women raising teenagers with full time professional jobs find their lives difficult. So, I had to ask myself, “Did she ever do a literature search?” In 2007, is she going to go on NPR and break the news that working women in greedy professions, who are raising children, probably without much help from their partners, feel overworked?

AR – Wow. And I know that there are so many instances of late of stuff being published in the flagship journals on leadership and so on that has no reference to the feminist literature.

JM – Yeah. I read something on leadership in the *American Psychologist* the other day and I thought, well, Alice Eagly, surely she'll be in there, she's worked on leadership forever and she has never broken a methodological rule. Not there.

AR – Yeah, not one reference.

JM – I'm a pessimist by nature and I just worry about the quicksand rising up and covering over the entire corpus of feminist work.

AR – Other than sort of ghettoization, that is feminist psychology gets regulated to its own journals and there's no permeability or crossover, other than that, are there any other reasons why this transformation, maybe it was optimistic, has not occurred?

JM – This sounds like a question you know the answer to!

{51:25}

AR – No I don't, I'm really interested in the answers because I agree. I was reading Fine and Gordon, and of course Michelle Fine will be the first to say that psychology has not at all been transformed by feminism. And even if you don't expect it to be transformed

JM – Did you interview Michelle yet?

AR – Yeah, we have.

JM – So you know she said that.

AR – Even if transformation was perhaps too optimistic

JM – I'll tell you a funny story about Michelle. This is going to go off the tape too. One time I was moaning to Michelle about how feminist work is marginalized and people always say things like "Oh it's really interesting but it's not psychology, and blah blah blah." And Michelle said to me, "Look, I'm a psychologist, I do this kind of work, therefore it's psychology. Finished, end of story." I think she was saying, "I'm not going to let myself be bothered by other people's definitions and hang-ups. That's their problem, not mine."

AR – She just goes and does her thing.

JM – She's amazing, yeah. She's just amazing.

AR – So any thoughts on what the obstacles have been?

JM – I think even feminist empiricists, even in their work, if you push many of the arguments to their logical limits, they start to run into conflict with some fundamental building blocks of American psychology. "Big" taken-for-granted principles of psychology – like the idea of a

science of generic human beings and the validity of studying college sophomores. Also, the taken-for-granted distinction (which I think is quite exaggerated) between basic and applied research and the privileging of basic research. Time after time, I've seen resumes of job applicants tossed aside because the candidate studies something real – conflicts in marriage, African American kids' racial identity, partner violence – because they are “not interesting” and instead, candidates who study “variables”—empty abstracted constructs—get put forward. And a third factor is that at least in the US, a lot of psychologists have a latent (or not so latent) commitment to biological foundationalism. That makes them regard all feminist work as “political not scientific” because it doesn't search for or seek to reduce phenomena to brain mechanisms. And then if you get to the kind of epistemologically “other”, methodologically innovative, situationally grounded work that I believe is a good way to do work, that really puts you at odds with what is canonical in the field and the privileged work in the field.

AR – Okay.

JM – And think about, well I don't know about Canadian psychology, but American psychology, I would say it's gotten [motions a shrinking movement with hands] even in the past ten years. Everybody wants an fMRI machine, and they're going to fMRI everything.
{54:07}

AR – Yeah, it still rears up.

JM – The dominant paradigm.

AR – Well let me ask you then to turn your thoughts to your work in Sri Lanka and on culture, because that seems somehow sort of related in a way.

JM – I hope so!

AR – How did your work in Sri Lanka evolve, how did that research get going?

JM – Well I had spent a lot of time in Asia, just hanging around, trekking, sightseeing, whatever. And at one point I decided enough of just hanging around, I really wanted to live there and have the experience of setting up a household and living there and seeing what that was like. I assumed it was going to be very different from travelling or hiking trips in the mountains and so on. And I wanted to have some Asian colleagues and meet people like me, not just taxi drivers and trekking sirdars (55:13). I imagined that I was going to be in India, in South India, because I knew it pretty well and liked it.

AR – Okay.

JM – But as it turned out just by chance, the opportunity to go to Sri Lanka opened up. I had never been in Sri Lanka before that and I naively thought it would be just like India. And all the Sri Lankanists that I came to know would just laugh: yes, yes, you go, ha ha ha. And they're right it's not – the narcissism of small differences – it's totally not like India.

I was there in a very difficult year in terms of political violence and security, so what I was supposed to do in the university wasn't possible. The government barely had control of the country and there was a lot of unrest. The university was closed, there were students being shot and so on. And that's the kind of experience that draws you back; you get involved in struggles, make personal commitments to people working under duress, and in sort of can't drop things at that point.

I didn't go there to study suicide, but it turned out that some of the people who I knew at the university were very interested in this question because it was such a major social problem in Sri Lanka at the time -- Sri Lanka was on its way to having the highest rate of suicide in the world. And so I kind of stumbled into it; I wasn't going to do the thing I thought I was going to do, which was teach in the university because it was closed. So okay, I had some research skills so we could do a research project together. The people whom I was working with didn't have research skills, weren't trained as researchers. One was a philosopher. So that was my first project. In retrospect it was not a great project, though I learned tons about Sri Lankan culture and society, rural village life, and third world medical and psychiatric care.

{57:06}

AR – How so?

JM – Well you know I went in there thinking, oh suicide, let's look at depression. And now when I go back to some of my early field notes, I can see one of the psychiatrists in the local hospitals saying to me, "You know, in the West, suicide has to do with depression, but here it doesn't. It's just something our people do." And I'm thinking, "Something our people do? What's that supposed to mean?" And ten years later I could finally see that he was right, it's just something that our people do. He certainly was right that it's not connected to depression. So that was a kind of firsthand powerful experience of the degree to which you can't take modes of thinking, empirical "truths," theoretical understandings, and measuring instruments from one context and stick them in another. So I kept going back and slowly I got better at seeing differently and better at setting aside more of what I knew.

AR – Well tell us about some of the nitty gritty here. What did you do in this research? I know we'll hear more about it on Friday.

JM – Yeah I'm sort of steering around it. At the time, it was not specifically about gender, although I always kind of had an ear tuned to what was going on in terms of gender. We interviewed people who had engaged in self harm, almost all of which was pesticide poisoning, swallowing pesticides, in the hospital. I knew we weren't going to figure out why people commit suicide, which was of course what everybody really wanted to know. I knew that wasn't going to happen but my idea for what was doable was that we would then go to the village after three months and see how the surviving victims were doing. And in particular I thought we could look at how people said their doctors and caregivers in the hospital understood the suicide; what they told them about it, how they helped them understand it, that sort of stuff. None of these people were referred for any kind of counselling or psychiatric care or whatever, so it would be what a nurse or doctor said on the fly. Unfortunately, the political violence in the countryside made it too dangerous to travel into the villages.

AR – Right.

JM – So that really never happened. But I did interview lots of people in the hospital, and I did go to a lot of houses in the village. I had a wonderful research assistant who was a sociology student. In actuality, he wasn't my research "assistant;" he taught me everything and very politely and discretely kept me from doing really dumb things. I mean he was both a research assistant and key informant. I still know him and keep up with him and his family because he was really very important to me and helpful.

AR – Yeah.

{1:00:15}

JM - I also learned what was going on politically in the country and what the powder kegs were that were ready to go off. So I really learned quite a bit about village life then. And after that I started to work with a group of lay volunteers who were trying to do suicide prevention, connected to the Befrienders, which I had never heard of. They sort of approached me, they found me and had heard that I was doing this stuff, and I did a lot of training stuff with them, and actually used them to begin to collect a little bit of data, with them as participants, about what their cultural understandings of suicide were and weren't. I went back to the university in Sri Lanka to do some teaching in '91 and '92. I worked with a group of students. I was supposed to be teaching them methods so we designed a project. They went out to interview people from different ethnic and cultural backgrounds in Sri Lanka -- Muslims, Tamils, Sinhalese Buddhists, and Christians about the understandings of psychological difficulties. I was still trying to track down an answer to the question, if you don't think suicide is connected to some kind of psychopathology, then what *do* you think it is? I mean, 'something we do' is not really sufficient.

AR – Yeah.

JM – I'm in contact with some of those students from 15 years ago. In fact, we're doing some post-Tsunami rehabilitation programs together, and I've done some work in the war zone with counselors working with civilians. It's fun to know people who were students and now they're grown ups.

AR – Yeah, that is neat.

JM – Now they work for the Ministry of Education and run NGOs and so on.

AR – Amazing. This is something I'm always curious to have people comment on, but coming back now to North American feminist psychology, where do you hope it goes in the next decade or two? What would you like to see happening?

JM – I would like to see it not die! Of course I have more grandiose ambitions—I'd like to see North American feminist psychology move in the direction of methodological pluralism; I'd like to see more North American feminist psychologists engage with critical theory and new ideas and ways of working centered in the UK. I'd like to see more North American feminist

psychologists be freed up to engage in community work and activism – and not be flushed out of academia for it.

You know, this is probably speaking out of my era and my generation, but one of the things that has been very important to me is that since the 1970s, I've always done some or another kind of community work. I was on the board of an agency for battered women, I was on the board of a feminist therapy centre, I was on the board of a group, this is actually in Sri Lanka, to get women out of the horrible mental hospital and into a residence that this group started, that also works with women diagnosed with AIDS and gets them into a safe place to live. In Philadelphia now, I'm on the board of a group that started out doing hotline counselling around abortion and contraception and now has expanded to do lots of other kinds of reproductive health education as well.

AR – Okay.

{1:04:05}

JM – And anti-violence stuff particularly in the urban minority, well for anybody who calls, but a lot of the callers are urban minority kids. That's always been an important piece for me, doing some kind of community work that for me is in some way connected to gender. And I really hope that those institutions don't die, and I hope that they don't get so bureaucratized, professionalized, institutionalized, and governmentalized that they no longer are able to do creative work and political work. I remember not that long ago, ten years perhaps, when every student in women's studies went to volunteer in a battered women's shelter, or a hotline, or to be an escort for Planned Parenthood or a women's health clinic. It was a rite of passage and I wish that were still the case.

AR – Yeah.

JM – The students whom I know now have a lot of social concerns and care about social justice, but their interests are much more diffuse; gender is not the priority. They want to stop genocide in Darfur and work with refugees, and so on, and that's all fine. But I worry that gender and women – everybody seems to think “oh women, been there, done that, that's fine now.”

AR – Yeah.

JM – So I guess I remember, and still find, those experiences of working with those agencies as very compelling and meaningful and real, and politically energizing. I hope that is still available for young women coming of age or, really, for anybody. So that's one thing that I would really hope for, that's sort of the anti-theory thing.

AR – Right. Has there ever been any tension in your own career between being a scholar and being an activist?

JM – Well, I look at your question about personal life. Well if you ditch your personal life, then!

AR – Yeah, I haven't asked you that question in that way about the balance between the personal and professional. Do you want to speak to that?

JM – Do you want to know the percents? I think I'm going to be one of those people who at some point in her life says, "You know, I worked too much. I spent my whole life working much too much." And I don't have a sort of sharp dividing line between them; they kind of run together.

AR – Has that been problematic or no?

{1:07:11}

JM – And what's personal? I mean is my work for women against abuse, or for the women's therapy center -- is that personal? It's not academic and it's not professional in the sense that I get paid for it, but it's not personal like planting roses. So I kind of don't think in those terms I guess.

AR – Fair enough. Maybe that's why I was feeling like that wasn't really a good question to ask, I'm not sure. Tera, do you have any questions? Things that have come up or things that you're just curious about?

TB – I think I'm curious about, because this is something that I've heard before, this feeling that feminism is dying. I've just spent the last year researching and speaking to young feminist women, and it's interesting to hear them say that yes that's their feeling, socially and politically, that there isn't an outlet to access any more. So I'm just sort of curious about, within academia even, what sorts of research topics do you see needing to be addressed or researched, or young women that are taking on these different issues that they're researching, as opposed to these things like pay equity and so on.

JM – Well there's a topic: why do we perceive feminism as dying, or maybe what are the new forms that it's taking and what should we call it instead? And are we misconstruing things to say it's dying when what's dying is a particular form that doesn't make sense in people's lives anymore. I also think that if it's dying, that death is quite regional. I mean I think about South Asia and issues about women/gender and development and human rights are very very, very alive. And people are not nervous, well sometimes they're nervous about calling themselves feminist, but it's for an entirely different postcolonial set of reasons than my students at Swarthmore would be. My students at Swarthmore wouldn't be fearful to use the term; they would just find it weird.

TB – Right.

JM – Like that's their mother's term, of their grandmother's term, and not their term. Which is not to say that they don't care about women's issues or that they want to be barefoot and pregnant in their own lives. But the term feminism in the South Asian context, and I think in some other Latin American contexts and so on, is still very vibrant; it's still on an upward trajectory. And the issues are very very palpable. In Sri Lanka, people worry about female

combatants and girls being recruited by the army, I worry about girls committing suicide because their sexual respectability has been compromised. Lots of people worry about women and development issues and how are women going to get some stake in land holdings, (1:10:23) given the legal issues about land tenure. And every issue has a gendered angle to it; you know water, big gender issue; tree cutting, big gender issue. So feminism is very vibrant there.

{1:10:46}

TB – So as a mentor, how do you mentor this new generation of young women coming up who may be more reluctant to get involved?

JM – Well I mentor women in Sri Lanka a lot. In my classes at Swarthmore, sometimes I just figure screw it, I'm going to talk about feminist issues, whether the students think it is cool or not. I'm going to say, I hate to tell you this, but things are really not okay. In my abnormal psychology class, we talk a lot about body issues and on eating problems and so on, and I say these are issues about gender; they are issues that are tied to social power. We're not going to talk about this like it's some therapeutic issue and this is some disease that someone has. And we talk a lot about violence, the whole range of interpersonal violence, including garden variety, everyday violence. I send my students out to do an exercise that involves talking to friends on campus. They ask a woman friend and a man friend, so what are all of the things you did over the weekend to be safe? And then probe a bit to see if there are things that the woman did to be safe that were so normalized that she didn't even see it. Like go to a party with a friend, or make a plan so that if I get drunk you won't let me on my own. Like not drink out of a glass that has been out of your hand or that someone else has then handed you or from a bottle that has been opened out of your sight. And then I'll say, this is all good. But isn't it weird that it's so normal, we don't even think about it as things that we do to protect ourselves? And why can't we ask men to change this? Why do we have to assume that this is how the world is and it can't be changed? Is it really true that we can't ask men to stop endangering us, that we can only routinize more and more forms of protection. Maybe they think I'm crazy, I don't know. I'm too old to care.

AR – Well in some ways you've been at Swarthmore for

JM – Forever.

AR – For however many decades. Have you seen changes in your, I mean obviously you have seen changes in the students

JM – Oh sure.

AR – And their receptivity to that form of critique. Well maybe we should wrap up by asking if there is anything we haven't asked you that you would like to speak about?

JM – I don't know if you've interviewed Leonore Tiefer.

AR – Yes we have, she's great.

{1:13:45}

JM – Yeah. When I heard Leonore at the AWP, she said something which I'm not going to be able to get out in the wonderful way that she said it, but she said something about how the first wave of feminism, there was a different kind of critique you could make because, she was kind of drawing the Foucauldian distinction between power from above and power from below. And she said now the issues that we're into are the power from below issues and they're so embedded, they're so much a part of subjectivity, that the forms of critique that we once used – sort of speaking about sexuality – they're just not going to make it anymore. She said, "I don't know what the new form is, I just know that there needs to be a new form." And it really resonated with me.

AR – Yeah. When we talked to Laura Brown, she said I'm not the same feminist I was 20 years ago, and that's a good thing, because it's different now. So feminism and the feminist critique will change, evolve, become maybe something that doesn't even resemble what was there before. And she seemed to think that was okay.

JM – I mean even if you don't think it's okay, it's what's happening so you might as well figure it out. I do worry that my students, and I suspect that this is even more true of graduate students, feel a lot of pressure to do the right thing and get their portfolio into shape, and have the right dossier to go to graduate school, and that sort of thing. There was a moment, maybe even a decade, when, say, being a women's studies minor or taking courses on gender or doing a thesis that squarely centered on gender or sexuality, maybe doing qualitative work, was okay and maybe even seen as positive. And in psychology that time is ending. So rather than things getting more expansive, I have the sense that they got more expansive for sort of ten years and really the door's closing on that.

AR – And why do you think? What do you see as the forces that are causing that narrowing?

JM – The return of the '50s (a joke). Well I mean if you think about institutionalized psychology in the United States, I think that the APS [*American Psychological Society*] people are very much unto themselves and doing their thing, and very kind of full of themselves and totally self-assured that they are doing science. The APA [*American Psychological Association*] is more and more the organization that is just clinicians and it is preoccupied with protecting clinicians' incomes and status. I think feminist work – and lots of other kinds of psychology, like history and theory, falls into a big void in the middle. Also, I think it's a very conservative time in academia, generally speaking. Tenure, for example, has eroded dramatically in the US and lots of academics go from job to job. Furthermore, the swing in psychology towards neuroscience and the neuroscience of absolutely everything is certainly narrowing. I'm sure there's someone who does neuroscience of gender somewhere. I'm sure people are doing fMRI studies of gender differences.

TB – For sure.

AR – Evolutionary psychology.

{1:17:35}

JM – I was on the NSF [*National Science Foundation*] graduate fellowship panel this year, which I'd never done before – they lock you in a room with thousands of proposals and you read until you're going buggy. I was reading applications in social psychology and developmental psychology, particularly social because I don't know a lot about developmental psychology. Not only were there no projects on gender, there were no projects that I would ever conceive of doing myself. There was one proposal from a woman who was doing work on battering or rape or something, and it was a joint project with the criminal justice department at her university, using real criminal records. She just went right down the tubes [motions dropping down to the bottom]. But I would say 85% of what we read were fMRI studies, young social psychologists to be, young college graduates, wanting to do fMRI studies.

AR – Wow.

JM – And the other 15% were IAT [*Implicit Association Test*] studies or cortisol studies. And that was it. There wasn't one project that I read that I would have any interest in following up on and reading this program of research, let alone doing it. Or anything that was in any way, forget gender, a remotely oriented toward social issues. So that's kind of where the juice seems to be, where the money is, and I just don't see, in the US, that gender or critical psychology really fits into psychology. I mean maybe it's going to fit in more with clinical programs that typically have not trained researchers.

AR – Yeah. Do we dare to leave it on that negative note? Would you have any advice for young feminist psychologists?

JM – You know one piece of advice that I think I would definitely say to people, because it's really been important for me is to develop friends and colleagues across disciplines. That's really important, specifically for a psychologist interested in gender. Also for a psychologist interested in gender and wanting to find a place where important interesting and innovative work can still be done, I would say don't lock yourself in the United States. Think about England, think about Sweden, think about Canada.

AR – Yeah.

JM – Think about Australia, think about New Zealand; read that stuff, go there. Actually I have two former students who, one of them just took a job in Australia and is vacating a post-doc at Exeter; the other is moving into that post-doc in Exeter. Another student, actually a Korean male student, is interested in stuff about immigration and identity and sexuality, and so on, and he was saying where do I go to graduate school? And I said you should think about England; if you're thinking about psychology, think about England, otherwise I don't know if you should think about psychology. Even if you find a good person to work with, the chances are that you will be embedded in a department that isn't going to be able to support you.

{1:21:25}

AR – Yeah, there's life outside the United States.

JM – There's life outside the United States.

©Psychology's Feminist Voices, 2010