Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History Project

Interview with Joanne Gallivan

Interviewed by Alexandra Rutherford
Halifax, NS
June 14, 2008

When citing this interview, please use the following citation:

Gallivan, J. (2008, June 14). Interview by A. Rutherford [Video Recording]. Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History and Online Archive Project. Halifax, NS.

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 Joanne Gallivan
Interviewed by Alexandra Rutherford
Halifax, NS
June 14, 2008

JG: Joanne Gallivan, interview participant
AR: Alexandra Rutherford, interviewer

AR: An interview with Joanne Gallivan in Halifax, Nova Scotia on June 14, 2008.

JG: Joanne Gallivan, born June 14, 1953 in Sydney, Nova Scotia.

AR: Ok, great. Well, let me start with a question we often start with. It usually is relevant. Can you tell us a little bit about how your identity as a feminist evolved or developed?

JG: I have to say I was a late bloomer. Although I would have been a teenager in the early '70s [when] there was lots of talk going along and things in the media, but none of it really resonated with me. I wasn't very politically aware. I can really pin point the beginning moments for me in my senior year at university when I was being interviewed for graduate scholarships. Those were my very first experiences. I was being interviewed for one scholarship, a SSHRC [Social Sciences and Humanities Research Council] scholarship in New Brunswick. We were taking a train from Antigonish to Sackville, New Brunswick and there were three nominees from the university; another woman majoring in French, and a man majoring in sociology, and myself from psychology. When we went to those interviews, the other woman got on the train she started talking and made a comment about the possibility that women might not be treated as fairly in this process as men, which was a comment that really shocked me in my naiveté.

I didn't think too much of it. We went to the interviews [and] she was interviewed first. These interviews were supposed to last…whatever the length of time was I don't recall. Anyway, she came out in quite a bit less than the stated length of time and spoke very angrily about her experience. She felt they were dismissive of what she was saying she intended to do and was very angry about it. Then I went into the interview. I didn't have that same sense of dismissiveness, but the questions I found were [odd]. They were asking me things that didn't seem to fit appropriately. There happened to be no psychologists [at] the table, but again, I was too naive and [not] skilled enough or knowledgeable enough to understand how to respond or why the questions didn't feel quite right to me.

AR: Do you remember any of those questions?

{2:42}

JG: Well for example, my interest in those days was largely in the psychology of learning and one guy was asking me a questions [like] "What can you tell me about Piaget's theory?" Well, I had taken one developmental psych course in which Piaget had been mentioned for one class and that was in my second year so I said that I really didn't know this Piaget person. It was vague to me. This person said, "Well you should. He's a great learning theorist." Well, if you took learning in psychology in the 1970s, they weren't and are probably still not going to talk about Piaget, but it was like this guy who wasn't a psychologist [was] saying to me in the interview that I wasn't doing well. I just found that odd. It was things like that. [There was] nothing very direct. Again, my interview didn't last nearly the time that they had specified. I came out and Marcel, the guy, went in after a few minutes and an hour and a half later [he] finally came out talking about what a wonderful interview it had been and what a terrific experience and so on. Of course all the interviewers were male. [The other woman] and I looked at each other and thought wow, this was such a different experience. So that was the first sort of "click" experience for me. Of course, he got the scholarship.

Later that same year (and talk about serendipity) at that time you could only do a bachelor of arts degree in psychology at St. FX [St. Francis Xavier University] and that's what my degree was, although I had started out in science as a mathematician. Nothing like calculus to turn one into a social scientist. But anyway, around that time, [the] psychology department had lobbied very hard to also be able to offer a science degree in psychology which, if they [were to be] successful was going to begin that fall. In order to do that, they had to be made part of the faculty of science or have some status within the faculty of science. Those in the natural sciences, a lot of them had fought this tooth and nail. Strategically, the chair of the department decided that if we had anybody who would be appropriate, they should nominate a psychology student for what was then NRC [National Research Council] and now is NSERC [Natural Sciences and Engineering Research Council of Canada] for their graduate scholarship.

One afternoon I got a phone call because they had talked among the honours supervisors and determined that I would be the person and I was going into learning, supposedly, which was an NSERC field. So I got a call one afternoon saying that the university committee that this goes to has to have this by tomorrow evening (laughs). They were wonderful. They gave me all kinds of help to do the application so I got it in and I ended up being one of the two nominees that was selected for interviews. I don't know how many nominees the university sent in [but] the NSERC committee chose of that number two of us, myself from psychology and a guy from chemistry.

Again we go off on a train [because] they didn't do flights in those days, to Hamilton for the interviews. Again when I went into that interview [it was] all men. This was national and NSERC at that time had two levels of scholarships. One was called the 1967 Science Scholarship [which] had been established in the centennial year. This interview I would have had in 1974 or '75. That was the largest graduate scholarship in Canada at that time in terms of monetary things. Then if you didn't qualify for that, you knew you were going to get the regular NSERC scholarship. That was their procedure at that time so I already knew that I had a scholarship. If SSHRC wouldn't look at me, I'm going to get the

regular [NSERC] scholarship, but I'm also being interviewed for this 1967 Science Scholarship.

{6:46}

So I went in and it was all men. Again, when I think back it was actually a pretty fascinating interview process because they were asking very broad questions, some of which I remember. [For example,] what was my opinion of the bilingualism policy in Canada? What would I suggest would be the ideal undergraduate curriculum? They were very broad questions [and so on]. They also asked more specific questions about what my thesis [was] about, what was my interest in psychology, where did I see my career going, and all these kinds of questions. Again [there were] no psychologists on this body of course. [There was] a chemist, a meteorologist and you know, whatever. In the midst of this really obviously intense interview and asking broad questions, they're taking their turns and this on man looked at me and he said, "So tell me, how will motherhood interfere with your career?" Again in my naiveté [this] just stunned me. In my naiveté I blurted out without thinking, "But it won't." He said, "It won't?" I said, "I've had to work hard to do this, to find the money to come to school as it is, and I can't go to grad school if I don't have money and I've worked hard to do this. Do you think I'm just going to throw it all away if I have a kid?" (laughs). You know, I was this naïve young 21 year old and they sort of laughed and seemed to think that was a fine answer and then it went on from there. But again, it was just that experience of [thinking] why am I being asked this question in the midst of all of these other kinds of questions. So that was the second event and those happened just a few months apart.

The big thing was [that] I then entered graduate school and for a number of reasons I ended up not going into the learning program or division, but cognition.

AR: Right. This was at Waterloo, right?

JG: Waterloo. Yes, and this is the part where you have to wait until I've died to show anybody at Waterloo the tape. It was the experience from hell.

AR: Ok. Tells us a little bit about it.

JG: Five women were admitted to the program. Most years they would admit one or two people because the division was maybe six or seven faculty. It was a very large department so they did everything by divisions.

AR: Ok.

{9:04}

JG: Five women were admitted that year. One woman already had her master's and was coming into the department to do her PhD and the four of us were beginning our master's program. There had been in the history of that program, which probably had existed at

that time for 10 or 15 years, less than a handful of women who had ever gone through it. Over the years I learned that of that small number, a few had not been successful. Again, it was the way we were treated compared to the other students who were mostly male. I think there was one other woman in the program prior to the five of us coming, and in the years subsequent, there was a more even split. In the mid '70s, things were beginning to shift in terms of numbers.

It was a horrible experience in the way that we were treated. Again, it's that unnamed attitudinal thing. It seemed like nothing we did met with their approval and the guys were getting away with murder.

AR: Wow.

JG: But you couldn't put your hand on it. [This was a] a big experience for me because I certainly went into that with very little self confidence and I had been treated great at St. FX. I had great mentors there. There were no women in the department. I only ever had one female faculty as an undergraduate and that was for two weeks in one course. But they were tremendous to me. The whole thing with nominating me for the scholarship and the mentorship I got was great. So to go into that atmosphere, everything was so different and awful, besides dealing with the homesickness and the first year experience and not being able to understand what it was about.

The big thing for me, again with that lack of self confidence in particular, was after eight or nine months, their procedure was [that] you had to do this annual report to describe what you'd accomplished. This was their big basis of evaluation. In those eight months, I had completed four graduate courses. I think one of them was graded on a pass/fail basis and the others were grades. You know, A- and A+ kinds of grades. I had completed the data collection for my master's and put this annual report in where you kind of describe where you are with your thesis and other experiences that might be relevant. Of course they had your transcript experiences. I was called into the office by the chair who said, "You'll get a letter on this, but you're being placed on probation."

AR: Wow.

JG: I was so stunned I didn't even know what to say. I finally said, "Why?" He said, "Because the faculty agreed that you're lazy and you don't care about what you're doing," which is the only explanation I ever got.

AR: Wow. Oh my gosh, how devastating.

JG: You can imagine how devastating [that was]. Well, it turns out all four of us that went into the program that year were placed on probation.

AR: Really?

JG: Four women.

{12:07}

AR: All with the same explanation?

JG: Well no, because we didn't talk to each other because we were all so embarrassed that we were on probation because that was a big deal. A letter went to the dean of graduate studies and the whole business. This was a formal thing. That was a devastating experience.

AR: I was going to ask if you developed any solidarity with the other women, but [I guess] it was more of, "Oh, I'm so embarrassed I won't talk about it." Right.

JG: One of the women, I just had a get together with yesterday because years later we reconnected and bonded over this experience. It took us that long to realize. But she actually had a worse time than I did in that she actually had gotten a failing grade in a stats course. It was a big hurdle. That was because of personal things that had gone on in her life and she had to go through a lot to get them to allow her to do another try at it. Now here we are. We both successfully completed our degrees and both have had fairly successful careers. I'm retiring from the university in two weeks to do other things. She retired at age 50 from the school board as head psychologist from the school board in Toronto and went into private practice. We didn't do too badly for people that were not worthy.

So anyway, that was obviously a huge kind of event for me.

AR: How did you recover from that? How did you negotiate that?

JG: I put my head between my legs and just tried to keep on doing things, although the chair at that time who was giving me the news also said something, [and] I guess it was his attempt to make me feel better, I think he did tell me the other three were on probation and that if I weren't on probation as well it would really make them feel worse or something.

AR: Oh my gosh!

JG: It was a really odd thing. Anyway, what do you do? You've done your courses and passed them and I had this data collected. What more did they want from me? I don't know, because it wasn't clear. Anyway, I kept going and I started writing up the master's thesis and so on and went on and did the rest of my courses. I did a presentation at CPA [Canadian Psychological Association] that summer on my undergraduate thesis work, so I had done a presentation at a conference because I hadn't done that before as an undergraduate. It's not like these days where we have much higher expectations of undergraduates. Anyway, I had done a conference presentation at CPA so I guess that helped. I think by December [which] was their deadline, they lifted the probation, as they did for the others as well.

{15:14}

In the meantime, and what really brought this home for me, I thought maybe that's what it's like. What do I know? That fall, two men entered the program and at the end of the academic year, one of them had two out of four incompletes, had not begun to collect his data and he was not placed on probation.

AR: Wow. Double standard.

JG: So again, it was that attitude. What's going on here? So then, I did not have a happy experience throughout my time at Waterloo. I completed the master's. When I started to do my PhD, I thought about going, but it means [doing] another transition and so on. I did decide to work with an advisor who was not in that division but was in the developmental division because I was essentially doing developmental psycholinguistics. So that gave me a little distance from dealing with those guys. Also there were two women, one who was part-time with the cognition division and part-time with kinesiology because they didn't have a PhD program then, who sort of looked out for me during my time in that division. [She was] kind of one of the people that helped me survive. [There] was another woman in the developmental division, also part-time. There weren't many female faculty. More of them were either cross appointed or part-time. I took a course from [her and she also] became very supportive. I think I credit them with a lot of my staying through to the end and surviving. It was not a happy experience.

Also, only once was I sort of a target but there was sexual harassment there. I didn't experience a lot of that. Again, it was the guy who was chair of the department [that] was the big perpetrator. A couple of years later there was one incident which I just kind of brushed off but some of the other women I know experienced more of that kind of thing. So it was all [part of] that experience.

AR: Tell us, you did your research in developmental psycholinguistics, but as your work evolved, it's clear at least from your CV that you developed an interest in humour and particularly in feminist humour. Tell us about the trajectory of that kind of research and how you went from developmental psycholinguistics and a learning background before that to the work on humour and specifically feminist humour.

JG: When I took my job at Cape Breton University, it was a department of 10 at that time in 1980, and I was the only woman. There had been one woman who had retired a year before and I was the only woman for…I can never remember whether it's 10 or 12 years. Again, without being able to name or understand it, I wasn't feeling very at home although I was going back to where I wanted to live, which was Cape Breton. I wanted to work at that university. Some of the people I was working with I knew because they had taught me, but it was still this feeling of not belonging and so on.

{18:43}

In this [state] of grappling with belonging and so on, I began to notice things happening around this thing called the Section on Women and Psychology [SWAP] emerging. I thought that was kind of interesting and curious. They did a SWAP institute in maybe ’83 or ’84 or something around there that had some title that intrigued me. Completely out of curiosity, I attended this thing having never read anything on the psychology of women or knowing any of these people. I went to that institute and just sat there hearing some stuff and [thinking] it’s interesting that people do research on these kinds of things and so on. I didn’t know a person. I didn’t speak a word from the time I registered until lunch time because I was very shy and I didn’t know anybody and I didn’t know enough about the field to ask questions or whatever.

Anyway, at lunch hour, I met a few people and started talking so they said I should join if [I’m] interested. I had come across a study somewhere, I actually think it was in some of the support materials that they provided for teaching about gender bias, and I did a little study replicating this [because I was] just curious as to how it would turn out about gender bias in student ratings of essays. So that’s the first thing I had ever done of that sort. I joined SWAP and I started reading their newsletters and then joined the division of APA [American Psychological Association] and started reading the psych of women.

AR: That’s when you kind of made that shift.

JG: I started to shift and I did a couple of other things. Not much, but I was just going and becoming interested.

AR: Do you remember who you met at SWAP at that first meeting who encouraged you to join?

JG: Well actually, only one person in particular and the reason was that, as I said, [I knew] not a person there. It would be different now. If I was in a situation like that I would go off and start conversations with people that I wouldn’t then. Lunch was included and so people went off into another room and people were picking their tables and sitting with people. This was in Winnipeg and I quite clearly remember standing there and looking around the room and not knowing what to do. I think I was about 45 seconds from turning around and walking out and just going somewhere to grab a sandwich and coming back for the afternoon sessions when Elinor Ames saw me standing there and said, “Would you like to join us?” Even I, as a cognitive psychologist, but because I knew so many of the developmental people, I knew who Elinor Ames was and I was just awed that this well-known person did this for me.

So she invited me to sit there, introduced herself, asked me who I was and started chatting. Then as people came to the table, she introduced me. I will never forget that. I don’t know whether I ever told Elinor that story or not. I can’t remember. Because I did meet her and get to know her over the years. So that was the turning point. So I met whoever was at the table and then talked more to people in the afternoon and probably Elinor and whoever else was sitting at the table encouraged me. Then of course you start to meet people. Then a woman came to work in Sydney as a clinical psychologist who

also belonged to the section and we actually met socially before. So in 1988 when they were talking about how CPA was going to be in Halifax in '89, she being much more outgoing than I said that there was nobody in Halifax who was volunteering to organize the SWAP institute and so Susan said, "Joanne and I will do it!" (laughs). So it ended up [that] I organized the institute because she kept getting too busy. Once you do something like that, people come and you really get to know everybody. Everyone comes and talks to you. Then I did stints as newsletter editor and so on and so forth.

{22:56}

It was at that same time, I think it was 1988, I read an article in Psych of Women Quarterly by Stillion and White on people's ratings of feminist humour items. I thought, people do research on humour? (laughs). Well, isn't that interesting. Of course, I had a sabbatical so I sort of threw myself into this humour literature and discovered all these writers, and I have some wonderful quotes that I still use in presentations saying that women don't have a good sense of humour and they don't find things as funny as men and all that sort of thing. That certainly didn't jive with my experience. I still say the funniest person in the world that I know is my sister who can make me laugh like no one else can. So I started to get into that literature and that started me doing that literature.

AR: Interesting.

JG: Yeah, and in fact, one of the most interesting things, and again I didn't really understand a lot of the analysis under any of this stuff, but there was one piece of research that I found cited in a number of sources including…there was a wonderful book that came out that I got [which] was my thing [I would use] to look up things when students would ask me questions I didn't know about, *The Oxford Companion to the Mind*, and it was even cited in there in their article on humour. This study proposed to show that the supposed, alleged difference in men's and women's sense of humour was rooted in hemispheric differences. And Waterloo, at that cognition division, is big in dichotic listening, hemispheric differences stuff, though I never knew that. I knew lots about it because there was a lot of work being done there in that time by Phil Bryden and people like that.

Ok, so not only do women not have as good a sense of humour, it's biologically given. Ok. I don't like this. So I then went on a very interesting search to find this study. It's being cited all over the place in everybody's books where they talk about gender and humour and *The Oxford Companion of the Mind*. I find out it's never been published and never been replicated that I can ever find out and yet it has gotten all this attention. Why, I thought. Well, there only can be one reason: because people want to believe this is true, so all these years when they're talking about replication and science and empiricism and all the rest of it, if it says what you want it to say, even if it's just an unpublished study somebody cited once in an article, it's going to take off. I even put an ad in the APA monitor [asking] if anybody knows where I can get a copy. Finally, some years later, somebody that I met at a conference thought they had it and I finally did get a copy of the original article.

{26:05}

AR: Oh, did you?

JG: Yup. But it was never published or replicated so I did what I thought was the fairly obvious thing. I did a dichotic listening experiment which I thought I would never do after avoiding it while at Waterloo. I said I think it has to do with the materials. Who makes up most of the comic materials even today, let alone the mid '70s to late '80s? It's men. So I did two things. I did one study where I used recordings and did the dichotic listening thing. I used a variety of materials and stayed away from things that could be really strongly identified as male or female focus or at least had a mixture of materials that were more contemporary. These were just recordings of, you know, Joan Rivers and Steve Wright who was one of my favourites, and Flip Wilson and people like that. [They were] recordings you could go out and buy. As I suspected, you couldn't find an ear difference.

I then did a second one which was all women's humour and [it had] excerpts that would target topics that would be considered to be more relevant to women [like] menstruation, pregnancy and childbirth and these kinds of things. My hope was that it would have been really nice if you flipped the effect. It was in that direction but it wasn't statistically significant. But at least I had an other thing where there was no difference.

AR: Right. When you start manipulating the materials and the kind of materials…

JG: Yes, exactly. Then I did a replication of Stillion and White's thing and of course theirs and my study shows the same thing: if it's feminist materials, it's the women who find it funnier. [It was] the same with the women's material on the tapes. The ratings of the humour, the women found it funnier than the men, that's true, but you don't get an ear difference. So this ear difference in two different studies with two sets of materials, you just get no difference. So why this guy got the difference with the other things I think probably had more to do with the materials than anything. I even stacked the deck to try to replicate their difference according to why they thought it was occurring, but it just didn't [work out]. So that's how I got into that.

AR: Ok. Well, tell us also about being the one woman in the ten person department at Cape Breton College at that time. How did that go? For instance, were there things like a psych of women class?

JG: No, and there still isn't because if there were, [the person to] teach it would be me, and I just never got around to doing that. I mean, there are other things that I prefer to teach.

AR: Have the demographics changed at all?

{29:02}

JG: Oh, yeah. Oh, you mean within the department?

AR: Yeah.

JG: Yes, we're just about half and half now.

AR: Ok, and what about the students?

JG: We're about 70% across the university. About 70% of our students are women, and that's not atypical. Of course, even back then we always had more women students in our classes and as honour students and so on and that's even more so now.

AR: Can you discern even among your colleagues or students or in the environment, attitudes towards feminism, towards feminist psychology, towards feminist approaches to psychology?

JG: It's really hard to know because we don't have a psychology of women course or such. The other woman (and for a while there were just two of us) is also a feminist and a member of SWAP, but again she has never done the psych of women or those types of courses. She does counselling and clinical courses. I've done cognition, sensation, perception and those kinds of things. So it's not something that's sort of out there. It's really difficult to determine. I still find in our department and among our honours students and of course picking it up from the faculty members, a real negative attitude towards qualitative research, which is one thing that often feminist psychologists are more likely to do for whatever reasons. So that's still there. It's really difficult for me to say.

AR: Right. It's not out there for the profession.

JG: It's not out there. No.

AR: Well tell me a little bit more about methods because you've written on method as well. You've written about Q-Methodology, you've also just written about qualitative and quantitative methods and the relationship between them and the relationship with feminist methods. So how did that evolve in your own kind of thinking?

JG: Going back to the humour research and the notion that these methods I was using, which is what [was ingrained in me] and I'm a very quantitatively oriented person. I started out as a math major and part of what attracted me to psychology when the calculus thing was saying that I don't want to do this, I don't want to do just math for the rest of my life, was two things. One was, when I took my introductory psychology course, because like most people who take it they have an incorrect or totally narrow view of psychology, as I did, and to see that it was scientific in nature, I'm that sort of person. I'm analytical. Then [there were] the mathematical underpinnings to it. My

second year I was taking a statistics course and a computer course so I wasn't away from mathematics entirely and it was that scientific orientation.

{32:05}

Then I was trained in the T scope capital of the world, as it was at that time before computers. These people don't even know what a T scope is. [It's a] tachistoscope. It was a device for presenting stimuli extremely briefly. Now of course you can do it on computers but in those days you used a device called a tachistoscope, a T scope. [So there was] all that hard core quantitative, positivistic kind of approaches and so on. But when I started into this research with humour, you do the study [and] there's an ear difference or there's not or it's materials or it's not, but it wasn't telling me very much. I had this feeling it wasn't telling me very much. So how do I find out something that tells me more about the whys and wherefores?

There was an interesting thing that happened that really opened my eyes to this in that when I replicated the Stillion and White study with the feminist slogans, just out of curiosity I had them printed up on cards and people would go through them and do their ratings. So I had these cards, about a dozen of them, and I just took them around to some of the staff mainly, some women faculty, but women staff and I said I want to show these to you. You'll get a kick out of them. Tell me what your favourite one is. It just struck me as so interesting because most of the staff were somewhat on the younger age, you know secretaries and so on, and they were women who had worked and done their secretarial training or whatever to go to work and many of them were married but they were still working. It was that generation. It was they '80s now. That's the common pattern. Almost all of them picked the same one as their favourite. It's one you might have seen. It's a baby boy and baby girl looking down the front of their diapers and the caption says, "Oh, that explains the difference in our salaries." Yeah, you used to be able to buy t-shirts and stuff. Well that's what they picked, not surprisingly, of all the other kinds of things that they might have picked. But there were two women who picked a different one as their favourite and this one shows a knight on a horse and it says, "Beware your knight in shining armour. You may end up cleaning up after his horse." And that was their favourite. The thing was [that] both of these women had been stay at home mothers and wives until their husbands died at relatively young ages and they had had to go to work or back to work in order to support their families because they still had children at home. That to me was such an interesting observation. Clearly, what these people found funny had more to do with what was relevant to them in their own lives than anything else. That, to me, seems to be so critical to who finds what funny. Right?

So I thought, how do you find out by doing these ratings? So that started me on the search for trying to find ways to understand things more and at that time I read an article by Mary Crawford, I don't remember specifically what the article was on, but she was talking about methodology and she mentioned Q-methodology and that struck me as very interesting. I then searched out Q-methodology and thought it might be a means to understand better what some of these things were.

{35:59}

AR: So you kind of let your interest and your desire to know more about what your current methods were telling you lead you to different kinds of methods.

JG: Exactly.

AR: Neat. Tells us, over the past seven or eight years or maybe more, it looks like you've become quite heavily involved in administration and decanal positions.

JG: Yes.

AR: So tell us a little about how that happened and what your experiences have been [in] becoming a leader in your university and in higher education.

JG: Well, let me go back a bit to tell you about that because I can realize it now. For whatever reason, early on I had a sense that I might be interested in doing administrative kinds of things. I'm an organized person and in academia there are a lot of people who are not who drive me crazy. I thought I probably might like doing and have some skill at the administrative kind of thing. Well the first step, of course, is chair of the department and things were pretty informal back in those days and there was one person who was chair for a very, very, very long time because it was very informal. You would say, "Is anybody else interested in being chair?" Well ok, then, I'll do it.

So at one point at one of these times that he said that, I wanted to say [that] I would like to try a term as chair now. I had been there maybe six or seven years, but I was reluctant to say it and this guy ended up being chair for however many more years before I finally got enough nerve at one of these times to say, "You know what, I might be interested in being chair." Interestingly enough, this led to a discussion among the department members in the beginning of a more formalized procedure in which the chairmanship of the department, it was decided, would go through the department on a rotational basis by seniority.

AR: Interesting.

JG: I was of course the least senior person (laughs).

AR: That sounds like it kind of blindsided you.

JG: It did, yeah.

AR: Where did this come from? Yeah.

JG: So anyway, that was the way it happened. Things went on. So people who had already been chair were not in the loop, so there were a certain number that were not in the loop, so finally my turn to be chair came in 1993 or '94. So I got to do a term as chair,

and they're two year terms. [Mine] ended up lasting not quite two years because…see I have too many interests and I like to do too many different things and I could never be a psychometrist doing the same thing day in and day out, but another opportunity came up to do a different position. I applied for that and got that position so I ended my chairmanship a few months early or something.

{39:31}

So that was the first experience. I actually quite enjoyed doing the department administration and I felt I did a reasonably good job. There had been some issues around scheduling that people [would say] a certain person has always done that in that timeslot and it's going to cause a big fuss if you do that. I went to them and I ironed out some scheduling problems and it made me feel like I can do this sort of thing.

So then I did the other job and whatever and then I got somewhat more involved with things here so I didn't look to go back to doing administrative things. My involvement with SWAP led some people to suggest I accept a nomination to run for the CPA board so I served on the CPA board for three years. [That] takes us to, and I always forget whether this was 2000 or 2001 that I was finished up, but in I think it was 2001, the vice president came to me because the dean of the position they called dean of research and library services had taken a job elsewhere. The vice president came to me and said she had talked to the president and would I consider taking that deanship on an acting basis for about a year. So that's how I ended up back doing some administrative things. It turned out I ended up serving five years in that position.

AR: Did you ever feel like it was an issue that you were a woman in those kinds of positions?

JG: Well, it always is an issue, though at the time when I first took that job the president of the university and the vice president were women. In what we called the senior management group, the split was about half and half, so it was a very unique situation. That was the atmosphere at the time so it was a positive thing and I found it a very satisfying position and I do feel I accomplished a lot particularly in those first few years. I worked very well with the vice president to whom I reported directly and with the president. Then that president ended up resigning. There was an interim president with whom I worked very well. He was already a member of senior management and I still work very well with [him]. Eventually the vice president also left. So we ended up with a new president and vice president, both male.

In a very short time, one way or another, the senior management group changed in its nature and so now out of the group of I think 12, 13, or 14 (it varies as changes happen and reorganization and actually I think it may be larger now) there were three women left when I left the position of dean of research so now there are two. So there's been a real change. I ran into a lot of difficulties in that latter part and in fact I resigned early. It's that whole atmosphere. Again, nothing blatant and the president and the vice president

was someone who came in later, I never did get to know him terribly well, but I know the president has a lot of respect for me.

{43:23}

But there were a lot of things that happened that were sort of inappropriate and decisions that were made which, as the dean of research I was excluded from, and other things where there was back room stuff happening and it was inappropriate. So eventually I just said I wanted to resign early. So I wasn't treated in the same way. People can talk about how things have changed but when you get that kind of environment people are used to working in that way and I simply refused to play games, in a way. There were certain things that I was asked to do that I refused to do. So I didn't play ball and things didn't go nearly as well in the last few years. That's still out there. I think this whole thing about more women in administration is never going to turn very dramatically until we understand that men are still being socialized in those position to behave certain ways and use certain tactics that fewer women are comfortable with or are socialized to do, so they're not going to be successful and they're not going to be happy doing it. I'll never do administration again. I had my time with it and I accomplished some things and I'm retiring now so the things that I'll be doing will be different kinds of things. I won't do university administration. I don't care how many phone calls and emails and letters I get from these head hunting firms because once you're in administration in Canada, because it's hard to find people, you'll have no trouble getting lots of opportunities to apply for other jobs. It's amazing. That was never my aim.

AR: Right, but there you were. Could you tell us a little bit about your time on the CPA board and what kinds of issues arose when you were serving, how those were dealt with and your perceptions of the board while you were involved?

JG: It was, overall, a very good experience. I learned a tremendous amount and got to meet lots of people. It was a terrific experience, but a lot of work. In my view, the board is too hands on. That's when you have staff and members that are drawn for committees, but anyway. I've been telling people I think I will run for the presidency this coming year and one of my aims is to try to get the board to move away from having so much hands on involvement. It's just too much work and it's harder to keep your focus on the vision and policy stuff which is what the role of the board should be.

AR: Oh, that's great! Yeah.

JG: We'll see what happens.

AR: We were just talking about Jean Pettifor yesterday and she was president in '94 or '95, somewhere around there and there's been a long period of no women presidents.

JG: Well Catherine Lee is coming in.

AR: Catherine Lee just got elected, yes.

{46:21}

JG: Was Jean the last? No, I think Cannie Adamec…

AR: I think she was before. She wasn't before Jean? I think she was.

JG: Really?

AR: I think so. Don't quote me on that.

JG: We had this discussion yesterday and we couldn't figure out who was the last one prior to Catherine coming in this year. I didn't realize it was that long.

AR: It might have been…don't quote me on that, but I think it was Jean. So that's great, I'm so glad to hear that.

JG: Well, we'll see what happens. In terms of the gender stuff, it rarely came up in obvious kinds of ways. The Status of Women Committee is no longer the standing committee of the board and that happened during my time there.

AR: Ok, tell us a little bit about that. I've read a little bit about that. The story was (and maybe it was true, I'm not trying to insinuate that it wasn't) was that it was budgetary.

JG: I don't recall that because what happened was there was a reorganization which included changes in what were standing committees, and so on, so it was part of a whole package.

AR: Ok, so it was the Status of Women Committee and this had been the one that was started basically back in '75?

JG: After the underground symposium, yeah.

AR: And so it was basically dissolved in the late '90s or mid to late '90s.

JG: Yeah, it would have been late '90s.

AR: Any resistance to that?

JG: There was very little, and it was very hard to argue against it. In its place, SWAP sort of took over the Status of Women function. They have a committee within SWAP and there was also a position created which I know still exists of a liaison from the board to SWAP. That was kind of done instead. I have to admit that I'm not very politically astute or good at arguing sort of a philosophical base for why you keep those things. I'm not a Sandra Pyke or someone like that. Anyway, it sort of happens. To me, there was a veiled underpinning. One person on the board sort of led the charge of anti affirmative action.

He tried on several occasions to have it changed that there would be seats designated on the basis of gender and language community as embedded in the bylaws.

{48:51}

My sense was that that was directed largely at women and francophones. He's one of those people. He said this at one point which infuriated one of the members at the time who was both a SWAP member and a francophone and I think held a designated francophone seat. It was the old anti affirmative action argument. You're not getting the best people. You're going to get deadwood if you do these designations. As I said, I think that was largely directed at women and francophones.

AR: Did that policy get changed as a result?

JG: No (laughs). It certainly didn't and he made various attempts to do so and he kept trying to find ways to do it and I do very clearly recall the last attempt because tempers became very heated and I got a finger wagged in my face. He came up with a wording of it that was non-specific, so some generally worded thing but it was clear to me that the intent was to get rid of that. There should be geographical distribution. We should guarantee representation of women and Francophones, MA level psychologists, and so on. I was very proud of myself because I pinned him right from the moment the motion was moved because we knew there was going to be another attempt made. I said, "The way this is worded, I think what you're saying is the organizational board should stay away from specifying groups or constituencies that nominees for seats must come from." He said that that's correct and I said, "So then I'm also correct to say that if that's the correct interpretation of whatever this wording is, I certainly don't remember, that we will not longer have seats designated for scientist practitioners," and he had to say yes. Of course, other people on the board do not want to see that because they feel that that's been successful in keeping all groups included within CPA. So that was the basis on which it was possible to get the majority of people, even if they sided with him without saying so on the specific targets, to say, "Oh my god we can't pass this motion."

AR: I guess that's good and bad, eh? Too bad it had to be done that way, but anyway.

JG: Yeah, because earlier on, when it was more specific people felt they couldn't have voted for it either because they would have been accused of discriminating against women and francophones. So this generalized language attempt to get around it was too broad sweeping. So that was his last attempt. He left the board and he hasn't been back on the board since.

AR: Oh goodness (laughs).

JG: It's interesting.

{51:59}

AR: Let me ask you now some more general questions that sort of require you to share your reflections and opinions and perceptions with us. What do you think has been the major contribution or major accomplishment of feminist psychology? What have feminists brought to psychology that wouldn't have happened without their influence?

JG: There are a number of things. I think the range of research questions that are considered legitimate have outlets. Look at *Psych of Women Quarterly* and *Feminism & Psychology* and the work that gets published there. The last time which is not really recent that I looked at the acceptance rates for the APA journals, *Psychology of Women*'s was the lowest. They had the highest rejection rate.

AR: It's hard to get published.

JG: It's hard to get published in there, so obviously there's tons of great research and it's in a journal that is widely valued and recognized. The same with *Hypatia* [for] philosophy and *Feminism & Psychology* out of the United Kingdom. So you know the old arguments [that say] it's not quality work and so on, forget it. Some people will tell stories of wanting to do research on topics of relevance to women and being told by supervisors they can't do it. Well not only is that not happening so much any more, but there are lots of faculty members that are doing research on women and they're trying to attract not only women but men and women becoming interested in those topics. So the expansion of the acceptability of those kinds of research topics I think is one clear thing.

I think how much different my life would have been had I gone through psychology in an atmosphere in which I find now where students are more likely to find good mentors (I had good mentors as an undergraduate but not as a graduate) who are not going to have those attitudes, who are open to their areas of interest and areas of interest students can identify with and so on. I can't even begin to imagine. When I meet some of my colleagues now and their students and seeing them interact with their students and looking at the work their students are doing and the posters that just came from the poster session and thinking oh my gosh, what an atmosphere it would have been for that! That's just a sea change. Just a sea change.

I think in the discipline more generally I think feminism and feminist psychologists have been a huge part of what I see as a really positive and wonderful increase of diversity within the discipline within all levels. You see this much more frequently, the interest in ethnic minority aspects of psychology, disabilities and so on and so forth. I mean, it's just so diverse. If you came to a CPA convention in even 1988, let alone 1978, you would have seen very few persons of colour, disabled persons and so on, let alone research on those areas. You see it now and it's much more diverse. I think feminists had a lot to do with that. The other thing I think is the methodology thing. Psychology departments, not mine but many psychology departments, are now offering courses in qualitative research and some of them will still laugh in your face if you say that, but there are some places that you never would have gotten that in the door. Qualitative or alternative methodologies [are seen] in honours theses even, using qualitative methods. That kind of thing.

{56:03}

It was hard when I did my PhD which I completed in 1980, I had a little bit of a tough road to haul in doing an interview study. Although it was all quantitative analysis (you know you did your categories and counted them up and did t-tests, right?) and even that was a little in the pail. Had I not had a developmental supervisor I don't know if I would have gotten away with it at all, but I certainly had cognitive people on my committee and I was part of the cognitive division, my PhD was in cognitive psychology. But it was a little, you know…it was totally quantitative analysis of interview data.

AR: It's clear that there have been some incredible changes. What do you see as the future of feminist psychology? What are the challenges in the future? What remains to be done?

JG: Oh gosh, if I knew that (laughs).

AR: If you look into your crystal ball.

JG: I don't know. I guess it's like they used to say in the old days about social psychology: if you do things right you put yourself out of business. You dream for the day when there's no such thing as feminist psychology or cross-cultural psychology or whatever because we will be so open and broad in our view point that we won't make those distinctions. I mean, that's the ideal world, pie in the sky sort of thing. As people used to say, if social psychologists do their jobs right, there will be no more social psychology. You know? So I don't know what to say in more specific terms.

AR: A question that we often ask and haven't really touched too much in the course of this interview on this topic, so I'll ask it sort of out of the blue. How have you, over the course of your career, managed to negotiate and navigate personal demands in your life and professional demands? Sort of the work-life balance.

JG: I actually haven't done that badly, I have to say. Number one because I didn't have children, so I never had that demand and when I was married kind of centuries ago I was in a marriage with someone with whom we shared responsibilities quite equally. So when you have someone with whom you can do that, that makes a huge difference. And I think partly I don't know the extent to which I really got a good balance between work and life because I think that certainly in certain segments of my career, I probably spent too much time with work. Not to say that I shouldn't have. That's a large part of your identity. At times when I was spending that much time doing those things, a lot of it was my own choice. That's a tricky thing to say, the work-life balance.

AR: It means different things to different people.

{59:32}

JG: Yeah, and in the last few years I have to say, because of situations and so on, I haven't devoted nearly as much time to work as I once did and a lot more to life because my personal circumstances have changed. I have a partner who is incredibly supportive of work and all the rest of it and encouraging, but who has also become disabled to some extent. So there's been more and more focus on having to do more to support her and more in terms of responsibility with health. But that's been ok. Also, family demands with aging parents and so on, so there came a time, you'll note in my CV, a time at which I was acting dean of science as well as dean of research.

AR: Yes, I saw that overlapped. I thought, holy cow!

JG: Well, not only that, but before the overlap ended in July of 2005, my parents both became ill and there was this everyday at the hospital thing. They both died that year. The saving grace was that the payback for doing the double duty for that year was that at the end of July I then had a three month leave. Then when I got out of administration, because of that and my partner's health becoming deteriorated, I never went back to working really as hard as I had on work previous to my career. I managed to stave off the potential guilt about that most of the time. I kept saying I'm getting paid back for the time when I wasn't getting compensated nearly as much as I should have for all the work I was doing.

I know people who talk about how do you negotiate it. I think I've done reasonably well. How have I done it? It's really hard to say. I think one part of it is that I was able to go and live in the place where I wanted to live. I always wanted to go back to Cape Breton. It's a wonderful place to live, and I knew that after living in Southern Ontario for five year that was not the kind of place that I wanted to live. Don't take this [the wrong way] (laughs). It was not the place I wanted to live.

AR: It's ok.

JG: So being in the place where you want to live and where you have family and you're part of the community in a way you're not in a place you haven't got that attachment to [is important].

AR: Yeah, feeling supported.

JG: I've done different things over the years in terms of being able to get away totally from work. My latest one over the last four years is [that] I'm part of a percussion group which didn't start out that way, but it's turned out to be all middle aged women and we perform gigs and have fun with it. Once a week during the public school year, we get together and practice and we sometimes get to play gigs and do things together. For many years, I was part of a bowling league. I'll tell you, I was the only university professor in a bowling league because that's not what many of those people do, but I did. I had fun with that and that was a different group of people. Sunday night I went and never thought about it. You went and laughed and had fun. It was a recreational fun kind of league. So I

would do things like that. You know, there was always things that I had that were totally removed from work.

{1:03:01}

AR: What advice would you give to students entering psychology now who are feminist and who want to pursue that in their life as psychologists?

JG: You have to do what you think is right for you. I always say that there's only one person you have to interact with every day of your life, and that's you. Some of the things I did, I paid a price for. Often I didn't know I was going to. It was sheer naiveté, and other times it didn't matter because I was going to do it anyway. You pay a price for that, but at the end of the day it's worth it. I have to say, I'm getting lots of rewards now. I earned full professorship, I have a lot of respect amongst colleagues, I've done CPA stuff, I've had a good career. And some of those SOB's and all the rest of it, you know, as their life went on they didn't necessarily have such great lives and been happy with where they ended up in their lives. I feel sorry for them for that. It's like, I can say I got a pretty good life and I'm happy with what I've done in my life and I'm happier now than I've ever been in my life.

Yeah, there were times that were tough when some of that stuff happened and I realized things had happened to me. For one thing, now that I'm about to retire, I missed out on a number of years of the pension plan simply because I didn't have information. The guys always talk about these things and tell each other. I probably could have gotten tenure my first promotion earlier, but because I was first there on term positions I thought I had to wait until the tenure track contract went to the automatic review. Well you don't have to do that. You can ask. Nobody told me that. You know, the guys talk to each other and they advise each other and those things make a difference. But so be it. You can't let yourself get twisted in knots over that because on the other hand some of the things I did brought me recognition or great pleasure. I got to work on things that were interesting to me. If anybody else didn't think so, well I've had a satisfying career.

AR: Is there anything that we haven't asked about in the course of the interview, either personally or professionally, that you would like to contribute to have on tape?

JG: This is like a job interview. They always ask that and I usually have something in mind, but I don't for this.

AR: Anything that we've missed?

JG: The only thing that pops into my mind is another anecdote from those earlier years that I didn't think to include. When I was interviewed for my job at what was the College of Cape Breton then, now Cape Breton University, as part of the procedure I went around and spoke individually with some members of the department. This is another one of the anecdotes that I usually tell but I forgot. In our environment, an infamous member of the department was asking questions like where do you see your career in five years, in 10

years, in 25 years. As we were wrapping up he said to me, “How is a woman like you going to find a suitable man in Cape Breton?” (laughs). Again, in my naiveté, I said I already had which was a reason I wanted to come back here. He was a person that said many disturbing things to our female students and sometimes in class had sexual harassment or sexual discrimination complaints against him, one of which I had to handle when I was chair. But he respected me very much but it was the exception that proves the rule sort of thing. It was this back handed thing, like well, how is a woman like you going to find a suitable man in Cape Breton and it was actually him more than any other member in the department who would clue me into things like applying for promotion before automatic review and so on. I find that very interesting, that he often had very positive things to say to me. It was clear that in his eyes, I was the exception that proved the rule.

AR: Ok, well let’s stop there.