Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History Project

Interview with Joan C. Chrisler

Interviewed by Alexandra Rutherford
Newport, RI
March 12, 2009

When citing this interview, please use the following citation:

Chrisler, J. C. (2009, March 12). Interview by A. Rutherford [Video Recording]. Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History and Online Archive Project. Newport, RI.

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 Oral History Project
Interview with Joan Chrisler
Interviewed by Alexandra Rutherford
Newport, RI
March 12, 2009

JC: Joan Chrisler, Interview Participant
AR: Alexandra Rutherford, Interviewer

AR: An interview with Joan Chrisler on March 12, 2009 in Newport, Rhode Island. To start we'll have you say your full name, and place and date of birth for the record.

JC: My name is Joan Celeste Chrisler and my place of birth was Teaneck, New Jersey in the United States, and the date was January 1st, 1953.

AR: Great. The way we usually start these interviews is to have you talk a little bit about your identity, or how your identity as a feminist evolved.

JC: That's an interesting question and it's not so easy to answer. I can recall when I was a little girl and noticing things. I loved to read and I was a very good student and looking at my text books in grammar school, the authors were usually men. I wondered about that as a child, why are there so few women who are writing books? The other thing I noticed was the only powerful women I knew were nuns; and the only intellectual women that I knew were librarians. One of my first career goals was to become a librarian.

AR: Not a nun? (laughs)

JC: No. (laughs) Although I often tell my students that nuns were the earliest feminists because they chose to live without men and they lived by themselves and they did everything by themselves. I was in high school when the women's movement really took off and there was a lot of talk about it. I went to an all girls high school and I remember reading about it and getting very interested in it with some of my friends. By the time I went to college I called myself a feminist. I joined the National Organization for Women; I participated in a consciousness-raising group in college that was run by a grad student in the philosophy department. I got involved early on.

AR: Tell me a little bit more about these very early influences. Was this feminist consciousness something that was supported in your family at all?

JC: Oh no. Not in my family at all. I had many arguments, especially with my mother about this sort of thing. She resisted many of my goals including going to graduate school and when I got married and did not change my name she was very upset about that. She told me that was the best part of getting married, so I said, "then just cancel the ceremony right now if that's the best part." So no, I didn't have any support from my parents. They were rather conservative. My father supported Nixon until the very end, that type of thing, many political fights.

AR: Wow, right. You mentioned nuns and I noticed somewhere in your CV that you went a Catholic high school, The Immaculate Heart Academy.

JC: Yes, I went to Catholic school from kindergarten through college. Then I went to a Jewish university for graduate school. When I began to apply for jobs I couldn't get any interviews at colleges that had a Protestant affiliation or history. I used to laugh about the fact that they didn't know what I was, but they knew I wasn't one of them.

AR: Interesting. I went to a convent school actually. It was called the Convent of the Sacred Heart. I don't know if it has anything to do with Immaculate Heart, but I remember thinking that the women there were really good role models. They were just interesting, engaged, socially active women.

JC: Yes, there were a number of early studies showing that women who went to all-girls high schools or colleges were most likely to be successful in their careers. However, they were often privileged people and more likely to have careers in the first place, so it's a little bit confounded, but it's quite interesting. I think about people like Hilary Clinton, for example, who went to an all-women's college. There are very many women that we can name even today. I'm grateful for that. Of course, in my school, the women were all the athletes, as well as the cheerleaders, and the presidents of all the clubs, and in student council; whereas a close friend who went to the public high school, she didn't see girls in any of those [roles], it was all run by the boys.

AR: Tell me a little bit about your consciousness-raising.

JC: Well that was great. That was the equivalent of what women's studies classes are today for students. Every week we had a different thing to talk about and we would just share our experiences. In some cases it was the first time I had realized I had been discriminated against, or I came to understand that experiences that I had had were common. 'The personal is political' was the big slogan of the second wave of feminism, and the consciousness raising groups really brought that home for you. These are the types of experiences that our students have today in our classes when we talk about violence against women and we share experiences with them and data about these incidences that we share with them. Often they are shocked about how common these things are, especially if they come from a sheltered life. So that's what it was for us. It was also interesting for me because I was a freshman and the leader of the group was a graduate student working on her dissertation and there were women of all ranges in between, from all across campus. It was really interesting to have the egalitarian feeling with a group of other women. It was good for me, really good intellectually.

AR: What kinds of feminist activities were you involved in? You mentioned joining NOW. Can you tell me a little bit about your feminist activism in this period?

JC: In that period, well I went to demonstrations. I remember going to a demonstration across from St. Patrick's Cathedral in New York City and we were yelling things like "Keep your rosaries off our ovaries!" and "Not the Church, not the State, women will control our fate!" I was also involved in a lot of anti-war protests because it was the Vietnam period, so there was just a lot of activism is general. Most of my activism was probably personal, developing a confidence to speak up when guys in my classes would make sexist remarks. I remember one time a group of guys who were 'my friends' thought it would be funny to take me down to the Village, where there was a bar that had been 'men only' for a hundred years and it was just forced by New York City to be open to women. I was one of the first women who went in there,

but I didn't know where we were going. I was completely naïve and the guys in the bar were very hostile and nasty to me so I left and then my friends felt really bad afterwards. They were the ones that took me there because they thought it would be funny, 'oh let's take the feminist down there and she how she likes it.'

AR: Right, 'let's see what happens.'

JC: There were a lot of comments.

AR: At this time you were at Fordham for your undergraduate, what was the gender ratio in your classes?

JC: I don't remember too much about it. I think there probably more men than women in most classes. The interesting thing about Fordham, well I hadn't meant to tell you this, but it's coming to me, but when I went there I enrolled in the women's undergraduate college, which was called Thomas Moore College. The men's college was Fordham College. In my junior year, Fordham decided it was really silly, since we had the same classes and the same faculty. The only thing that was different was we had our own administration and Deans. They decided to merge the colleges, and of course I didn't get to graduate from Thomas Moore College, the college I had enrolled in, and of course the women Deans all lost their jobs. Then what was really interesting was the first graduation that was after that the women were the Salutation and the Valedictorian because the women had higher grades as there were higher admission requirements for Thomas Moore than Fordham. The priests were very upset because 'we can't have all these women getting these prizes,' so they cancelled all the prizes!

AR: And that was the reason? Wow!

JC: Exactly, to save the young men's egos. So you can image the women were very upset about it. Even today, some of us, when we have occasion to meet with alumns, will sign our names TMC and the graduation year instead of FC, which is what they want us to write.

AR: Tell me how psychology entered the picture in all of this?

JC: In a kind of serendipitous way. I wanted to be a librarian as I mentioned, so I thought I would be an English major because I would get to read a lot of books. I liked to write, and I thought I would write the great American novel on weekends. I started in the English department and I just didn't enjoy it because we weren't really talking about the beauty of the writing and the wonder of the story. We were talking about literary theory in ways that just weren't interesting to me. One of my friends was taking psychology in the next semester and he said 'why don't you take it with me' and I did. I ended up falling in love with experimental psychology and deciding I wanted to be a scientist. I declared a psychology major instead and never looked back.

AR: At that point did you have any mentors or teachers that stood out for you as being supportive?

JC: No, not one. I only had two women professors in my entire four years of college, and this was in the early 1970's. One was in sociology and one was in French. There was one woman who was quite famous in the Fordham Psychology department, Anne Anastasi, who was President of the APA in the 1970's. She was President while I was there actually, but she only

taught graduate students. I don't know if she was shy or snobby, we couldn't figure it out, but she never spoke to us. We were kind of in awe of her, especially when she was President and we would see her in the hallways and say, "There goes Anne Anastasi." She had to hear us and she never smiled at us or said "Hi, how are you?" or anything. So no, I had no mentor and we didn't have academic advisors at Fordham at that time. I went to graduate school because I didn't know what to do with myself after I was finished college. I only applied to graduate school in the city and that's how I went to Yeshiva University because it was the only one I got into.

AR: Interesting, wow. Certainly your parents were not interested in this, not supportive?

JC: There were not many college graduates in my family, and none in my immediate family. My father and his brother and sister were not college graduates. My mother was not and neither was her brother. I didn't have anyone in my family who could give me advice on this. My father paid for my undergraduate school and said if I wanted to go to graduate school then I would have to pay for myself. I used all the money I got as graduation gifts and I worked my way through grad school. I didn't have an assistantship or anything and I didn't know really that you shouldn't go to graduate school if you didn't have one of those things. I was sort of naïve or ignorant to that and it was really tough. The way that I got mentoring was from joining AWP. There was a New York City chapter and someone had put a flyer on a bulletin board, so I went to the meeting. The first person I met there was Florence Denmark, who sat next to me in the meeting. Then I met people like Leonore Tiefer and Ethel Tobach. Ethel was the one that made sure I graduated because I was procrastinating and she used to yell at me a lot.

AR: I could see that! (Laughs)

JC: Leonore told me that I must go to an AWP conference, even though I couldn't afford it. It was a 1981 conference in Boston, so I stayed with my sister who was living in Providence and I drove to Boston every day to go. That's where I made a lot of friends who are my peers today, like Suzanna Rose and Maureen McHugh, and we did peer mentoring. When we learned something, we shared it with each other. They introduced Irene Frieze to me, who was their mentor, and she has been very good to me. Rhoda Unger has been a mentor. I met her at AWP. If I hadn't gone to AWP, I don't know where I would be today because certainly my dissertation advisor was not a mentor to me.

AR: I was searching for the person's name who might appear who was your dissertation advisor, but I couldn't find it.

JC: There is no point in putting it there because he never did anything for me. He didn't even write letters for me when I looked for jobs. That is my fault. I didn't ask him because I was teaching as an adjunct part-time, so I asked people who were familiar with my teaching. I had very warm letters from department chairs and Deans of places where I had worked. I look back on it now and after I've been on so many search committees, I think, "What were my colleagues thinking when I didn't have any letters from anyone at graduate school?" I'm lucky I got a job. It's amazing. I was too dumb to know it was a bad thing. He would have done it if I'd asked him to, but he didn't offer; he didn't tell me to.

AR: Tell me about your graduate training, and about Yeshiva. Of course the question that's burning in my mind is how did you get into menstruation research?

JC: Do you want me to start with that?

AR: Ok, that was a tripled-barrelled question, which I know I shouldn't ask, so talk to me first about getting into graduate school.

JC: Let me tell you a little bit about what it was like for me to go to Yeshiva because, as I said, I went to Catholic school from kindergarten to college where we behaved very sweetly, and we took notes, and didn't question the teacher much, as you know. Jews have a disputational learning style. My first class was psychophysics and my professor wrote on the board an equation. And I opened my notebook, my clean, beautiful notebook, and wrote the equation. The other kids in the class are saying, "How is that derived? Where did that come from? How is that important?" I thought I had fallen down the rabbit hole – it was very interesting for me. I had to learn to speak up more. I think it was good for me to be there.

Oddly enough, my husband ended up going to the Yeshiva University law school, which for the first couple of years was in the same building, before they moved the psychology department up to the medical school in the Bronx. The registrar hated me because I didn't cover my hair and I didn't wear long sleeves because I was not an orthodox Jew, unlike most of the other women. So when my husband started school there, he used to go and talk to Rabbi Twersky for me. The Rabbi liked him just fine, so it was really ridiculous.

How did I get involved with menstruation is an interesting question. When it was time for me to think about a topic for my Master's thesis, or what we called it, a Pre-Doc research project, I really didn't know what I wanted to work on. I started to think about what I liked and I liked physiological psychology, which was the major thing I was studying, and I liked social psychology, and, of course, I was interested in women. I tried to think of something that would be an intersection. Of course, menstruation has both physiological aspects, sociocultural overlays, and concerns women's lives. I selected that as my topic and that's how I got started in doing that.

AR: Was that supported by your supervisor?

JC: He was ok about it. My Master's project I did with Irma Hilton, who was one of the few women in the department at that time. She was trained as a social psychologist, but she was mainly teaching clinical courses. She taught a course on sex roles, as they used to call it, and I took that course and she helped me with that. My major professor, Allan Goldstein, was my supervisor for my dissertation. He was an expert in wolves and wasps. He's a comparative psychologist, but he was fine with it. He had actually supervised a couple of previous dissertations, which he had me read, that had to do with aspects of the menstrual cycle, so I was not the first person to study that issue. A few years ago, one of my former students, who is now a tenured faculty member in the department where I taught, invited me to give a talk on Psychology Day at Yeshiva and the undergraduates from the men's college, women's college, and the social work school all came together and did these poster presentations. I gave an invited address about menstrual cycle research. Louise Silverstein told me afterwards that some of the men were so embarrassed and she never thought she'd live to see that day that someone talked about that out loud at Yeshiva, so it was great fun! That was also the first time I saw my major professor since the day I defended my dissertation. I had had no contact with him during all those years. He is retired, but when he heard I was the speaker, he came.

AR: Did he say anything to you?

JC: Oh yes, we sat and had a little talk and he said that he always knew I was so special and bright and he was so proud of me.

AR: A few years too late.

JC: I wanted to say, "Well why didn't ever try to give me any guidance, Allan?" but I didn't. But I said, "You were a very kind person," and I made nice. He's old now.

AR: Well, clearly you've taught a lot during your graduate work too. Was this part of trying to make your way through school?

JC: Yes.

AR: Tell me about your experience teaching, because teaching has been a big part of your career.

JC: Well, it's kind of funny because I said before that I went to graduate school because I didn't know what to do with myself, so then I'm ABD and I asked myself, "What am I qualified to do?" That's when I realized pretty much the only thing I was qualified to do was become a professor. I think it's hilarious when I say this because my students today, they are so smart about careers nowadays, but we weren't back in my youth. I realized I was going to have to become a professor. Lucky for me, I enjoy it and I think it's a great career, but I stumbled into it. It was not planned.

My husband, we met at college, I don't know if I indicated that, and he had been working as a car salesman and a restaurant manager and he decided to go back to graduate school and get a law degree. He went back to school right at a crucial moment, really, where I should have been working on my dissertation and trying to finish, but he didn't have any money then, right when he gave up his job. I had to work more and it took me quite a long time to finish my degree. I was very angry at him about doing that. I'm still not sure if he realizes that he retarded my career by not waiting a couple of years, or at least one year, but anyway.

I was working a lot. I taught part-time at a lot of schools in the area. Luckily we were living near New York City and there were many colleges within an easy driving distance. It was a tough life. Every school is different. They were all using different text books, even if it was the same course. The students were very different from one place to the next. I would have a lot of classes, large classes, trying to learn everybody's name, driving a lot. I can remember some days I would set out from my home in Westchester County and I would drive to New Jersey, so across the George Washington Bridge, eating my English muffin in the car on my way to teach a course in a college in New Jersey and then drive back and go to Northern Westchester for my afternoon class, and then somewhere else for my evening class, and eating dinner in the car. This is kind of a funny story; I used to bring hardboiled egg and some carrot sticks, or something that would be easy to eat while you are driving. I had to peel the egg before I left campus because I couldn't peel the egg in the car. So, as I was drawing to the close in my psych class, I would take out the egg, crack it on the edge my desk, and I would peel it into the garbage can and put it back into the plastic bag. At the end of the semester my students said, "Ok what's the deal with this egg?" They thought it was some kind of psychology experiment! They thought I was trying to see if anybody would mention it. But no, I was just getting ready for my dinner.

AR: Classical conditioning at the end of the lecture or something. (Laughs).

JC: That was the signal for them that I was almost finished, when the egg came out.

AR: That's funny, that is good. What I'm getting towards is how have you meshed feminism and psychology. You've mentioned a couple of things already in terms of being interested in women as well as physiological and social – and menstruation research was a way to combine all of that. You mentioned taking a course in sex roles. Maybe I could get you to elaborate a little bit on how those connections or your exposure to feminist ways of doing psychology.

JC: I think my exposure to it came at AWP. I had one class as an undergraduate, the sociology class. I mentioned the sociology professor was a woman and the class was about gender, maybe it was called the Sociology of Sex and Gender, or something like that. I had two classes in graduate school and that was it, basically. Women's Studies was just beginning and there wasn't a lot of opportunity. When I began to teach, you know you send your CV all over the place and you wait by the phone, and then they start calling. One of the first courses I taught, the professor said to me, "Can you do psych of women?" I said, "sure." I didn't really know if I could do psych of women or not, but I got the textbook and a lot of the stuff was familiar to me. There wasn't a lot of stuff in those days. I used to have students read novels to supplement the course textbook and talk about themes and relate them to the text book. Basically, I taught myself. Then, by coming to AWP and hearing cutting-edge ideas, sometimes radical ideas. I really just soaked it all up like a sponge. I discovered the Society for Menstrual Cycle Research as well, which is a feminist women's health organization. I got a lot of nurturing from them as well. I grew up with the field, basically.

AR: Tell me a little bit about your earliest exposure to AWP and what the organization was like.

JC: It was like sort of what it's like today, except maybe more contentious, I guess would be fair to say. AWP really tries to live the feminist process. It is run by a collective. It's not run by elected officers. The collective members are all volunteers except for the Co-Co, Collective Coordinator, who is invited by the implementation collective, known as the IMPs, to be their leader. The Co-Co's original name was Harrier and her job was to call people and say, "Are you doing your job?" It's very grassroots. If you say you are going to be in charge of something, you are left in charge of it, the President doesn't give you directives. Everybody sort of works on their own. The board meetings, or collective meetings, IMPs meetings, as we call them, are based on feminist process where everybody speaks and the decisions are made by consensus. It was a wonderful experience, except when you can't reach consensus. I remember one time we discussed an issue until somebody's term was over, and she rolled off, and then we were able to move ahead because she blocked the consensus. It can be frustrating, but, again, it is a really good way to gain confidence, learn to speak, learn to assess your thoughts, and learn to get along with other people, and search for common ground.

Really, AWP has been very important to my career. I served in a number of IMP positions, as we call them. I started out as the correspondent. Then, I was a spokesperson, so I used to speak to the media on behalf of AWP. I was the Co-Co. I was a conference coordinator and many other roles. In fact, I got involved in Division 35 because I was the Student Research Prize Coordinator, which is a joint prize of the two groups, but AWP always picks the person who runs the committee and that person has a seat on the Division 35 EC, so that was how I went there the first time in that role.

AR: You mentioned things being contentious, I'm curious.

JC: There is another thing that is kind of funny. When I was the Co-Co there was a fight at every meeting. It wasn't my fault, I assure you! I would have to tell people to get over it. There were always arguments because we talked about things that were so important to people. People's emotions were on the surface and this was the time when a lot of caucuses were forming in AWP. First we had the Women of Color caucus, who were fighting for more recognition of their issues and membership drive to bring in more women of colour. Then we got the Jewish Women's caucus and those two were in friction, like, 'why do you need a caucus when we made a caucus first?' Then, we had the bisexuality caucus and both the gay and straight women were dubious about that in AWP. Lots of things were happening. Every time I would come home from an IMPs meeting, and there were four a year, my husband would say, "how many people cried?" When I go to Division 35 meetings, I can only remember one meeting when anybody cried. People don't cry at Division 35. They are business oriented, 'we get the job done.' It's just different. I don't know how to explain it, even when the same people are at both places. It's just different. People are not afraid to speak their mind here – you know the old joke, four feminists, five opinions. You can really experience that at AWP. It's been interesting, it's always interesting.

AR: Any other highlights of your year as Co-Co?

JC: There were a lot of highlights; the organization almost went broke when I was Co-Co. That was a terrifying thing. I remember I was on sabbatical at the time and the treasurer called me and she didn't balance the check book regularly, so when it was time for the meeting she had to make the financial report and she saw that we were almost out of money. Our previous conference was in Atlanta and there was an ice storm and people couldn't get there. We lost so much money. It was also badly organized, that was another problem, but the ice storm did us in. We had to make sure the next conference was a money maker, otherwise we would be dead. I had to fly to California. I used some frequent flyer miles and worked with the Committee that was organizing the conference. We had to cancel an IMPs meeting; we had to cut the newsletter back to 3 issues; and we had to do a bunch of things. We came through. It was a very stressful thing for me, but I felt great that I had played a role in keeping the organization going. So that was probably the thing that I will always remember about it.

AR: Tell me a little bit about what you see as the complimentary functions and roles of AWP, with say, Division 35.

JC: Originally, when Division 35 was formed, there was talk about whether AWP should go out of business. Do we need two organizations that are basically doing the same thing? The decision was made, and of course I wasn't around when it was made, but it was made to keep both going so that Division 35 would be the insider group, pressuring the APA to change from the inside, from the position of power inside, and AWP could be more radical. They could nip at APA's heels. They could be more rude because they are on the outside and wouldn't be owing to anyone. For a number of years they did play those complimentary functions. I don't know now, maybe not so much. I think a lot of APA people don't care about AWP very much anymore, and if they do care they are involved in 35, and if they don't care, then they don't go because the conventions have gotten so expensive. AWP also has members who are not psychologists. We have social workers; we have some teachers, nurses, and activists who like our group. Not all of them are psychologists, so that's another thing. For me, right now, when I go to the meetings, I find that I have more fun at AWP. I usually do give a talk. I'm giving a talk and a poster at this meeting. I come, not so much to do that, but to see my friends and to see my former students. I socialize my students by bringing them here. It's usually the first place they present because it's

so comfortable to present here. I come for the sheer pleasure of it. I go to Division 35 more for intellectual stimulation. After coming to AWP for so many years, I find the young presenters are saying the same things we said 20 and 30 years ago. It's just new to them, they just discovered it, but it's not new to us. Also, some years it's mostly clinical. AWP members like a lot of workshops and discussion groups, so they sit around and talk. I like to hear papers with data and new theories and things like that, so I enjoy Division 35's programming more for that reason.

AR: Tell me, since we are on this topic, about your involvement with 35 then, because you've played an important role in that organization as well.

JC: Yes, in and out. Here's one more difference between AWP and Division 35. In AWP people just volunteer and if someone volunteers usually you say 'yes' because you are always looking for people. But in 35, you can volunteer and volunteer and volunteer, but until somebody you know gets elected President, forget it, because the President appoints everyone. People pick their friends and their former students to bring in. I did the same when I was President, that's the way it works. I went to the EC first; it must have been around 1990 maybe as the Student Research Prize Chair. I had a seat for three years in that role. I rotated off and then I volunteered each year and nobody asked me to do anything. Then I got on some task forces because friends of mine were chairing them. I think when Maggie Madden became President she asked me to chair a task force. Then, I think when Nancy Baker was President, she asked me to be Fellows Committee Chair. The task force runs for two years, so I came to all the meetings for two years and then I was Fellows Chair. I came again, so then I was asked to run for President. That is how it happened. I was actually asked to run for President once before, years before, in 35. Often you get asked to run for President because you're sitting there when they are trying to fill out the ballot, so then if you aren't there they never think of you anymore, then you come back and they ask you again. That's how that happened.

AR: Tell me about your presidential initiatives when you were President.

JC: My presidential initiatives had to do with politics and action. As you can tell from our talk, I'm a doer. I'm politically active. I'm still involved with NOW. I still hold leadership roles all these years later. I like to carry petitions. I brought some stuff with me from the War Resister's League, which I put downstairs, so I'm always doing something like that. I really wanted Division 35 to think more about the fact that they used to be much more activist and now they seem to be more much careerist. That is what I wanted to do. I set up a task force; all presidents' have two or three task forces. One of mine was teaching about socioeconomic class, that was a joint task force with SPSSI because Irene Frieze was president of SPSSI the year I was President of 35 and we decided to do that together. Then I asked Rhoda Unger to chair a task force on feminism and political psychology. Oddly, feminism doesn't have much impact in the field of political psychology and her task force looked into the reasons for that. I can't remember what my other thing was, anyway, so that was what I was interested in.

I wanted to encourage 35 members to speak to the media more. I speak to the media frequently. I'm quoted a lot in women's magazines and often that's the only exposure people are getting to feminism these days. One of the EC meetings that I ran, I had some people from APA come in and do a training about how to speak to the media. I asked all the EC members to forward their CVs to be in APA's data bank. I never did check how many people did that. People seemed to enjoy the workshop and even the people who speak to the media a lot said they got something out of it. I felt good about doing that because it was important I think.

{38:21}

AR: What have been the highs and lows of your media work?

JC: Well, you know, they misquote you and they take your words out of context sometimes. One time a guy called me from USA Today and wanted to talk to me about Miss America. I said, "what a joke, are you kidding?" So, he wrote that in the paper. The interview hadn't started yet. So, you really have to be careful. Another time, Connecticut College arranged for a reporter from the Associated Press to come and talk to me about my work on stereotypes about PMS in the media. The reporter came to my house and took a picture of me surrounded by stuff I had collected and it was a very nice story, actually. It ran in papers all over the country. After that I started to get phone calls from those early morning radio shows where they are clanging bells and laughing and I just let my answering machine pick them up. They would leave messages like, "Hello, Professor Chrisler, we want to talk to you about menstruation." It was really horrible, so those were the lows. I do get hate mail sometimes from people when I speak to the media.

AR: Anti-feminist kind of stuff?

JC: Anti-feminist or… I'm anti-dieting, so sometimes I get letters from people saying that dieting works and you're hurting women by saying it doesn't. Or if I say PMS is a cultural construct, we need to think about what it means, then people write and say, "I'm crippled by PMS, how dare you?"

AR: Right, right.

JC: Not that often, not that many, compared to the number of times I've spoken. I like to talk to the reporters and they are very interested in what I have to say. We have wonderful talks and I feel that I'm doing some good. I did an interview once and I gave ten tips about how mothers could improve their daughter's body image and that was reprinted and it's on a lot of websites. Somebody just told me the other day, "Hey, I saw this on a website," so you can do a lot of good sometimes. The important thing is, if you don't go out there and say, "dieting doesn't work and PMS is cultural construct," nobody else will say it. The reporters are happy to have someone say things like, "maybe you shouldn't take continuous oral contraceptives. They may not be safe for your health," so it's an important role.

{41:12}

AR: Let me at this point get you to elaborate then on your work on PMS and menstrual cycle research in general, coming up with another go at getting PMDD out of the DSM and that type of thing. Can you tell me a little bit about the evolution of that body of research? How you got into PMS specifically?

JC: That was actually what I did my Master's thesis on. I was sitting in a medical library just looking through journals. That was what we did before PsycINFO. You pulled them off the shelf and looked through them and you found many interesting things you weren't looking for. So, I found some articles about premenstrual syndrome, or premenstrual tension and I had never heard of it before. I decided to try to study it. I had some surveys and I gave them out to women of various ages and basically my thesis didn't work out so well because nobody knew what I was talking about. Everybody knew about cramps, but nobody knew about PMS. It just wasn't

something people complained about, it was just unknown. My mother used to say sometimes, "I got up the wrong side of the bed today." Maybe she had a little water retention premenstrually and she was irritable; maybe that's what she meant. Or she could have meant she had too many martinis the night before – it could have been anything. It was just part of the ups and downs of life.

Then, in 1980, there were two trials in Great Britain where women used the defence that they had premenstrual syndrome at the time of their crimes. This was an international sensation. One of my early studies was called, "The Media Construct a Menstrual Monster." I went back and read in magazines and newspapers and read articles about PMS, which exploded from maybe two a year to maybe 32 a year, after that. Everyone was talking about it and everyone thought she had it. Sometimes I tell my students and they are just astonished. They can't believe there was a time when nobody thought they had PMS and now everybody thinks that she does.

The problem is, and I'm not trying to say that there are no changes in your body that you can experience and notice across the menstrual cycle, every woman knows that there are. But the question is, how bothersome do they have to be before you say I have a medical problem? If it's normal, it's not a medical problem. It's just premenstrual changes, or biorhythms, whatever you want to call it. It's not premenstrual syndrome. I have done a lot of writing about women's views of PMS. I've done some theoretical writing about PMS as a culture-bound syndrome. I'm collecting some data right now; we have probably 150 people, at the moment. We are posting on craigslist and asking women to fill out the questionnaire. We are looking at self-silencing and perfectionism as predictors of PMS. It's a very interesting area to study. There is quite a lot to do, but it's amazing to think in the 1970's that nobody knew what it was and now everybody thinks she has it.

AR: A world before PMS. That's the importance of knowing the history.

JC: It's unbelievable. Yes, exactly, as you know.

AR: Talk to me a little bit about the Menstrual Joy work that you are doing.

JC: Oh yes, of course. That was a fun study. Some of the work that I do has to do with attitudes toward menstruation and menopause and I think that you would fit that study into the attitudes arena. What we did was we gave people the Menstrual Attitudes Questionnaire, which is a standard measure. Before they filled out that questionnaire, depending on what group they were in, either they got the *Menstrual Distress Questionnaire*, which is the major questionnaire people use to collect symptom experience. Of course, in the title it says 'menstrual distress,' so generally menstrual cycle researchers white it out – we don't give them the title when they see it, but this time we left it in there. Or we gave them a joke questionnaire that was invented by the authors of *The Curse*, Lupton, Toft, and Delaney, and they made it up just to make fun of the MDQ. They called it the *Menstrual Joy Questionnaire* and I think there are about 10 or 11 symptoms. They are things like elation, concentration, enhanced sexual drive, vitality, creativity, a bunch of things like that. The students, depending upon which one they saw first, they answered the attitude questionnaire differently. If they saw the Distress Questionnaire first, their attitudes were more negative. If they saw the Joy Questionnaire first, their attitudes were more positive. This was an important study because it showed very clearly that social learning influences the way we think about things.

AR: Another big area of work for you has been on body image, eating behaviour, and dieting. Tell me how that developed.

JC: It came together in a number of ways, I suppose. I think about what I do now, if somebody asks me what I work on, I sometimes will say 'women's healthy embodiment' and that covers everything. It covers chronic illness, menstruation, eating disorders and weight, and so on. I taught a course early on, before I was at Connecticut College, and I continued to teach it there, on the Psychology of Eating and Drinking, which again, you can see as a way to combine my interests in physiological and sociocultural issues. That was a really fun course to teach. There is a section on eating disorders, of course, and a section on alcoholism. But most of it is on just the everyday behaviour, how people decided what foods they like and they don't like, cultural influences, and we do some comparative work, looking at different species and how they eat and so on. I was teaching that course, and also for a while I worked with some people at Yale who were running weight loss groups, psychoeducational weight loss groups, and applying psychological principles to help people change their behaviours. It was a 20-week program, sort of 10 weeks of behaviour therapy and then 10 weeks of a more cognitive therapy, changing your attitudes towards things. I did that for a couple of years and I got some expertise in the areas through doing that as well, sort of clinical expertise.

Then, when I went to Connecticut College, it's a private liberal arts school with a lot of privileged students – it's a breeding ground for eating disorders, compulsive exercise, and what we are now calling orthorexics, people who are so health conscious that they are terrified to eat a food that wouldn't be good for them, it's another obsessive compulsive disorder – my students were very interested in those issues and they had very negative attitudes towards their bodies. Negative attitude towards menstruation are not surprisingly correlated with negative body image – you don't like your body, you don't like all parts of it, or many parts of it. So, it was partly my students' interest, partly my own.

When I was doing weight loss groups I came to realize gradually that dieting really doesn't work, and even a very good program, like the one we were running, doesn't necessarily result in much weight loss. It may change people's attitudes and their behaviours so that they exercise more and are aware of what they are eating, so it can help them to be healthier, but it really doesn't help them to lose weight and keep it off. I became very anti-diet and I did a number of writings about not dieting and learning to accept yourself at any weight. Actually, the symposium that I'm speaking at today is about fat affirmative teaching. Well, I'm speaking about fat affirmative teaching about health behaviour.

{50:39}

AR: It seems to be a topic, I mean just from looking through the AWP program and at some other conferences, that it seems to be gaining a bit of momentum.

JC: Yes, we actually have a new caucus at AWP. The newest caucus has to do with body weight. I forgot exactly what they've titled it. I'm sure you can find the meeting in the program.

AR: Yes, I saw a workshop too today.

JC: Yes, I think Esther Rothblum was doing that.

AR: So many things came into my mind when you were talking. I wanted to ask about the behaviour therapy bit, because I saw that on your CV and I wasn't sure how that fit in.

JC: Well, I'll tell you how that fit in. In the 1970's when I was finishing my work, when I was ABD actually – I didn't graduate for a number of years after that, but I was finished my coursework and that was a very bad time to get a good job in academia, so I had had the realization that all I could do was become a professor. I didn't know how I was going to become a professor because there weren't very many jobs. There had been a recession and a lot of places were cutting back, so I thought, "Well, I should get some practical skills." So, I signed up for a program that Long Island University was running. It was supposed to be a Post-Doc, but I was still a Pre-Doc of course, on cognitive behaviour therapy. I think it took a year and half and I had to work with some clients and take a number of courses on relaxation training, assertiveness training, basic operant conditioning, all kinds of things. It was very interesting. It helped my teaching and it helped me get that job I mentioned before with the weight loss, but I realized that I really didn't want to be a therapist, so it helped me in that regard. After I took that program, Ray DiGiuseppe, he was one of my professors in that program, and he was Albert Ellis' right hand man at the Rational-Emotive Therapy Institute, so I actually went over there and applied to get into their program to learn more about how to do RET. He interviewed me and he said to me, "Don't you think you ought to finish your dissertation first before you do a second Post-Doc?" and I said, "Yeah, you are probably right about that."

AR: That's funny, so if it weren't for him saying that, you might have become, who knows?

JC: I don't know. If I hadn't gotten the job at Connecticut College, maybe I would have gone back and tried again.

AR: Were you at all interested in feminist therapy at that point?

JC: I'm not sure I knew what it was at that point. It wasn't talked about very much. FTI [Feminist Therapy Institute] was just finding itself around then. When I did hear about it, my friend Doris Howard, who was very active in AWP for a long time, she went to FTI regularly, said that their meetings were fantastic and they used to sit around in a group and talk and they would teach each other and they had a different topic each time and then they would do a book afterwards, and she loved those meetings. But by the time I was really aware that that would be a great place to go for me, it was too late for me. They had set up these rules that you couldn't go to FTI unless you had X amount of therapy experience, and I wasn't a therapist. So no, I really wasn't aware. I learned about it through AWP and then through reading some of the books that FTI came out with.

AR: Ok, well tell me about Connecticut College at this stage.

JC: I feel very lucky indeed to have landed there, given my checkered past with teaching in all kinds of places and not having any publications when I arrived there. They would never hire me today. They wouldn't even look at me now. And not having a letter of recommendation from any of my professors. What happened was they had a job and I applied for that job and I didn't get it. They chose somebody who had been working there on a one-year visitation. But then suddenly, the department chair, Jane Torrey, who was the founder of AWP, she figured out a way to hire a second person. She was in phased retirement and so was another colleague. So, since she was teaching half-time, she convinced the Dean that two halves could make a whole. She said, "Let's go through our file of people and see if we can find anybody else that would be

good." She was, basically I think, looking for her replacement. She selected me based on what she could tell about my interest in women, because she started Women's Studies at Connecticut College and she was teaching Psychology of Women at that time. So I think it was because of her I was able to get there.

AR: Had you met her at AWP?

JC: No, she wasn't coming at that time. The other person who was there was Phil Goldberg, who did an early study on stereotypes about women. The way he did his study is now known as the Goldberg Paradigm – you provide vignettes of a man and woman and they are all the same, but you change the name and you can see the prejudice when people rate them differently. He actually died in the summer before, so I never got to work with him, but he interviewed me. He was a Fellow of Division 35 because of his work. I think it was Phil and Jane who wanted me and the others just sort of said ok. I don't think they ever expected me to stay there, but when I got there and realized the other guy had a bunch of publications, even though he didn't have his dissertation finished yet, and when after being there for one year we hired someone else who came from Yale and had a lot of publications already, I realized what I had missed in graduate school. I worked very hard, very long hours. Now I've published more than either of them.

AR: I was going to say you've made up for lost time.

JC: Indeed. You know, there were so many stories in those days, too, of women not getting tenure, famous women! Judy Rodin was denied tenure. I mean, there were very famous women who came up against this problem. I had done this feminist work and one of my colleagues said, "you are never going to get tenure if you keep doing that work on the women." So, I had to be better. I had to do more.

AR: So you were conscious of that then?

JC: Very, very conscious.

AR: How did that work out in terms of balancing your domestic life?

{58:07}

JC: I don't have children. If I did have children, I couldn't have worked as many hours as I did, that is just clear. My husband is an attorney and he is very busy and works long hours as well, so he doesn't complain when I do that. He has always been very supportive of my career, except when he quit his job and went to law school at the wrong time. In general, he is very proud of me and encourages me. Even when we didn't have much money, if I needed to buy books, or I needed to go to a conference, he would say, "just charge it," and we would worry about it later. I still work 6 days a week. We spend Saturday together. We try not to do work, unless of course I'm at a conference. He's just good about it, that's all I can say. I don't have a very good work-life balance, I would say. I don't feel that I'm overly stressed and frazzled. Most of the time I feel calm. I feel I have a handle on it. I write lists. I plan out my time so I know what I'm doing. I do spend a lot more time working. I don't really have many hobbies, except reading, listening to music, and travel. So we take a couple vacations a year and we travel and we think and plan. We really enjoy that.

AR: Tell me a little but about your role as a mentor. You've clearly mentored lots of people and won awards, so how did you figure that out.

JC: I'm sure you know the answer already. I didn't have a mentor in my undergraduate and graduate school days. When I realized what I missed, I became angry. In addition to my peer mentors and the women that I met at AWP, I read a number of books about how to succeed in academia and things like that. I wanted to use what I learned and help my students, so that has been a goal of mine, right from the beginning when I first went to Connecticut College. I founded a research group and now all my colleagues have research groups. Undergraduate and Master's students work together with me and we do a lot of projects and we go to conferences and present. I teach them how to prepare a CV and I groom them for graduate school. I keep in the touch with them after they graduate for years; some of them become close friends and collaborators of mine. One of my former students is on the Conference Committee, you might meet her, Barbara Silver, and Ingrid Johnston-Robledo is probably another of my favourites. We still do a lot of work together. That's an important role in my life that I derive a lot of pleasure from it.

I also learned a lot from Florence Denmark. I like to describe her as a collector. She collects people, and she collected me, for example. If she meets somebody that she thinks is talented, she plugs them in and she watches after them. She came to every poster that I did at EPA and APA over the years. She would see my name in the program and just come and look at it, whether she was interested in it or not. So I have collected a lot of early career professionals, and even some of other people's graduate students. I have mentored a lot of people who were not my students. Also on campus I'm known as the person to go to if you are worried about how to present yourself for tenure or promotion.

AR: So you do mentoring of your own colleagues?

JC: Yes, and not just junior faculty either. This is actually kind of funny story, last week I was on campus, even though I'm on sabbatical, and I ran into this woman from the Spanish department that I hadn't seen in several years and she wanted to come and talk to me. She came back later and told me that she had writer's block and she was very depressed about it. I did some therapy with her in my office. I pulled out all my behaviour therapy things that I knew and she was asking me, "How are you so prolific?" She promised me she would spend one week of the two week spring break thinking about a topic for her next book. I'm going to call her on Monday after spring break and see if she did. She left all smiling, she was happy.

AR: That's amazing. Tell me a little bit about the changes you've seen in your students over the past 20, 25 years.

JC: Well, when I first went to Connecticut College, students were still getting engaged in senior year. Now they don't date anymore. I don't know, students are much more sophisticated now a day. They have travelled a lot. They have career plans. That's on the good side, on the bad side, they are entitled. They think they should get an A in every course. I've had students come to my office and yell at me because they got a B+ or an A-, and of course I say, "I have lots of those in my college transcripts." I was happy when I got a B+, but they are not happy – they are mad.

Also, in the early days when I was at Conn, I used to say, students will do anything if you tell them they can put it on their resume. So, they would come to the research group and get very

involved and we would design projects together. Now I have fewer students going to my research group. They only come if they are doing an independent study, or Honours, or Master's thesis. Although I do have one sophomore who wandered in this year and I put her to help a graduate student who is doing a focus group, and she was great. She's really enjoying it, but I used to have a lot more of them than I do now because they are so busy. They have double majors and a minor and a certificate and they are playing two sports – they don't have any time to do things.

AR: What about attitudes towards feminism?

JC: They weren't that feminist when I first went there, so I can't say it's gone downhill. We have some good people in Women's Studies now, so there is a cluster of students who are quite feminist and happy to say so. We also have a quite active LGBTQ group on campus. We find those in our Women's Studies class too. They challenge me in Psych of Women if they think I am getting too heterosexist, so I like that. I like that they are willing to speak up and that they are there. I don't know, Psych of Women classes are getting smaller, even though they weren't feminist in the first place. Fewer students are taking the class and a larger percentage are coming from Women's Studies rather than Psychology, so I don't know really what to think of that. Maybe there are so many other interesting courses that fit in that box for them, since the major is designed in boxes, with one from here, two from there, it could be that. Or it could be that they think I'm too strict.

AR: Do you care to elaborate on the notion that Psych of Women isn't necessarily feminist in some ways? How have you seen that developing over the years?

JC: You mean the course?

AR: Yes, well… and the area of Psych of Women. One of the things that some of my clearly feminist students are finding is that they are taken aback that it distances itself from feminism.

JC: I think that depends on the instructor. I certainly don't. You'll like this as a historian – on the first day of class I start by putting a time line of big events from women's history. I go back to medieval times and renaissance, and I also include 1911 Connecticut College for Women founded because it used to be a women's school. I am explicitly political right from the start. Maybe the textbooks aren't, I don't know. I used to use Unger and Crawford, which I thought was quite feminist, even though it's also densely social psychological, which I liked, but the students found it a challenge. I used Mary Crawford's book last year, which was a lot less dense. I suppose some of the books maybe are not so feminist, maybe Matlin isn't for example, I don't really know.

AR: Maybe it depends on the instructor.

JC: I don't read the books that carefully, I just looked to see what they are covering where so I am more or less on target with what they are doing. I know that at some schools, particularly if there are a lot of conservative or religious students, the faculty deliberately try to tone it down, hoping that the feminist ideas will seep in there without mentioning the word and turning students off. I don't worry very much about that. I think partly the fact that I'm heterosexual and I'm married takes the edge off for some of the students. Plus, I dress in a fairly feminine way, so I don't seem to be too dangerous to them.

AR: Right, subversive.

JC: I used to have a bumper sticker on my car that said 'subvert the dominant paradigm.' I really hated when I had to turn my car in and I lost that sticker.

AR: I noticed you spent a year at the Stone Center?

JC: I spent a semester there. I was urged to come up there by my friend, Nancy Genero who was involved with the Stone Center group, and she is in the psych department at Wellesley, so I went up there. I didn't enjoy it. I thought that I would have more interaction with people if I went up there, but everyone is so busy they don't really have time to sit around and talk in the way that I imagined that we would. In fact, I think I only had lunch with Nancy twice the whole semester. It wasn't really that good for me. I do better at home because my house is quiet, my husband is out, there is no noise. I can really work very well there. I have never tried to go away again, it cost me quite a bit to go and do that and I didn't get much out of it.

AR: Ok, there are a couple of other themes that emerge in your CV. One is an increasing number of international foci. Can you tell me how that has developed?

JC: Sure, I always wanted to travel when I was young. My parents used to take us on vacations regularly, but they were always places you could drive to in the Eastern US, and I longed to go elsewhere. I wanted to go to Europe and I studied French for five years, so I wanted to go someplace where they speak French. The year that I got the job at Connecticut College, that was 1987, that year some AWP members were planning a symposium at the International Congress in Psychology for 1988, which was going to be in Sydney. Doris Howard was one of those**,** Susan Gore was another, and Joan Saks Berman.

My aunt had just died and she left me a little money, I mean, $5000 or something, and I said I want to go. So, I went with them and that was my first international trip. But we didn't just go there. The International Council of Psychologists was having a conference in Singapore and they had a meeting in Bangkok and a meeting in Jakarta in between. Doris and I flew from San Francisco to Bangkok and we were there a few days, then we went to Singapore, and then to Jakarta, and then to Sydney. It was great! Oh my goodness, Thailand is so different from anything we Westerners are used to. It was just wonderful! After that I decided to go an international conference every year if I could. I pretty much have managed to do that. I think I only missed one or two years. I got my husband to go with me. The second ICP I went to was in Halifax. I went by myself to that, but then the next one was in Kyoto and I told him he had to come with, even though he didn't really want to travel. We just loved Japan, so he's all over it now and we go all the time.

Of course, I got involved in the International Council of Psychologists. I've served on the board twice; I ran for President; I was a committee chair; I ran one of their conferences. Then those people are the ones who founded Division 52, so I signed the original petition. I was elected to the board, the first board of Division 52, and I was Membership's Chair, Fellow's Chair, Program's Chair. It seems like every time I join a group I end up playing a leadership role even if I don't want to. The main thing that I got involved in that for was because I really loved travelling and I really loved talking to people from other countries. It's my greatest pleasure.

AR: Great, so that's your biggest indulgence, which isn't the right word, but something that you can really enjoy.

JC: You would say it is an indulgence. Occasionally it's a tax-deductible indulgence. We are going on a safari in Tanzania this summer and that's not tax-deductible. I'm very excited.

AR: Wow, how wonderful! I'm going to skip around now a little bit because I wanted to touch on a number of different things. I wanted to ask you a little bit about any thoughts you have about any inroads that feminists have made in psychology? What are the accomplishments of feminist psychology at this point?

JC: They have made a lot. We've made a lot of inroads. Of course, when I started out in graduate school there were very few women graduate students and now the majority of graduate students are women, so women have really taken over the field. I think that men have been slow to welcome, or step aside, for women in leadership, but that's changing. There still have been very few women presidents of APA, but there are a lot of women in leadership on council, running committees. There are more women editing journals than ever before and we have feminist journals. We have several of them and they are very good. We have founded new journals. We have founded and built a field, which is a very lively field with lots going on and the organizations that contribute to it and run it. I think we've come a long way. It's almost amazing to think about the days where there were almost no courses on the Psychology of Women and where we are today.

AR: Where do you feel that feminist psychology hasn't made enough of an impact? Or maybe it attempted and failed, or hasn't gotten so far?

JC: I guess the only thing I could say about that is the fact that women do back away from calling themselves feminists now. I think that some women, especially those who are trying to assume leadership roles in APA, they would prefer not to be thought of as feminist, even though they are acting in a feminist manner, and living a feminist life, but not using the word so that the old boys won't be too anxious. Go along to get along. That's something that I've never been able to do.

AR: Have you felt that that has been a disadvantage to you, because you didn't do that?

{11:38}

JC: Oh sure.

AR: Do you have any examples?

JC: When I ran for President of ICP for example, there were some people who didn't like me because I was too out there, too outspoken, too feminist. When you are in these international organizations and you have men from cultures where women don't speak much, they think that someone who speaks up the way I do is rude, not feminine, taking their face, making them lose face. They recruited a former APA President to run against me and, of course, he won because his name had a lot more recognition than I did. He did a lot of damage to that organization and they are very sorry now. They have asked me to run so many times since then, but I don't want to anymore. I'm busy with other things, so they lost their opportunity. I had a similar problem when I ran for President of the New England Psychological Association. Some enemies of mine actually called back the ballot and added another candidate for president. This other candidate didn't even belong to the organization at the time, which I knew because I was secretary

treasurer and I had the records. So, they paid for her membership so that she could run, but she didn't win, I won.

I've been active in the American Association of University Professors over the years. I was president of the Connecticut State Chapter for four years, two 2-year terms. I tried to get involved in the national organization and they weren't interested in me at all. The reason for that is that it is very male dominated and they have a true gentleman's tradition of asking people, 'do you want to continue in your role?' and of course they say yes, so they are continuing their roles years after they have retired from faculty. That makes it almost impossible for women to break in. I think for an outspoken woman it's maybe harder.

AR: On that note, when you have students with whom you work and they are interested in feminist psychology and feminist theory and ideas, what advice do you give them in terms of navigating through that in psychology?

JC: I'm not sure that I give them any. Maybe that's wrong, I don't know. I tell them to follow their passion and do what they think is important. I help them to find supportive graduate programs. One of my former students is now doing her doctoral work with Stephanie Shields and that is a wonderful program where she is going to get a degree in Women's Studies and Psychology. I try to hook people up with people so they will be able to do what they would like to follow. I bring them to AWP and get them into networks where they will have support with that. I'm not sure that I know what else to do. Often I deal with sexism by humour and I give a lot of examples in my classes of doing that and I guess that's a way of teaching a technique that people can use.

AR: I'm skipping around a bit, but you've done so much, focusing on your editorial work, and one of the things that stands out is that you were the editor of *Sex Roles* for many years. Can you tell me a little bit about that? Maybe some of the highlights and lowlights.

JC: I mentioned that when I was in high school, I wanted to be a writer. I love to write. I love words and I like editing. I'm a good editor. You'll have to agree because I just edited some of your work. I really enjoy that, but it's very time consuming. *Sex Roles* is a monthly journal, whereas most journals are quarterly, and the work is constant. If I took two weeks off for vacation or something, I would be way behind. It is a lot of work. I did it for five years. They wanted me to renew for another five but I said no because I was exhausted. I miss it, though and that is a great way to do mentoring. For a lot of people who submitted articles to me it was their first manuscript, they were on tenure track, and they needed the help and support. A lot of international papers come in and it's wonderful to mentor people from other countries. I discovered that in many countries they can't get tenure unless they publish in English language journals.

AR: Interesting.

JC: Because their work is not as widely read if they just publish in Czech, or Hebrew, or Spanish. They really have to do this, and their writing is often so bad because their language skills are not up to par and I would literally spend hours essentially rewriting things for people. They are really very grateful and I've made some nice friends that way. That was really very satisfying. Each month when the journal would arrive in the mail, it just felt great. I have them all piled up. I have a set in my office and a set at home. It really was a highlight in my career. I

wanted to be a journal editor for a long time. I feel I was very lucky to get the opportunity to do that.

AR: Do you ever want to do it again? Not necessarily *Sex Roles*, but another journal?

JC: Maybe, if it was a quarterly and after I had some time off. It's hard to find women to do journal editing jobs because of the time it takes. Because of busy family lives they wonder if they would have the time to do it. I know it's a continuing problem, but I do a lot of ad hoc reviewing and I'm a consulting editor for *Sex Roles* and *PWQ*, so I always have manuscripts coming in, so I didn't have to give it up entirely. As you know, I edit books frequently.

AR: Of your publications, your massive list of publications, I don't even know if this is fair question because there are so many to chose from, but are there any that stand out as being particularly meaningful or ones that you are particularly proud of?

JC: Sure, my textbook, my reader, *Lectures on the Psychology of Women*, which I did with Pat Rozee and Carla Golden, which is an idea we got at an IMPs meeting, just hanging around talking. That book is beloved by students all over the country. When I meet people who have used my book, they recognize me because our pictures are in it. That's very nice. Also we won a Distinguished Publication Award from AWP for the first edition. That's a special one. Also, the book I did with Kat Quina and Lynn Collins called, *Arming Athena: Career Strategies for Women in Academe,* that was very meaningful for me because of the lack of mentoring I had early in my career. A lot of people have told me that book was very important to them, that they have read certain chapters over and over again. That's great. In terms of my articles, I think my Presidential Address from Division 35 on fear of losing control is sort of a current favourite. I did an article for the *Annual Review of Sex Research* with Paula Caplan on Dr. Jekyll and Ms. Hyde about PMS and PMDD, and I love that. The Menstrual Joy, of course. The Media Construct a Menstrual Monster. I think those are probably my favourites.

AR: I would venture to say that *Arming Athena* has become a classic.

JC: Would you?

AR: Oh yes, I had heard about it when I was getting into grad school, "Oh you have to read this!"

JC: Oh, great.

AR: I know lately that you have been getting more involved, and perhaps you have been more involved over the years, with SPSSI.

JC: I really just got involved with SPSSI. I've been a Fellow for many years. I served on the Program Committee twice when the Program Chairs were people that I knew, but I had never really done anything with them. I ran for Council recently because Irene and Rhoda were insistent. I didn't expect to get elected, but I'm elected. When I got elected I was told that the incoming President believed that every Council member should be a Committee Chair. You can't just go to the Council meetings twice a year. She gave me the Policy Committee which was dysfunctional. It's been really a lot of fun learning about and figuring out what it could do and where it should go, and then getting staff and getting it going. I've been to the UN twice and I went down to Washington and we are having all these conference calls and it's been...I'm on

sabbatical, I'm not supposed to be working so hard! SPSSI, well it's different. I've only been to one Council meeting, so I can't say too much, but Rhoda Unger always says, "Oh he's a SPSSI type, she's a SPSSI type, you're a SPSSI type," so I couldn't wait to get to Council and find out what a 'SPSSI type' looks like, but I couldn't figure it out. I couldn't really figure it out.

AR; We will have to ask Rhoda exactly what she means by it and maybe we can figure it out. Is there anything at all that I haven't yet asked, either from the list that I gave you, or from rambling around, that you would like to talk about.

JC: I don't know. I think we covered a lot of ground. I made some notes in case I forgot something, but I think we spoke on just about everything.

AR: The one thing I haven't really asked directly, but I think you've given me answers as we've gone along, is just experiencing various forms of discrimination based on gender, you've given me some examples of where that has played out.

JC: I could give you more. I didn't get into some graduate programs because of sex discrimination, I'm sure. I remember going to Brooklyn College to be interviewed for their Experimental Psychology program. The guy was borderline rude to me during the interview and he asked me if I had any carpentry skills. So, I said, "No, I was a Brownie, not a Cub Scout. I didn't build a bird house, but we sang at old people's homes." He said, "Well, if you don't have any carpentry skills, I don't think we can use you." I said, 'I'm sure I can learn anything I need to know." Well, I didn't get in there, so I think it was something they were using. Of course, experimental psychologists sometimes have to build their own equipment, but really, nothing I've done since then has required any carpentry skills. That was kind of a big one.

One time I was asked my views on the Roe v. Wade Supreme Court decision at an interview to teach part time at a college. When I was asked that question my first thought was to say, "And what exactly does that have to do with teaching statistics?" But I knew I would definitely not get the job if I said that, so I had to think and I guess tell him what my opinion is. I did, and he had a sour expression on his face, but I was hired anyway. I think it's hard to find people to teach statistics, so I got the job anyway.

One time I applied for a job as a waitress and they didn't hire me because they only wanted waiters. But they didn't tell me that because that would have been against the law already at that time. My husband went over the next day, I sent him over, and they offered him a job on the spot. He had less experience in restaurants than I did. He wasn't my husband yet, he was my boyfriend, this was during college. Experiences like that were so common in those days. I would sometimes go on my lunch hour from my part time job in New York City and in the pizza place the guys would take care of all the men first and I would storm out, but then I'm starving and I had to go someplace else. These types of micro-aggressions, I guess they would be called today, were very common.

AR: Anything else I haven't covered?

JC: No, I don't think so. It's been interesting.

AR: Good. Let's leave it there.