

Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History Project

Interview with Jill Morawski

Interviewed by Alexandra Rutherford

Vancouver, BC

November 2, 2006

When citing this interview, please use the following citation:

Morawski, J. (2006, November 2). Interview by A. Rutherford [Video Recording]. Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History and Online Archive Project. Vancouver, BC.

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, 2012

Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History Project
Interview with Jill Morawski
Interviewed by Alexandra Rutherford
Vancouver, BC
November 2, 2006

JM: Jill Morawski, Interview Participant
 AR: Alexandra Rutherford, Interviewer

AR – An interview with Jill Morawski, on November 2nd, 2006, in Vancouver. So here is where we usually start these interviews. Could you tell me a little bit about the emergence of your feminist identity?

JM – The emergence of my feminist identity. Well, Don Harriot talks about [how] women in the 1950's were offered some of the same opportunities as boys in the classrooms, in science, American culture. And very early on I went to a very kind populist [school], I grew up in my early childhood in Minnesota in a very populist [environment], everyone kind of equal, of course that's not true, but that's the ideology. So I always had a sense that boys and girls were not all that different. But that's a bit different from feminism. And it was probably as an undergraduate in 1969 to 1971 that I just consumed the feminist literature that had been coming out in the 1960's, whether it be Betty Friedan, or Simone de Beauvoir, which is a bit older, but pertinent; and then eventually Phyllis Chesler and all of the classics that were coming out in the 1960's. I went to a women's college and I started in a very small women's college, Mount Holyoke, and there was a very strong sense of women and accomplishment and I think these all meshed – early childhood in a populist environment, the feminist literature, the music, Janice Joplin, it was certainly a figure to contend with. And then, being in a women's college, where all women could do science, because if the women didn't do science, there would be no one in the classes.

AR – Right, right. Tell me a little bit about the atmosphere at Holyoke in that period and time.

JM – The atmosphere was, it was actually kind of split culture at that time. It was when I was an undergraduate that the Ivy League started going co-ed. So at that time Holyoke and Wellesley still had the most high-achieving American students, I wasn't from the States, I was from Canada, so these women were very hard-working high achievers, but there was this split, it was almost like a generational split in the same generation. There were women students who didn't buy feminism, not many of them, but they said 'Look, let's play bridge at night, let's try to find a guy at Amherst or Harvard', the smokers, but the majority of women were very high achieving, they set high goals for themselves and they saw feminism as necessary. They weren't radical about it, but they just thought it was right.

AR – Uh-huh, uh-huh. It was a natural fit.

JM – We would talk a lot about it, and I never reflected on it, but we would eat breakfast and lunch and we would talk about it, you know, we read so and so, and what

{03.48}

do you think of Gloria Steinem, and what do you think about this new *Ms. Magazine*, which I think debuted in '72 or '73. So it was a very supportive environment.

AR – Were you involved in any feminist organizing or activism at that time?

JM – Well, we were all involved in anti-war. We were all going to Washington and writing letters and carrying signs at various events. And in terms of feminist activism, I think it was more intellectual. We were more engaged in bringing women's issues into the classroom. There weren't a lot of classes; there wasn't a psychology of women class; I think the first women's history class, because it's a women's college, was taught around that period. So we would do things like have a 'women in film' festival. And these were all firsts because it just sort of had not been done. So I think it was that kind of local academic organizing. And then some people got involved in abortion rights issues and battered women's shelters, but that type of activism was just starting.

AR – Did you study psychology in undergrad?

JM – I did.

AR – And what attracted you to psychology?

JM – What attracted me to psychology... There are two ways to put it, the positive and the negative. The positive is that I liked science and I also liked human issues. When I started I wasn't sure if I would go into religion or biology, so you can see how I came to psychology. That's the positive. The negative is that I went to high school in a very remote area of Canada and the schools were really bad, and so by the time I got to college I really wasn't prepared to go to chemistry or biology. You know, just didn't have the preparation. But psychology is sort of a walk-in science...

AR – Yeah, you don't get trained in psychology in high school.

JM – Yeah, nowadays some people are, but you know, then you didn't. So I could take the lower level biology courses, prepare me better for psych, and I went to psychology.

AR – You note very accurately that psych of women was just starting, but as you recall in your psychology classes, what was the attitude towards feminism?

JM – Well, it was very interesting, the Holyoke psychology department has not discovered the cognitive revolution. So I graduated in '73 and there was still no cognitive psychology. Social psychology and personality psychology you could take it, it was offered full year for half the credit of a regular course. It was all physiological and Skinnerian behaviorism. So we all had to learn how to do surgery on rats and stopwatches; it was all very scientific in a kind of Skinnerian way. So there wasn't a lot of space in class to talk about these things. But I did do my senior thesis on a psych of women issue. I brought it up to my faculty instructor, this is the kind of activism I am talking about, "You know, we don't have anything about psychology of women and sex differences." And she said "Well there isn't anything." So I got together with these students and I somehow got the assignment that I was going to do a bibliography on psychology of women. I spent

{7.51}

hours and hours in Psych Abstracts and I think I came up with, in twenty years, maybe sixty references. You know, there just really wasn't a lot on the psychology of women.

AR – Did you go way back to psychology's first years as a discipline and look at some of the first generations?

JM – No, I was looking mostly at, well first of all started, being trained in such an experimentalist, empiricist environment, only looking at experimental work on sex differences, stuff on children, you know, sex role acquisition, and there was some physiological stuff from the '30s and '40s, but there really wasn't that much. There was Holland's work, a few of those people; we tried to keep it in the contemporary world, after 1940. And there wasn't a lot to look at. At that time Donovan Stephen's text came out, or was coming out but hasn't come out, but there wasn't much. So I convinced my advisor that I should do a feminist thesis.

AR – How did that go over?

JM – She was okay with it; she was social psychologist. She was a little skeptical, but I replicated a study by Cooper, I can't remember his first name, but he had an attitudes towards women study in which he had subjects read passages and half of the group was told that they were written by men and half by women, and then they were supposed to rate these writing samples. And both men and women rated the same writing sample worse when they thought it was written by a woman than by a man. It was classic, you know, art evaluation as well, and the same thing happens in art. So I replicated that and only two of the nine measures came up significant. I was just devastated until I wrote the person who first did the study, and it turns out only two of the seven were significant in his. So it was my first lesson in all you see in psychology journal pages is not all there is to it. But at that time I was also, I think that was my first big step in wondering about the power of psychology to really develop ideas and feminism and gender. That was my first and last experiment. I mean, I participated in design and conducting experiments in graduate school, but I never did my own. I had an epistemic or epistemological crisis.

AR – Oh, interesting, yeah.

JM – But you might have another question.

AR – Well, no, I was actually kind of intrigued because I think I had a similar crisis but it took me into my Master's to get there [Laughs].

JM – No, I started when I finished my thesis, but then I took a year off before I went to graduate school and didn't even know at the time I was going to go to graduate school. But it didn't really hit till I was doing my Master's.

AR – Well, tell me a little bit about your next step in terms of your decision to pursue graduate work in psychology and how that kind of came about.

{11.36}

JM – Well, I was also a dance major and my supervisor was pushing me to go into dance criticism. I

was not a good dancer, but I was a good critic, a good theorist of dance. So I was a little torn about what to do and applied to a couple of Ph.D. programs in psych and then decided, in fact, to marry my childhood sweetheart and move back to Canada. It was a guy who was living in Ottawa and at that point I said, 'I just want to go back and study psych, I don't know what I want to do.' I thought I wasn't going to figure it out working, and so I enrolled in at Carleton University at Ottawa. And in my first year I thought I might go to physiological, because they had a very strong, I am sure they call it neuroscience now, but anyway really strong physiological psych program. And in doing that I had my first crisis [which] was that 'Oh my goodness, this is actually going to be an amazing field that's starting to blossom, but the action is not going to be in psych, it's going to be in chemistry and biochemistry.' And I didn't want to go into chemistry or biochemistry so I said, 'I don't want to do that,' you know, I was watching some of the psychologists [come] to be dependent on chemists and biologists, to give them the models, and I didn't like that. So that's what I decided and also I really liked social psych, so I started working in social psych.

And that's when I sort of had two crises. One crisis was about experimentation, it's just I could not be convinced that laboratory simulation of real world phenomena really told us anything more than that: laboratory simulation of the real world phenomena. That was one, and the second part was the notion of bad temporality. I had difficulty really deeply believing that social psychological phenomena were trans-historical and that when you studied love and attraction, or decision-making, or cognitive dissonance, that all of the stuff that was new, person perception, I couldn't really believe that it was going to hold across cultures and across time.

AR – Now was that after or before Gergen wrote *Social Psychology as History*?

JM – It was after he wrote it, but before I read it [Laughs].

AR – I see you coming to some of the same conclusions in your own experience.

JM – It wasn't hard. As an undergraduate at Holyoke we had to take this history of psych course. So I had already been thinking about historical change in psychology and I think feminism was important there. And I think what people like Naomi Weisstein was saying that I was reading is that 'Look, there is this social construction of the knowledge base.' And at that point I started reading more and more about sociology of science, about organization of knowledge and I wrote my first paper on the kind of social organization of social psychology. I looked at, for instance, lots of textbooks, kind of non-systematic, and all sorts of social psychology literature and saw no mention of Marx. Yet if you read a little bit about Marx, this man had an ingenious notion of the social, he might be wrong, but the textbooks don't even talk about it. That's when I started coming to it, that this was, very slowly and very naively starting to see the kind of boundaries of the discipline that have been rendered by professional goal-seeking and not by... it was still pretty naive; if you really want to understand perception, you know, you have to understand it. We didn't know that we had to understand it in terms of the assumptions sent down by some higher set of researchers.

{16.15}

AR – 'This is what psychologists do' [Laughs]. Who was your supervisor at Carleton or who did you work with there?

JM – I worked with two people; well, I worked with a number of people, more than two people. Lloyd

Strickland was the person I worked with in social psychology; and a very important person in my life was a woman teaching psychology of women, named Elinor Burwell, who is now deceased. And she was this wonderful generation of women psychologists who survived. She received her Master's in the forties and during the war was able to teach in Canadian universities and to do work as a psychologist. Of course, when everybody came back she literally was one of these people who had to move out.

Somehow she found a way to survive at Carleton. Many did not regard her very highly because she only had a Master's and she taught psychology of women. She was also a developmental psychologist. And it was really in her classroom that I began to understand how important it is to think deeply about gender. Not just to think about okay, women's rights, okay, we have to make sure there are females in our samples, that we can't have measures that are gendered, but to think deeply about what it means to have a discipline that proceeds this way, or what it means to be a woman living in a diverse social world who has problems that aren't even addressed in the literature. And it was inspirational. So those were the two that guided me a lot in my thinking. My dissertation advisor was a woman who was working in history of psych. So it just so happened when I was having these crises that Carleton, as you probably know, had for a while what York developed, but it started well before. It had this history stream, and you could do dissertation work in history of psychology. Did you know that?

AR – I didn't really. I know some people who have come out of Carleton, but I didn't really know how they were able to do that kind of work.

JM – It was actually very earnest as a program and there were two or three faculty that taught in it. One of them was a woman named Marylyn Marshall who was trained by Kenneth Spence, in behaviorism, I seemed to just follow the end of behaviorism; to its dying breath, I was there. But she was, along with a lot of behaviorists, turned to history when the behaviorist programs they were involved in came to a dead end. She started working, I think, on Gustav Fechner. She left academia about three years ago so I think she never finished her work on Fechner; she is a very demanding task master; we really had extraordinary historical and historical training. Very disciplined in getting us to think historically and what historically means.

AR – Well, kind of tell me more about your dissertation and what developed into your dissertation.

JM – Well, while they pushed the history program, there was lots of divisiveness in the department about what constituted doing the dissertation which would fulfill the requirement for an experimental Ph.D. and then we could do our dissertation.

{20:08}

So really there were some courses and they allowed us to do our historical dissertation. I, at this time, was a little nervous about doing things on gender. Then maybe second year I was at Carleton, the female graduate students wouldn't get the same stipends as the male graduate students, because it was believed that the male graduate students might need it to support families. Now that ended, but the fact that there was enough of non-consciousness or a certain kind of consciousness that it was okay to sort of discriminate in this way. I was getting a little nervous about doing a Ph.D. on a gender-related topic; not paranoid nervous. So I worked on androgyny for one of my qualifying exams; done some work about history of masculinity and femininity. But I did my dissertation on utopias written by five psychologists.

AR – That was one of the first articles I read of yours actually, yeah.

JM – And I looked at gender, at roles of men and women in these utopias, but it wasn't the only thing I looked at; I looked at the place of psychology, the kind of social structure they had. And I tried to examine their scientific works to see to what extent these utopian projects entered into their theory and their articulated notions of the psychological. I was very much interested in the way values, you know, this value-free science we are taught, I was interested in the ways these [values] entered the discipline or how we could detect them. And of course one of these things was androcentrism. And it was very much a feminist project even though gender was a small part of this.

AR – You are using the word gender now. When did gender start to become common?

JM – When did gender, that's a good one. I am pretty sure my dissertation still used sex, sex roles. I can remember when I was in graduate school in late '70s it being of course an issue. Several essay of Rhoda Unger, I should have done my homework...

AR – Yeah, I'm trying to think, too; she had written quite a lot about...

JM – End of the '70s, a kind of debatable matter. And I can remember people saying “Well you should use sex here and gender here” and some people said, “No, no, sex is perfectly good, you don't need it for anything.” And I think by the time I started teaching I was pretty much committed to using gender and well, using 'sex' for biological and gender for social; and then of course it dawned on me that this was as constructed as all the other terms. And then I moved to using just gender, because if you want to use sex, referring to sexual practices and not to anything about one's identity. But I think that happened in the early eighties. But as you know, it's still debated.

AR – It is. And I think the students today don't really have a very good sense of, other than the kind of sex is biological and gender is everything else, I don't know how nuanced, but I am still not sure.

JM – I don't think they are synonymous, which is probably the best.

{24:17}

AR – Yeah, yeah, or I like gender as a verb. Let me ask you I've interviewed a couple of Canadian feminist psychologists, because they were local in my university. And in the '70s in Canada, when the Royal Commission on the Status of Women came out, I mean that was the cultural backdrop, how much was that part of your consciousness at the time?

JM – It was very interesting, it was not part of discussions that were in classrooms, but we would talk about it, and I can remember when I first moved up, after I graduated from college and moved up to Ottawa, I went to work at a women's center. Well, I went to hang out, then to volunteer, and then to work, because someone somewhere mucked up my immigration papers which is the reason I got married, so I got into the country easier, because I was a landed immigrant but I left and lost my status. So I couldn't work for a long time until my papers came through; I hung out at the women's center. There was a lot of talk about that then, but I was really surprised that the sense that Canadian women were still tentative about bringing it into the workplace. So in the women's center it was really strong, and the few that I met that were involved in that project were pretty adamant. But if you moved into university, it was sort of not happening. Maybe that's just because I was in psychology, maybe if I had

been in English literature or political science it would have been happening.

AR – Was there any women’s studies at Carleton at that time that you were aware of?

JM – It was just starting and Elinor Burwell was a big part of that. When I went to Wesleyan in 1980, the same struggles were happening there. It was convincing chairman that yes, this course could be offered and then convincing deans that maybe they should set a little space aside and make an office and so it was happening, but it was the very beginning. During my graduate career it wasn’t organized enough to be an intellectual center yet; it was that new.

AR – One of the things that tends to recur in some of the interviews that we’ve done is the notion of the relationship between psychology and women’s studies and, I am speaking generally, except for the involvement of a few feminist psychologists, women’s studies and psychology haven’t really meshed very well. So I wonder if you could talk a little bit about that, in general.

JM – Yeah, in general; you know I was just a lowly graduate student, I can’t remember what was happening in particular at Carleton. At Wesleyan there were several of us in the psych department that were involved with issues about women and gender, and various different degree of involvement. So it was okay. My colleagues in psychology thought it was just a fad, psych of women; twenty seven years later we can fill ten classes. If it’s a fad, it’s lasted that long. So Wesleyan had a number of people in social sciences, couple of them interested in women’s studies, so our women’s studies department is actually fairly, our program, it wasn’t a department, was fairly balanced. And I say that of course because in natural sciences there was nothing, and actually in fine arts there was a fair little bit; the rest of humanities and social sciences had a healthy balance of participation. In other institutions that was purely quite uncommon; from talking to

{28.51}

women at various women’s studies conferences, psychologists didn’t participate. You know, there are exceptions, but they weren’t big players in women’s studies, history and English, maybe government and sociology tended to be or present.

AR – Do you have any sense of why?

JM – Well, I think for the really empiricist, experimentally trained people it’s a big jump to take. You think it isn’t, because you and I kind of agree on some of these things, but I think especially with the rise of cognitive psychology, where one’s gender, race, social class don’t really matter, because what we are looking at are cognitive processes which purportedly transgress class, race, and gender, so I think a lot of the women entering psychology in the '80s were entering into this world in which the only place where gender played a part was in social psych, and maybe a little bit in development. And they were becoming imbued and influenced by thinking about cognitive models and backgrounded gender. So that’s one reason I think it is. And the other reason is that psychologists become increasingly narrowly trained, as many scientists are. Even though there is an inclination to be feminist in one’s politics, there is not an intellectual base to sort of make that work in your science.

AR – You’ve told me how from a more theoretical or epistemological standpoint, you started to integrate your own feminism into your work. But tell me a little bit about how, did you get involved in feminist organizations in psychology at any point? I don’t have your CV, so I wasn’t able to...

JM – Well, the first thing that happened is I arrived at Wesleyan and within a week of classes starting students approached me and asked me if I would be the facilitator of the women’s studies program [Laughs]. Which, part of me young and naïve knew was probably not a wise thing to do, but they were really in need. And there was a senior faculty in English, male, who had offered to help facilitate it so it should not fall apart. So I agreed to co-facilitate with him, his name was Richard Ohmann, he was a radical left person, actually founder of the organization called *Radical Teacher*, a journal by that name, one of the co-founders. He was a wonderful mentor, helping me, sort of being there without stepping on me and without saying ‘You know, this is how you do it.’ And our women’s studies program was run by consensus. We did not vote, we ran by consensus, and students who were in the program were participants; anyone could come to the program meetings, and every decision was made by consensus. So that was another feminist awakening I had, and I wondered off, why did I go there when you had another question?

AR – I was just asking about sort of feminist organizations in psychology, like Division 35, or...

JM – Right, so it’s true that I became more aware that I should become involved in organizations and that I saw the importance of that work even if you are just an audience in it. So I became, I don’t know when, I think I joined Division 35 when I joined the APA. And I would go to all the sessions at the APA and we would read everything, and in those days you still could read everything, although it was getting harder every

{33.07}

year. Not being trained in the States, a lot of these women had networks that were thick and developed and not just women, but psychologists. And I was always feeling like a little bit of an outsider, I knew everyone through the literature, I didn’t know a lot of people. So I didn’t become actively involved in Division 35 except giving papers and going to papers. And I think other feminist organizations. You know, I had very transitory experiences with having to organize something for some momentary thing. Organize to get daycare on campus or organize to help a battered women’s shelter. Not any professional group.

AR – Let’s return now to your scholarly work. Tell me a little bit about your book, *Practicing Feminisms*, and how that came to be.

JM – So how that came to be, it came to be because someone at Michigan Womyn’s Festival was writing a series and the series fell apart, but I started writing a book. They wanted to have a series of feminist surveys of the disciplines across the disciplines, but it didn’t quite pan out that way. But I’d started this book so I just finished it and published it with them. I had sensed just going to the APA and reading some of the literature, sensed two kinds of cleavages going on. One is that some of the feminists trying to push new methods were getting shut off by other feminists who were abiding more by empiricist doctrine and rule-following, and others saying ‘You have to talk to your subjects; if you do an interview, you can’t do a survey interview with all these little checkmarks, because that itself is a gendered practice in a way that it closes off certain ways of knowing.’ And so listening to all this and of course not doing experimental work myself or even collecting data on anything but historical or theoretical matters, I was outside of it. My research is not at stake in this. And I started saying, ‘This is really not good, because feminist psychology has already moved psychology already tremendously, and because differences aren’t differences that really matter.’ I mean they do matter in terms of someone’s

particular research program, but in terms of advancing feminism within psychology, all of these ways can work. However, I had my preferred, my preferences are clear in the book, so I wanted to show that the transgressions that feminists have done, both those in more traditional areas and those in more risk-taking kind of methodologies were really epistemologically important changes. They seemed like small little moments, but if you looked at them all together, they were big, and they required that people worked in alliances and were not fractured. And I can't recall them now, you didn't read my CV and I didn't do my homework on reflecting and going back and probably look at the book, because there were a number of debates about whether one should routinely just test for gender difference, for instance. And they were heated debates. And it surprised me when I came down on a side of a real kind of arch, empiricist-feminist psychologist on that; yet I thought these debates are kind of causing us to lose ground, rather.

AR – Right, right. Taking up energy that could be directed elsewhere.

JM – I saw the larger picture. That was a part of this, was to show that feminist psychology had made great advances and that our differences are important to see

{38.59}

but our alliances are more important. And also there is a not insignificant third part which was for people to try new methodology and to think beyond reductionism and positivism.

AR – Well do you think has been feminism's greatest in-roads in psychology? Or what has been the most important challenge or contribution that feminism or feminist theory has made to psychology?

JM – Well, I am a living testament to the greatest challenge that feminists made, were made before I was there. I wouldn't have a job if they didn't. I think that there is no way that psychology would be hiring women unless there were not pressures put upon them in the discipline through feminist work, I mean not just through feminist work within psychology, but feminist work generally. It's a revolution.

AR – That said, have you personally experienced discrimination based on sex or gender [Laughs]?

JM – Sex or gender? Wesleyan was a perfect example. There were two of us hired at the same time, a male and myself and he was ABD when he was hired and I had finished, and I had a post-doc for nine months with the Science Council of Canada, so I had more experience, I finished my dissertation. And three years into our jobs somehow we mentioned our salaries and out starting salaries and it turns out his starting salary was higher than mine, so I went to vice president and he said "Well, Mark, Mark had another offer." And I said, "I had another offer." And he said "Well, Mark had publications." I said, "No, Mark didn't have publications, he still doesn't." And I said, "I think you should go back and look because I finished a Ph.D. and a post-doc and yet he started at a higher salary." He conceded that, he said "Yes, that's true;" so he said, "I'll look into it and I'll fix it." So when we got our raises at spring I thought he had actually fixed it because there was this extra cost-of-living raise plus there was this adjustment, and I was just excited. I won my first sexism battle.

About a week later I was talking to Mark in the hallway and he said, "You now I just got my raise letter and I just don't understand it, I have this adjustment" [Laughs]. So not only countering sexism, but I couldn't be rewarded for or given, I mean there was lots of sexism, there still is lots of sexism, and I am sure that there are some opportunities that I didn't have. I'm just old enough that I wasn't even

conscious of it for a lot of the time, and I do look and see that things people got and people didn't get, things were probably sexist in their basis, but I guess I was never the one to do a lot of that comparative work, in part because of the time and part because that's not how I operate.

So I think that feminism's, in general, greatest accomplishment in North America has been to pull down a lot of barriers in the workplace and to make public a lot of transgressions against women in private life, whether it be battering of spousal abuse or sexual assault. There have been advances in preventing those or in calling them for what they are. In psychology ... I mean still the major advancement in psychology is women in the profession. You know, I am not sure right now; I am having a little, it's a kind of moment of despair. I think that the rise of neuroscience, of evolutionary psychology, of very advanced and little bit stale cognitive psychology models don't make much room for gender. Um, so my colleagues are

{43.11}

terribly enthusiastic about evolutionary psychology and it's very sad because I was trained first as a scientific psychologist and it doesn't even have scientific basis. And I have to think that what's driving a lot of this is actually disregard for feminism, and disregard even among other women who are enjoying the child care that some feminists maybe unlocked, enjoying maternity leave and not recognizing that they could still be victim to discrimination.

AR – Yeah, yeah. You are an educator as well, as you look around the current undergraduate in psychology, what do you see as their relationship to feminism if any?

JM – Well, I teach at a school that's politically liberal. We have great students, and many of them come because it is liberal. So a lot of them are very feminist and they do a lot of gender-related research. There is paucity of faculty; there are a lot more students who want to do research and take courses than they are regular faculty. And almost all of our moonlighters are visiting faculty are teaching something related to gender, because it's a big issue. And the students are pretty good with it, but I think our faculty, especially the younger faculty, it's not on their agenda very much.

AR – Part of the reason I ask is that I was hired at the same time as some other women, similar age and so on, but their orientations were sort of clinical psychology, health psychology, and so on. And we never discussed feminism anything, although one of them does teach psych of women. So we are talking, we are sitting around talking one day, and they completely disavowed any kind of feminist, or maybe except for very diluted, 'oh you know, that's kind of passé and everything is equal now,' even the one who taught psych of women was not really keen on calling herself a feminist. That was really quite interesting. So I have an undergraduate student now who wants to take that on in terms of what does feminism mean for her generation women and sort of focusing of negative aspects of feminism, feminism, the F-word, whatever. The people who do identify as feminist in her generation, what makes that a positive thing for them. So I was curious about what your experience was with this kind of generation.

JM – Yeah, it's interesting because these women who are your generation do take it for granted that all these things will be there and they do take it for granted that when they have children we won't have meetings after five, and that if they should not produce as much before tenure, if they've had children, others will understand it. And a lot of them are getting harsh surprises, that it's not quite how it is. But for most of them, we are talking about privileged, white, upper-middle class, they don't have to

[identify with] feminism, they are still going to do okay and it's not going to hurt their lives any. I am not sure, I think a lot of the students that I see really want to make a change; they still see a lot of inequities, they are very interested in the global condition which we weren't. And I think not because of lack of interest, but because the world is more accessible to them, they can travel more than we could; they have much more information about women around the world than we had available to us. Those are all good things.

{47.35}

AR – Can you talk a little bit about psychology's response, if there is one, to US third-world feminism, and whether or not you think psych of women has adequately kind of dealt with that or incorporated it, or addressed it, even.

JM – Well, that's interesting because in the mid-80's, well, in the early 80's we started seeing a lot of criticism in women's studies against North American women's studies, that it was ethnocentric, that it was white women's movement. And I think those criticisms weren't always fair, I think that some of them were quite just, but they weren't always fair because from the beginning there were feminists that I would encounter that I would encounter with much broader visions and much more inclusive. I think that at least the women's studies programs that I am in touch with at Wesleyan is very engaged with global feminism and intersectionality and a lot of ways one can theorize and understand women around the world and very much influenced by Donna Haraway's global feminism perspective, and all the others. But psychology, I am not sure. I was just thinking about my department, where we are doing some restructuring in the psych department and we are dropping, we have had six categories in developmental, social, psychopathology, neuroscience, and women was one; and it's been taken out and instead we are putting culture and internationalizations, I hope that we are going to use those terms. But it's very interesting because the way my colleagues are conceptualizing internationalizing that they still have the UN model of understanding others, the other, whether the other would be a woman that other be a...

AR – Culture.

JM – Culture. And this international like how to people negotiate, how do people make decisions, you know it's going to be really difficult for psychology to; and I guess in *American Psychologist* there was this big thing in internationalizing the psych curriculum. I am like 'internationalizing, I cannot let you have this word.' I mean, is this absorbing, is this imperialism? Are we internationalizing the curriculum because we are going to take over the world, I don't know. But I think that, I haven't had a chance to think deeply because we what I have to do is try to negotiate through the department and try to convince them that yes, we need this kind of person, and it's usually class negotiation. I haven't had a chance to sit back, but my pessimism is that I think psychology is not a receptive place at all and it's moved towards more determinist models, it's moved to hyper-technology, which are none of them surprising. Toward kind of riding the genetic craze, that that really makes gender and categories of people in the world, like gender, irrelevant, if not minor.

AR – Well, let me skip to something a little bit unrelated to what we were just talking about. This is a feminist question so how have you, over the course of your career to date, how have you balance the personal and the professional in your own life, something that women talk about, I mean that all people struggle with but that women especially, perhaps, struggle with. So I just wanted to hear a little bit on you've managed to balance.

JM – How I managed that. One of the ways I balanced is that I have a gift I was given, is that I have a lot of energy and I don't need a lot of sleep. And I hate to

{52.14}

say it but if you needed eight or nine or ten hours sleep, you couldn't have done what I did. Not that I don't sleep, but I just don't need eight or nine hours of sleep. And that really makes a difference, so part of the reason I have been able to balance is actually working longer hours in the day than some people. But that said it has been really hard work and an immense amount of trade-offs. I think that people, especially mothers don't like to talk about it is that I've traded off work accomplishments, I've traded off the best possible world for my daughters. I don't think they suffered, but I don't think I gave them all of what I would have liked to given them. I was a single parent for most of their childhood. So I think had I been in a nurturing relationship, in a mutually supportive relationship with a partner raising children, I think it would have been a very easy balance. And I see people in those relationships, and I think there are still trade-offs, because time is, even when you don't sleep, limited.

But for me it's been just a lot of hard work. I had to give up dancing, which I wasn't doing professionally or anything, but I couldn't dance anymore, I didn't have the time, so part of that was that I'd love to ride a bike, and I just sort of put my bike away. So I just sort of focused my life on two things and only two things, my children and my work, and it was worthwhile. But there was a kind of balance with lots of trade-offs and cutting the budget, like 'okay we have to cut our budget here, what goes?' But it's been rewarding.

AR – Well I was going to ask, what is sort of nourished you in your work life, let's stick with that. What's kept your work so energizing for you?

JM – Well, again, this is really interesting. I love to learn, I just love to learn. You could put me in geology class and I'd love it, too. So part of it is that and part of the other two are psychology and its history just compel me, and I think it would probably compel anyone. It probably compels you to think more deeply than people have thought about it. Not that there aren't others thinking deeply, here are, but there's lots of space and room to think deeply. So in addition to the first component, that I love to learn, too is here is a project that maybe my work won't make much of a difference, but the whole project of thinking historically about psychology just might make a difference to some people some time. And the third reason is I work in an environment with incredible students, and for twenty seven years they continue to be incredible and it's hard not to get into a class and not get excited again.

AR – Yeah, yeah. Let me ask one more question because our time is running out. If you were to encounter a young, deeply feminist psychologist today, what advice would you give her or him about what they need to do in psychology? What remains to be done?

JM – Wow, okay. Well I think I would advise them to be strategic. I was not strategic, I don't think a lot of us were, we were doing what we could do that would be accepted, so when I went on the job market I sort of sold myself as a social psychologist who did projects that are historical, and did say that I did gender, but I wasn't strategic about it. If I was a feminist psychologist I would first of all pick important problems and I think a lot of feminist psychologists don't do that; they pick good problems because maybe they got it through the literature, but I think strategically to make a difference, I mean it's make a difference for the field or make a difference in your life they may not be

{56.56}

the same. But for instance, more critical feminist work has to be done in cognitive psychology. Some of the very interesting projects are so male-centered in their very structure and the whole notions that there are no processing difference between genders, that it's all the same, I am skeptical, I think there is some rich stuff to be found. And likewise, evolutionary psychology, most of us laugh at it and say, 'Can you believe it's being peddled?', but it being peddled right into textbooks now. And I think that there is huge project that could be done, taking big projects, strategically big projects to sort of transform, in the case of evolutionary psychology something that's really not science, and in case of cognitive psychology which could be so expanded. So I would tell them to think strategically about things that would make a difference for the larger field. I guess that would be the main one. And I think it's a different world than when I entered it, even though there is still many years more to work. But I think I would tell them to have a really deep-down reflection about the way in which professionalized academe could be harmful to their lives. Allow me to explain that. That the work world has become so rationalized, that I think that feminist psychologists have to be of these kind that put their whole being into their work, it just tends to go along, that I would probably advise critically not to do that in the hyper-rationalized academic world, and just sort of maybe think out your projects carefully, your time carefully.

AR – And which of your projects, contributions are you sort of most proud of?

JM – Well, I think my book, the book that you mentioned. It's hard to know, it's hard to say. Some of them not too proud of [Laugh].

AR – I won't ask about those.

JM - Certainly with feminist projects, the book would be the greatest one, and I think some of the history of psychology, some of the things I've written, which is also in the book. It probably is on reflexivity and the place of subjectivity and objectivity. I don't know.

AR – Okay. Is there anything that I haven't touched on or asked about that you'd like to add?

JM – It is very interesting you don't ask about our personal lives very much, it's very interesting because of course, feminism is, you know...

AR – Well, yeah, maybe another time...

JM – Personal is political, yeah okay [Laugh]. That's fine, but it's just very interesting; it's just a comment.

AR – Yeah, sure. Feel free to talk about it [Laughs].

JM – No, that's okay, I'll stick with the project. Because I think a lot of us were also influenced, in my generation and certainly the one before it, maybe even up to your cohort, by personal experiences. I (pause) think I was young enough to see things like sexual assault go unanswered or the person sent away and said 'get over it, all he did was blah, blah, blah.' And I think that some of those personal experiences just in their own right didn't make women feminists, but I think a lot of us watching it

{01.01.44}

and experiencing it personally with the rise of feminist consciousness were motivating factors. I think it's also the case that there was a tremendous unevenness in men's and women's consciousness; now men have been reading feminism for twenty five or thirty years, and there are a lot of men who practice feminism and teach it. And right down to masculinity and gender roles.

©Psychology's Feminist Voices, 2013