Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History Project

Interview with Kay Deaux

Interviewed by Alexandra Rutherford
New Orleans, LA
June 24, 2010

©Psychology's Feminist Voices, 2010

When citing this interview, please use the following citation:

Deaux, K. (2010, June 24). Interview by A. Rutherford [Video Recording]. Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History and Online Archive Project. New Orleans, LA.

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

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

©Psychology's Feminist Voices, 2010

Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History Project
Interview with Kay Deaux
Interviewed by Alexandra Rutherford
New Orleans, LA
June 24, 2010

KD: Kay Deaux, Interview Participant
AR: Alexandra Rutherford, Interviewer

©Psychology's Feminist Voices, 2010

AR – This is an oral history interview conducted on Thursday, June 24th, 2010, in New Orleans, Louisiana. The interviewer is Alexandra Rutherford. The interview participant is Kay Deaux. Ok! If you could just state your full name, place, and date of birth for the record.

KD – Kay Deaux. I was born in Warren, Ohio on November 4th, 1941.

{0:33}

AR – Great! Great! Well, Kay, as I mentioned to you, part of this project has to do with – well there are a number of different objectives – but one of the things I've been really interested in is asking psychologists who self-identify as feminist to tell me about the relationship between their feminism and psychology. So, one of the ways I get into that is by asking people to tell me little bit about the evolution of their feminist identity. So, we can start there.

KD – Ok, to the extent that I can identify that I will try…

AR – Sure.

KD – Some of the things evolve and really, it's hard to say, the magic moment when you said, "Aha! I am a feminist." And I think that's probably true, well I don't… maybe it's not true for everybody, but certainly the folks that grew up in about the era I did, when feminism wasn't quite in the air yet. In my case, I grew up in sort of a conservative suburb where it was very homogenous. There weren't people of color; there weren't people of Jewishness; or there weren't people of a lot of things; it was very homogenous. So, it wasn't a political household by any means at all. So, where do you start? Where do you move from that to something that's more awareness as a feminist? And I think, given the time – I'm in high school in the late 50's and I go to college in 1959 at Northwestern – I think, for me, there were a lot of 'isms that I had to become aware of along the way because they weren't indoctrinated or taught to me in any way, I don't think, before that. So, probably, awareness of things like racism and inequality based on color of skin and those kinds of issues I know those came to mind first. I think that was sort of the awareness of otherness that first came into play.
{02:22}

AR – Do you remember any specific instance even around that that would stand out?

KD – I think it was just certain people that I started associating with, some friends I was hanging around with; some people in theatre and someone who was a philosophy graduate student and they were talking [about] those kinds of ideas and it all struck me as, you know, "Oh where was I all this time? Why didn't I think about these kinds of things?"

So, you know, gradually I think that happened, but I don't think gender was part of the equation. I mean nobody talked about those kinds of things. There were no women in the psych faculty at Northwestern at the time and there were no courses in gender. So, that came later. I think that came probably…. You know, I was down in Texas for graduate school and certainly, it was beginning to come up, but still not very much. I mean, I think if I had lived on the east or the west coast, particularly the east coast, probably the awareness would have been faster in some respects than stuck in the middle of Texas. Not stuck – I have many good experiences of Texas.

AR – Right, Yeah.

KD – Although, if you look at my research, you can see I was doing some very traditional things, like in attitude change, latitude of acceptance, but I started measuring masculinity and femininity instead of traditional attitudes. Then I did my dissertation on attitude change and the issue – I mean, social psychologists don't care what the attitude is particularly when they study attitude change and it's just, you know, "Find an issue and we'll see how the processes work" – but my issue, and this was my dissertation work, was whether women should be drafted into the military. So, clearly I was thinking along these lines. This was the time of the Vietnam War and men were being drafted. I don't think there was any talk of women being drafted at the time, but it seemed an interesting issue.

Although I remember one of my committee members said, "Well, why can't you find [something] more relevant? That's not a very important issue, you know? You could study something like, should grades in the university be lower or some…?" you know, some trivial university kind of issue. I was stubborn enough for whatever reason. I still don't think I would have self-identified as a feminist, but I was stubborn enough that, "This is an important issue and that's the issue that I am going to use."

So, it is probably really after I got my PhD and I started to teach and the feminist movement was now becoming much more a large-scale thing. It was much more in the public domain at this point and I think that's when I really started doing it. Certainly that's when I started doing research on these issues. You know, I was a couple years out of graduate school and attitude change stuff just seemed kind of boring to me and I really was saying, "Look at all these things that are happening related to women," and, "Can't I use my research skills and my social psychological theory to do something that's relevant to this stuff that's going on now?"

{05:12}

AR – Right.

KD – And that's when I really began to do research in gender, which then I did for years and years and years.

AR – So, your interest in issues of sex and gender really came through your work as a psychologist and your awareness that this was becoming an issue, socially, politically and so on. That's how it kind of fit together?

©Psychology's Feminist Voices 2010

KD – I think so, yeah. I think that would be.

AR – Well, what attracted you to psychology to begin with?

KD – Oh, I don't know. When I went to the university, I was majoring in math for the first quarter of my time there and I first took a course in calculus and I decided this really wasn't what I wanted to do. I mean, I kind of liked to play with numbers, but I didn't want to do serious mathematical theorizing. Then I shifted to French and I had ideas of doing I don't know what, sort of vague, but then my professors said you should do the junior year abroad if you were going to do that. My parents were certainly not paying for junior abroad and so then I took my first psychology course at the end of my sophomore year and I thought it was great. I just found it fascinating and that was it. Off I went and took psychology and that was it.

AR – Tell me a little bit about your…

KD – Although I also minored in sociology – so this sort of dual thing that you can still see in my career today was there from the beginning – because the sociology people looked at real issues. You know, they looked at race relations, for example. And I took a course from a wonderful sociologist named Raymond Mack**,** who taught a course on race relations, whereas psychology was not terribly relevant to the world at that point. I was doing a job with Benton Underwood, running memory drums for short term learning kinds of experiments to get some money, but that was the kind of thing that psychologists were more likely to be doing then.

{07:00}

AR – So, at that time, you were able to discern that sociologists seemed to be touching on real world problems and psychologists seemed to be working in the laboratory and on more basic stuff and maybe there'd be a way to kind of bring these things together, or…

KD – I think so. I mean, there was a wonderful social psychologist, but there was just one at Northwestern, that was Don Campbell. Don Campbell didn't do research in this sort of standard way. He didn't do experiments and he thought big thoughts and he thought big theories and things. He was wonderfully inspiring, but he didn't give a sense for an undergraduate of how you would go about putting these ideas into practice. I mean, they said, at the time, you had to be a Post Doc before you could really understand what Don Campbell was talking about some of the time.

AR – Right right.

KD – Although there was a book on obtrusive measures, which you may be familiar with, and I did work with Campbell one summer on that project. I did some of the library search and I wrote a draft for one of the first chapters. So, that, I think, was also engaging me because that was all about looking outside of laboratories for ways that you can assess human behavior and that intrigued me as well.

{08:13}

AR – Oh, neat, neat…Well, tell me a little about your doctoral training. I couldn't discern from your CV who your supervisor was or if that was the even the way it worked.

©Psychology's Feminist Voices, 2010

KD – Ah, well, if I can, I'll just do a little backtracking of how I got there. I finished undergraduate school and I was in the honors seminar, but women going to graduate [school], even if you were in the honors seminar, just didn't seem to be the thing that they expected women to do. In fact, the professor who directed the honors thing, the honors program, said he wouldn't admit women to graduate school and they shouldn't be there because, you know, the standard story: The faculty are going to spend this time and invest this energy and then the women students are going to go off to have a baby and get married, you know, that kind of thing. So, I was in a bit a quandary about what exactly to do. I knew I wanted to go on doing research in some way. I knew I wanted to study people. I don't know why I would think I could be a university professor because I hadn't seen any women as university professors in psychology, except that Janet Spence had been there before I was there. So, I had heard about Janet. She was sort of the ghost that walked the halls, but was no longer there. So, maybe that, some place in my brain, said that it is possible for a woman to do this. Anyway, what did I do? I decided, and nobody abused me of this, that the only way to study people with research was to go to social work school and get a doctorate in social work. So, that's what I did.

AR – Ok, that's gender appropriate, I suppose?

KD – Yeah! That's what they thought and everybody said, "Oh good choice Kay! That's a good idea!" So, off I went to Colombia to do a social work degree. It was a two-year program for a master's and then I was going to go on and do a doctorate, although I didn't really know very much about it.

{10:11}

But it was clear the first semester I was there that this was not a good choice. I mean, it wasn't…I wanted to do research and, even though this was an honors section of Colombia and they were trying to really upgrade it in some ways, it clearly wasn't the kind of research program that I wanted to do. But I liked New York at that point in time – an early taste of what has come to be my identity as a New Yorker at this point. I wanted to stay in New York, so I decided I would go get a master's at Brooklyn College and then find out about getting into PhD programs that I might have done if I'd gone straight there. At Brooklyn College, this is a very long answer to your question, but at Brooklyn College there was a man named James Bieri, who had at one point taught at Colombia's social work school and some people knew him. And he offered me a research fellowship for the year at Brooklyn College and I thought, "Well, great! Now, I've got my way paid there and I can get a master's and then I'll go."

So, this is now my second year in New York, but at the end of the first year within this program, my second in New York, he took a job as head of the clinical program at the University of Texas and he said, "Kay! Why don't you come to Texas?" Well (laughs), in the meantime, Hal Proshansky, who you may have heard of – he was *the* social psychologist at Brooklyn College – I'd gotten to know Hal. I'd actually applied for an NIMH Predoctoral Fellowship with both James Bieri and Hal Proshansky as my cosponsors and I'd gotten it. So, at this point, I'm in the end of my first year and I have gotten an NIMH fellowship, which, you know, will pay my way most any place, and Bieri says, "Come to Texas!" I am thinking, "Well, hmm, I don't know anything about Texas, but that sounds like it could be interesting." And I actually called up Don Campbell and I said "Ok Don, I'm going to go to graduate school in social psychology." He'd been kind of missing from the scene when I graduated and wasn't involved in the whole advice process of where to go. And so, he said, "Well, you know…" Obviously Stanford and Duke

©Psychology's Feminist Voices, 2010

were the places that were really good social psych schools at that time and he said, "Well Texas is, you know, new and it's developing this new program. It's hiring all these good people. You'll probably get more attention there than you'd get at some of these other places, so if it sounds interesting to you, go do it." So, off I went to Texas!

AR – Wow!

KD – Now, James Bieri was, on record, my major advisor. I was only actually there two years. I got my PhD at the end of two years there, but I was in the social program because I didn't want to be in the clinical program. I wanted to be in the social program, so it was always a little odd and I, in some sense, didn't have a mentor. Now some people think it was Janet Spence.

AR. Right, oh because… yeah, yeah…

KD – But it wasn't. Janet wasn't even in the psych department at the time. She was over in ed psych because of nepotism rules because her husband Kenneth Spence was in the psych department. The psych department, in fact, like many departments at that time, had no women in it at all.

{13:00}

AR – Right, right.

KD – So, it was a big department, all men, so I kind of just…

AR – Let me get you to reflect on that. You've spoken about being the only woman both in your undergraduate and now in your graduate program, other than the kind of shadowy presence of Janet Spence and all of this. Was that a consciousness you had at the time, do you think? And, if so, what effect did it have on you?

KD – I don't know. I've tried to think back on that. I actually don't spend a lot of time thinking back on things, but I have wondered, I mean, at some level below conscious awareness, it had to be there, I think. And certainly when people like, you know, the faculty at my undergraduate school said, "We don't want women in the department." (Laughs). And they didn't hire another woman at that department for, like, 10-15 years after Janet left, so she was really an aberration in that sense. I don't honestly know. I mean, it seems odd that I would think that I could go be a PhD and an academic, which is what I was gearing myself toward, when I hadn't seen women in the departments of psychology doing it. So I just wondered, how could I have been sort of blind or naïve or unthinking about some of these issues?

Now, there were women in graduate programs, at least at Texas, so it wasn't that women weren't studying there. And I knew of Janet because, in fact, I was married at that time to, what turned out to be, Kenneth Spence's last student. So, I knew of Janet and I knew she was a professional and maybe that, you know, again, had an influence. And, of course, they may not be in the main departments, but [women] can be active professionals. It was clear she was and she was already an established figure in her own right. So, I think in some, but still pretty non-conscious way for me, that created a sense of possibilities, the sense that this wasn't a ridiculous thing to be doing.

©Psychology's Feminist Voices, 2010

AR – Other than the experience you had of being told that women weren't suitable for grad school, can you think of any other experiences you may have had of sexist remarks or being treated in stereotypical ways, for example?

{15:19}

KD – In school or even later?

AR – Yeah, even later, yeah.

KD – Certainly, yes. My first job was as an assistant professor at Wright State University and I was married, at the time, to someone named Edward Deaux, from whence my name comes, and we, in fact, had gone out on the market together and that wasn't easy at that time for a lot of reasons. First of all, there weren't APA Monitor kinds of ads. It was all old boys network still and talking on the phone. And because I considered myself a social psychologist, but my major advisor was not a social psychologist, he didn't have the network for the kinds of places I might want to go.

{16:06}

In my husband at that time's case, his major advisor was no longer living, so he didn't have the connections. So we were really kind of struggling on our own. We got an interview at Wayne State. In fact, we were both interviewed and we didn't get the job and I, at the time, just thought nothing of it. However, I've learned since then (laughs), you know, many years later – first of all, Alice Eagly had been interviewed the year before and didn't get the job – and I learned many years later from someone who had been on the faculty then, that that faculty wasn't going to hire a woman. They simply weren't going to hire a woman. They may be bringing them in for interviews to please somebody, but they had no intention of hiring a woman. So they said no to Alice one year and they said no to me the next year and there they are.

AR – Boy, this game sucks (Laughs).

KD – (Laughs)… But we did get these two jobs; he got a job at Antioch and I got a job at Wright State University, which was still, officially, a branch of Ohio State University, at that time. By the time I arrived, it was a full-fledged, independent, standing-on-its-own university, you know, very small at the beginning kind of thing. I got hired there and one thing that I found out, probably two years after I got hired there – I knew what my salary was, of course, but there was another fellow who had been hired, also from the University of Texas, graduated at the same time that I did, fewer publications, and no reason to think that he would have been hired because he was a stronger case than mine – but I found out I was hired at something like 2000 dollars less than he was.

I started inquiring as to why this was with the department chair. Well, it turns out that Antioch has a lower pay scale, had a lower scale in general, and probably still does. Antioch doesn't even exist in the same form anymore, but had a lower pay scale than Wright State University and so the chairs of the two departments got together and decided that my salary should be adjusted downward because it wouldn't be appropriate for a woman to be getting more than her husband, or, at least, not a whole a lot more! They couldn't adjust it down too much because the pay scales really were quite different. So they docked me like 2000 dollars below what this other person got

©Psychology's Feminist Voices, 2010

hired at or what I should've gotten hired at because of their assumptions about what spouses should be and the role a relationship should be. So, that was a clear one.

AR – Right, right, oh, how interesting!

KD – And I remember even when I resigned from that place to go accept a job at Purdue, the president of the university wrote me a letter saying, "Dear Mrs. Deaux, so sorry you're going to leave…" or something. By this time my feminist hackles (laughs) were up and running..

AR – Yeah.

{18.48}

KD – So, I wrote this letter saying that you wouldn't say, "Dear Mr. Deaux or Mr. Anybody" when they resign. "You know I am a professor and you should say, 'Dear Professor Deaux.'" He never answered the letter, but that one didn't have the same consequences as several thousands dollars over two or three years…

AR – Right, exactly! Oh gosh! Interesting…Well, let me ask you then, you spent, I think, in total, 17 years at Purdue, so a bulk of your career.

KD – A chunk of time…

AR – Can you tell me about the trajectory of your research as you moved into this extended period at Purdue and kind of explain how it developed at that point?

KD – Yeah, well, that's certainly where I really became a feminist researcher, I think. I was at Wright State for three years and so, like most people, I was still trying do something following up what my dissertation was, but the attitude models just weren't very interesting to me, as I said, so I was beginning to look at what I could say about gender kind of things. I'd started to do a little bit there and when I got to Purdue, it was clear that's what I was interested in and I didn't really want to do anything else but that. Now, I remember also that one of my colleagues, who was very well meaning, but said, "Kay, this is not the way to a successful career. If you want to do this gender stuff, maybe do it on the side. Do a little second line of research, but you have really got to have something much more mainstream if you are going to expect to get promoted or tenured." I think (laughs), you know, it seems silly to do research you are not interested in and it seems silly not to do research that you are interested in. I mean it makes no sense to do it in either way, I don't think.

I was very fortunate, I think, in that the department chair, James Naylor, was very supportive. It was not because he was particularly supportive of gender issues, he didn't know much about them and certainly wouldn't call himself a feminist, but he really believed in doing good work and so his attitude toward me was, "If you do good work, if you get it published in *JPSP* or whatever, I don't care what you are studying, gender, anything is fine." And he really totally supported me the entire time I was there and he was chair for a good, say, that first probably 10 years I was there. So he was very supportive, you know? I got good raises. He even got some of his consciousness raised I think! I remember one time he was telling me that someone wanted to do a study of sex differences in, I can't remember, engineers, aviators, or something like that and they had come to him to ask if there was anyone in this department who could study this kind of

©Psychology's Feminist Voices, 2010

issue. He suggested me because the interest was in sex differences of some sort and the guy said, “But she is a woman. I mean, she is going to be biased on this issue.” (Laughs)

AR – (Laughs)

{21:55}

KD – And the chair defended that. The original source never followed through on the project, but the chair did defend me as being no more biased than the man who was going to be doing this study of sex differences. So, he was really good and I think that is so important. Some people were just lucky, like me, to be in a place where those interests could get encouraged and other people, equally or more talented, would end up in places where there wasn't that kind of encouragement. So there is always this sort of dumb luck factor, I think, in careers, not always, but an awful lot of dumb luck factors in careers. I was really fortunate in that case to do it. So, I just merrily went ahead doing my gender related research and finding it fascinating and…

AR – Well, let me ask you, I mean, you have an incredible body of work, but one of the studies that, of course, has almost become a classic – I hope you are not uncomfortable with being made into a classic already – is the Deaux and Emswiller paper of 1974. Can you tell…

KD – Actually, that was designated as a citation classic, you know, some place in the 80's or something, so I've gotten used to it. (Laughs)

AR – Ok, oh, well, there you go! (Laughs) So you are comfortable!

KD – I wasn't used to it, you know, at that point in time. Then I'd really be a classic – only in my 30's or something like that… (Laughs)

AR – Ok, no problem then. So, tell me little bit about the evolution of that study. How did it come to be? Did that lead to subsequent work? Or why do you think, of all of your work, it's a citation classic?

{23:22}

KD – Yeah, sometimes it's cited without even mentioning it's a study of mine (laughs)…

AR – Yeah, it's become something on its own. Yeah, yeah!

KD – It's sort of in the air, you know? Everybody knows this now.

It's always hard, I mean, we were talking about going back a lot of years to where I got this idea for a study and I think it's often hard to pinpoint that moment, just like it's hard to pinpoint when I became a feminist. But, certainly I'd done a couple studies just demonstrating that women weren't…I think the first studies, to backtrack a bit, but the first study I sort of consciously did saying that gender makes a difference was basically a replication of a study that Aronson and his colleagues had done in Texas which was the study, *To Err is Humanizing*, I think, was the subtitle on it. It was a typical two-by-two kind of experimental social psychology study and you had high competent people or low competent people and someone spilled a cup of coffee or…

{24:33}

©Psychology's Feminist Voices, 2010

AR – So was that pratfall effect kind of stuff?

KD – Yes, yes, exactly. So, the main finding was that if you have a high competent person and he spills the cup of coffee, he becomes even more human because you like him, he isn't perfect. And, you know, I looked at the study and it was male subjects and male experimenters and male targets and the whole thing was male! And it was one of those things where you look at a study and it just doesn't feel right somehow. It just doesn't jive with something in your experience for this to happen. And I thought, "Well, what if a woman spilled the coffee? I can't believe she would be liked more if she spilled the coffee. It would just be an excuse for her to be a klutz and you could dismiss her!" So, we simply replicated the study with male and female targets and male and female judges and, indeed, the only time that you get that sort of pratfall effect was when men were judging men. When men judge women or women judge men, it didn't happen at all.

One of the things that's interesting about that, *that's* the study where Janet Spence first became interested in gender as well. She did it a little differently and came at it a little differently, but it was that same study that triggered her interest in studying gender and looking at how competent women are evaluated, which is interesting how we both triggered off that same thing. Now, we both had been at Texas when the study was coming out. So, I think it was sort of an accessibility kind of factor, but in any event…

AR – Right, right.

KD – So I have done that kind of thing, but I think the Deaux and Emswiller was theoretically more important. I thought "Well, you know, social psychology loves theory and has a lot of good theories. Fritz Heider has wonderful theories about attribution and explanations. Let's see how this might work…" because it's not just that men and women are judged differently for the same kind of performance, but people think… and attribution theory was very popular at that time and one of the reasons that it is interesting is because people make these explanations and those explanations then have consequences for the next set of events or expectations about what people will do and so they've got future ramifications. So, I basically said, "Let's see what that kind of Heider theory would do if we'd apply it to gender."

There was some writing in Heider that made it seem perfect. I mean, it wasn't a real big leap for me to make the theoretical prediction that ability attributions would be higher to explain the men's success and that women's success should have to find some other more temporary kinds of reasons. From the Heider framework, it was just a, sort of, automatic set of predictions. So we decided to do it and Tim Emswiller was an undergraduate, at that time, a very energetic, very smart, young undergraduate and he was very enthusiastic about…He was a feminist, I think, (Laughs) a very early feminist himself. An undergraduate in Lafayette, Indiana in the early 70's, undergraduate male is not so common to have, being a feminist, but he was a very good fellow and the two of us did this study and there it was.

{27:26}

AR – Wow, that's pretty impressive, yeah.

KD – I think one of the interesting things is that it keeps replicating. I mean, people are still replicating it today, which is so depressing. I mean you would think 30 years later that maybe

©Psychology's Feminist Voices 2010

people are not going to make those same sorts of attributional patterns, but unfortunately, the most recent stuff I have seen, I don't know how recent now, but it still does get replicated.

AR – Right right. Well, I have a couple of questions. Pick one and come back to the other. Right around this time – so that was '74 when it was published and so you are starting of your career at Purdue, well, you've done some other stuff – second wave feminism is making waves in psychology, too, at this point. So we've got, in '69, the Association of Women in Psychology and, in '73, Division 35 of the APA, did you have any relationship to those developments within organized psychology at that point?

KD – I certainly wasn't involved, I don't think, in the founding of any of them because I wasn't particularly involved in sort of national APA kinds of organizations. I probably was, I don't know for sure, but I certainly was a very early member of Division 35, but I don't know if I was the very first class or not, but it would have been very close to that. What I was doing, though, locally, was helping start a women's studies program at Purdue. So, Irene Diamond, who was a political scientist, and I and a few other people really laid down the groundwork and got a women's studies program into the curriculum at Purdue and got courses in psych of women and other courses.

AR – How was that process? I've heard many different stories from many different women who have done this in their universities and they seemed to have met with different kinds of experiences trying to get that going.

KD – Well, it was…I don't really remember, you know, again, I don't remember all the details, but it wasn't easy. We did get some funding from the Dean's Office to do it because I remember we brought in Florence Howe as a consultant about the program very early on. That was after it actually had gotten started or when we were still thinking of starting it… I think probably when we were still thinking of starting it. So somebody was giving some money to fund it and there was a core, probably half a dozen of us all together, that were pretty persistent. We were, I think, at the time, probably all assistant professors or very close to it. Now, in fact, Irene Diamond who was certainly one of the major forces there, didn't get tenure. And, you know, we fought it and we did suits, and we, you know, went in line on it, but it didn't get reversed and she didn't get tenure. So, she left Purdue shortly after that. So, it was positive in that the program got founded and it still exists certainly, but for her, it was one of those costly things. I don't know that it, in itself, cost her – I'm not suggesting that, but it was not a positive experience that after that all was well and she was highly regarded.

©Psychology's Feminist Voices, 2010

AR – This was a period, of course, in which psychology of women courses were just getting started too. It was still pretty early. What was the feeling of your department towards having psychology of women? At that point it would have been psych of women, not psych of gender…

KD – You know, I honestly don't remember. There are some times (Laughs) I [don't know] how these things don't have more of a certain impression there, but I just sort of muddle along sometimes. I don't bother to register things. (Laughs)

AR – No, well it may not have been salient. I just thought I would bring it up because it's something that pops up in every once in a while in these interviews, "I was trying to get that course going," or what the reactions were…

{31:26}

KD – Yeah, yeah, by that time, I guess, things were rolling along enough. I mean, it was shortly after that I wrote, *The Behavior of Women and Men*. In fact, I think that right after I got tenure, that was my first project, really, to write this book, when I could take the time not to be doing the empirical studies and getting the journal articles out. That was *such* fun to do and so that came out. And I don't know, we're still in the 70's… anyway, then we hired Alice Eagly when I was, I guess, head of the program and head of the search committee for that. That was probably late 70's or early 80s because I left Purdue in '87 and Alice was certainly there.

AR – Ah, I didn't know Alice was at Purdue.

KD – Yeah, yeah

AR – Ok, ok. So you overlapped about 5 or 6 years.

KD – I think probably 4 or 5 years. Check hers and my vitae on that.

AR – I have interviewed her, I just have to check. (Laughs)

KD – (Laughs)

AR – Well, interesting. The other question I wanted to come back to is this and it's a general question, not specific to this period in your career, but can I get some of your thoughts on method in psychology. I mean, a lot of your work has been experimental. And, of course, you refer to this period in social psychology where attitude research was so prominent and some of the real classic experimental stuff that I think of social psych classics that have to do with attitudes and other things were happening and a lot of this was experimental work. So can you tell me a little bit about your training in method, how you have approached doing social psychological research and your attitude, how you see laboratory experimentation playing a role and how that connects with social issues and that kind of thing?

{32:59}

KD – Yeah, I mean certainly all my training, my formal training, such as it was… it was a little haphazard when you think about it. I mean, a year in social work school, a year in Brooklyn College with Hal Proshansky, who was always, you know, fighting the fight that social psychologists should get out of the lab and not do this and he was founding environmental psychology and stuff. So, you know, those ideas sort of settled in my head at some point. I went to Texas and that was straight experimental social psychology. Aronson was the big figure in social psychology. Dissonance was the big theory. Everybody did experiments on dissonance theory kinds of things, which I never did exactly, but certainly the only methodology I was taught was experimental methodology.

Maybe it's fortunate that I wasn't there very long because I didn't get, you know, totally socialized into that and was still a little looser. Jim Bieri, actually, he also did experiments, so it wasn't that. And I'd worked with him and had him for a year at Brooklyn College doing experiments of some sort. So, really, that's how I learned how to do it. I think, though, the messages of Hal Proshansky always were up there some place. And then, as I said, I'd also minored in sociology as an undergraduate and that piece has never gone away. It's actually very

©Psychology's Feminist Voices, 2010

interesting how it has evolved over the years, so that, I am a member of ASA now; I have written in *Social Psychology Quarterly*; I was just at a conference last spring where they were specifically trying to talk about sociology and psychology, versions of social psychology and how they interact with each other. So, I've always been a kind of card-carrying sociologist as well, which leaves me open to a lot of methods. So, I think I'm open to a lot of different kinds of methodology.

I'm still, as you point out, more of a numbers and experimental person, but I think I've always been interested in connecting whatever I'm doing experimentally into what's happening there. And, for example, one project that I did when I was at Purdue, which was looking at women in the steel mill, which is a real favorite of mine. I did it with a person in the business school who approached me about getting involved in this project and it was a real policy-oriented starting point. There had been a consent decree signed between the steel industry and the government to get women into the blue collar jobs in the steel industry because those were high paying jobs and they are ones that pay a whole lot more than women get as secretaries or waitresses or things like that. So the question was, "How's the policy working? Are women doing the job? Are people accepting them in the job? Do they want to stay in the job?," etcetera. This was a real open-ended project in the sense of how we could find it out and, certainly, there were no experiments involved in this. So, it was interviews; it was observations; it was just chatting with the managers, chatting with the corporate officers, chatting with the women themselves, reading documents, looking at archives of whatever they had kept about attendance or stuff, which was very little, actually, but we tried. So, that was a real open-ended project. And again, you know, that was fairly early in my career. I mean, we are still in the 70's at this point in time. So I think that sort of let me feel comfortable with using a variety of kinds of research methods, a variety of methods to ask questions that are interesting.

©Psychology's Feminist Voices, 2010

{36:38}

AR – Yeah, absolutely, absolutely. Well, let me ask then about your transition to back to New York. I think that happens after yeah your…

KD – '87, I think.

AR – '87, yeah, yeah, yeah. So what brought you to New York?

KD – Well. Love and marriage and job, I guess. (Laughs)

AR – (Laughs) Ok, ok, great, great. That sounds like a good story! (Laughs)

KD – When I went to Purdue in the first place I figured I'd stay there maybe three or four years. I'd been at Wright State for three years. The marriage in graduate school did not last at all, so it was a very short lived marriage and, once that was no longer reason to be at Wright State, then I wanted to go to a department that had graduate students, that had more research funding etcetera, etcetera, and get a better job, so to speak. So, you know, I was on the market and I got the job at Purdue and I moved there. And I thought I'd be there for three or four years because I just didn't envision myself – I grew up in the Midwest, but I really wasn't a Midwesterner at heart, I didn't want to stay in the Midwest the rest of my life and I didn't want to stay in a small town in Indiana the rest of my life. So I thought I'd go there for three or four years, get some good research support, get research done, get a record, and then I could go to some other places that might be in areas of the country that I liked better. I actually sort of joked that one of the reasons

that I became fairly well known fairly early is because I didn't like living in Lafayette so much. If someone would say "Kay, would you be on the committee? It meets in Washington." Or, "Kay! Would you go to this meeting in San Francisco?" or something and I'd say, "Sure!" So I frequently traveled out of Lafayette.

Around the mid 80's, I really wanted to get serious about getting out of Lafayette and at one of these meetings – I was on the publication and communication board of APA – I had met Sam Glucksberg, who is now my husband, to get to the end of the story before, who was representing the council of editors at that meeting. So we had sort of gotten to know each other. And then we actually started dating, long distance for a year between Princeton and Purdue, which is not a particularly easy commute because neither of them have airports nearby and whatever. But we did that and it seemed like, "Well, this is sort of nice!" (Laughs) Then he was going to the Center for Advanced Studies the next year, '86 to '87, out in Palo Alto, where I'd been, actually, a few years before. We decided that might be a nice opportunity to see what we really wanted before anybody made a drastic move about leaving their job or deciding where to go, to see if this would be a relationship that we wanted to continue. So we both spent the year '86 -'87 at the Center for Advanced Studies and then we decided, "Well, ok! This is good. So we'll find a place to live together."

And that's then when we sort of looked at jobs. You know, there were a number of opportunities. The options were: I got a job in East Coast. Sam got a job in Lafayette, or we both got a job some place else. Sam getting a job in Lafayette was actually probably the easiest one we could accomplish, but it was the least desirable one for both of us. So, fortunately, I got a job at the Graduate Center at CUNY and that solved all the problems. So, in the fall of '87, I moved to New York. I took the job at CUNY Graduate Center. I married Sam. We got an apartment in New York and that's where it all is still.

AR – Well, you know, the other thing that's going on at this time, I think, is that you are starting to get involved, in the late 80's, with the Price Waterhouse versus Hopkins brief, the Amicus, the brief that APA put together.

KD – Right.

AR – Can you tell me – I read a little bit about that in preparation for this interview – can you tell me how you got involved in that and what the experience was like?

KD – Yeah, that was really interesting. I mean, the original work on that case at the lower court level was with Susan Fiske as an expert witness. [She] had been working with Sarah Burns, a lawyer who was doing a lot of litigation in the gender area, and they, together, came up with the idea that here was this work that was being done [at the time] on stereotyping and categorization that could be reasonably applied to understanding cases of discrimination. And so, when the Hopkins case came up, Susan was first called as an expert witness in that case. And then, as you know, the case went forward, Hopkins won. Price Waterhouse kept taking it forward and eventually it ended up at the Supreme Court.

At that point, APA decided that it wanted to get in the case as a friend of the court to do an amicus brief. And so they pulled together a group, basically. Don Bersoff was at the lawyer for APA at that time. Susan was there and they brought in three or four others of us who had been doing, for years in some cases, research on gender. So [it was] Gene Borgida at Minnesota, Madeleine Heilman at NYU, and myself. I think that was it. So the three of us, plus Susan, plus

©Psychology's Feminist Voices, 2010

Don Bersoff, plus the other lawyer, and I think a couple of other people were there and it went up. A group of us got together basically for just a day, I think. We just did brainstorming and figuring out what the literature was and trying to structure what an argument would look like and what literature supported those kinds of arguments. From there emerged then the amicus brief, which really pulled together decades, at this point, of research, certainly decades of research on stereotyping and a good fifteen years, probably, of research on gender stereotypes too, a lot of that laboratory, but not all of it laboratory, to show that, yes, this is the kind of thing that happens. These are the psychological processes that go on. People do discriminate against women, even if they don't think they are doing it and even if they, presumably, control such issues. I think we presented quite a convincing case, so that case then went to the Supreme Court, and Hopkins won in that case.

{44:00}

Actually, it was fascinating because I went to hear the arguments at the Supreme Court. It's amazing to watch those things if you haven't been to one because each lawyer gets a half an hour, but the first lawyer will get about three words out of their mouth sometimes, or at most a sentence, before they start getting peppered with questions from the Justices. It's fascinating to watch. And, at that point, you weren't – I think it may have changed – at that point you weren't allowed to take notes either. So there I am trying to [take notes]. I want to take notes for this historic event that I am going to. And, you know, a clerk or somebody comes over to me and says, "No, no notes." (Laughs) But yeah, there have been many cases, obviously, after that, that have used that kind of logic to do it. I actually did some expert witness work, myself, maybe 6 or 8 cases. I suppose that…

©Psychology's Feminist Voices, 2010

AR – And how were those experiences?

KD – Well, you know, they are very interesting and they varied because the whole procedure varies. Sometimes things get settled before it goes to a trial. Sometimes it goes all the way to the Supreme Court, as Jensvold against NIH did, which was one I did, which was both discrimination and sexual harassment. That had a very bizarre and unfortunate outcome where, basically, the jury decided in her favor, but the judge decided to only award her one dollar or something like that. Yes, it was a terrible thing and, you know, her career was nowhere after that. But, in other cases, it's at a much more local level. That was the only other one that I worked with that went to a Supreme Court level, but sometimes you are speaking to a jury, sometimes you are just speaking to a judge… there are issues of whether your testimonies are going to be allowed, whether you have special knowledge or not. So, they take a lot of different forms and, of course, the lawyers are different. Some lawyers are much more savvy about social science data than others. Generally, I would say they were positive experiences and I think, more often than not, the cases won, but not always. They take a lot of time.

AR – Yeah.

KD – They are very time consuming because, often, you are reading huge amounts of documentation and depositions and things of that sort, so it can become a career in itself if you wanted it to be. It has tapered off, in my own experience, because I am not doing gender research as much as I am doing immigration research these days. But also I think that line of argumentation has probably played out in a sense and cases of gender discrimination, my impression is, they are not being brought to trial very often. They are expensive for the people who are doing them and they aren't always successful so…

AR – Right. So, they are being settled out of court or not brought.

KD – Not brought, yeah.

{47:13}

AR – Well, you know, there was a bit of a back and forth in the *American Psychologist* after an article that you all wrote about the case and so on. Can you tell me a little bit about that how that affected you, kind of describe it?

KD – The rebuttals and things? Oh, it's a funny business this, you know? Given our legal system, which is an adversarial one, which has opponents, the psychologists also get called into being on one side or the other. And, you know, it's always seemed to me that it would be preferable to have a judge bring in an expert witness who would be neutral and not identified with either the plaintiff or the defendant, but that's not the way our legal system works at this point in time. So you often have opposing experts and, as social science data has gotten involved in the courts more often, you more often have cases of there is a group of psychologists on this side and here are some on the other side. I mean, the Wal-Mart case that's been going on now is a clear case of that. They've got a lot of psychologists on both sides of this issue. This is more on implicit stereotyping and IAT kinds of stuff. So, you get social science experts on one side and you get social science experts on the other side. Often people are identified more with one side than the other, either by their own disposition because they want to be on that side, or because the data say that that's the side that they are going to argue for and the data, as they interpret them, don't speak for the other side's argument. I mean, I would find that hard to, you know, frankly to use this stereotyping data that we have to argue or defend corporations or defend managers who are doing these things. I don't see that the data particularly fits the evidence. But there are people that are clearly identified with one side or the other.

In the case of this argumentation that went on, there was primarily one person, as I recall, who was writing the articles, questioning, or criticizing the basis of evidence that we were using and he was someone who typically was on the other side of our arguments. He also was someone who wasn't actively involved in research, certainly wasn't a social psychologist. I think his field was industrial organizational. He wasn't actively involved in research, but he was one person who was frequently hired by the corporate side in these kinds of cases. So, it was to his advantage to question the basis of our argument in terms of his own career.

AR – Right, right.

KD – Not so kindly, but those kinds of things can happen. There are mixed motives in these things.

AR – Sure, sure. Well, let me ask you then, go back to what you alluded to earlier, this shift into doing research on immigration. Can you tell me about how that shift occurred and what got you interested in immigration and what that looks like?

KD – Yeah, actually the sort of middle piece, one of the pieces in gender that was sort of a key piece for me in terms of both defining a perspective and also maybe making a

©Psychology's Feminist Voices 2010

{50:51}

transition point, was the paper that Brenda Major and I did for *Psychological Review*, where we talked about putting gender in context. In that [paper] we brought in a lot of research literature on gender, a lot of social psychological research, which wasn't necessarily gender, to try to develop a framework as an alternative to saying, "There are stable sex differences." We were trying to portray and present an analysis that showed that whether men and women differ in certain situations is really context dependant and that there are a lot of factors that will push men and women towards acting differently. [It's] not only because of dispositions, but often expectations or the situational demands, expectations of the other people you are interacting with. Also, with those same sets of factors, if they were lined up differently, you could have no sex differences. Much of the research, the sex difference literature, as you and I both know, it's a long and messy literature. So, our attempt there was to really try to show how you can't just say, "Are men and women different?," but *it depends* really has to be an answer, and *it depends on what* was what the purpose of this paper was.

In doing that, one of the things that we suggested was that gender is an important identity for many people and it's an important category that other people use to apply to us, but it's not the only identity that people have. People have other identities and, in some situations, they may be most conscious of their gender and then, in other cases, say, they may be more conscious of their ethnicity or their religion or their occupation whatever else depending, again, on a lot of situational and contextual factors. And that then got me thinking, "Well, what are all these other identities that I sort of alluded to and said are out there?" So, I began to really get interested in just studying social identity categories as a more generic kind of issue.

Now, at the same time, so this paper comes out – this is like the mid to late 80's, the '86 -'87 year that I have mentioned when I was at the Center for Advanced Studies. I was a part of a working group that was about six or seven people, half of which were psychologists and half of which were sociologists, my two-footed camp that I keep. And we met every week and thought about writing a book – the book never happened – on issues of self, identity, and affect. So I spent a whole year thinking about identity issues, both from psychological terms, people like Tory Higgins were in the group, and from sociological terms, Shel Stryker and Roberta Simmons and a group of folks like that. So I'd spent this whole year thinking about issues of identity and trying to think what that meant for my own research issues. Then, I moved to New York. Now, if you are in New York, (Laughs) ethnic identity is certainly something you think of!

There were a couple of early studies, one of my favourites was Kathleen Ethier's master's thesis essentially, which was a look at students of Hispanic descent who were in Ivy League colleges and how they negotiated their ethnic identity in a context where ethnicity such as Latino ethnicity was not a predominant feature of the environment. These were homogenous upper class, for the most part, white colleges where these Latino kids come. So, she and I did this project that was a longitudinal study of ethnic identity over the course of the first year in college.

Then, as I continued to be interested in issues of ethnic identity, I am suddenly realizing that what I am talking about is immigration, in a sense, because New York has any ethnicity that you might think of and it just got to the whole idea of immigration. I realized that there was a whole literature on immigration that had nothing to do with psychology, for the most part, but that I ought to get familiar with to some extent if I was going to study ethnic identity. So I just became increasingly interested in immigration and started reading of all this literature. I mean it's, again, my inclination to start drifting over to these other areas of social science, so I started reading all

©Psychology's Feminist Voices, 2010

this literature from sociology, anthropology, and political science, etcetera on immigration. And, as it turns out, there is a wonderful group of scholars of immigration at the Graduate Center, in sociology primarily, but in the other disciplines too. So they were there as resources and also just to kind of give me a sense of what this field is all about. So I just got very involved in it and intrigued by it.

I realized that psychology was simply silent mostly. I mean, there is some psychology work, more often it tended to be clinical work dealing with the presumed stress of immigration, which sometimes is stressful and sometimes, maybe, isn't so stressful, but there wasn't really much other work. I remember seeing this handbook of immigration research that came out in the 90's, I guess, probably about 1999, at this point. And it was a huge handbook. It had like fifty or sixty chapters and it had every discipline you can imagine in the social sciences, you know, economics, anthropology, sociology, etcetera, and not a single chapter in psychology, which struck me as really quite inappropriate because it seems to me so many, you know, intriguing and important psychological issues in immigration. So, at that point, I sort of made it my charge to inject psychology into these immigration discussions and to, at the same time, get immigration on the table for social psychologists and other psychologists because so many of the issues, whether it's identity and ethnicity, whether it's inter-group contact, I mean, whether it's attitudes, they all have a great deal to do with immigration and they are often just assumed by these other disciplines. I mean, they'll take their perspective and then sort of wave their hand at what motivation or attitude might be, without any data to speak of. So, it seemed to me that the time was right for those two kinds of things to come together.

©Psychology's Feminist Voices, 2010

AR – Right, there was a big hole there that needed to be filled, yeah.

KD – Yeah.

AR – Wade, did you have any questions about that because I know immigration is something…Ok, alright.

I am trying to be aware of time and I want to make sure we get to SPSSI, but I just have a couple more questions that I want to make sure to ask. One is a question that came out of something you said earlier, about how a lot of your research has been basically, well, I don't want to put words in your mouth, but it appears a lot of your work on gender has tried to complicate this crude sex differences paradigm, men are different than women, by introducing how people think about men and women in different contexts and so on and so forth. Looking at the field now, the field of whatever you want to call it, psychology of gender, psychology of women, or feminist psychology, and we could talk about the differences among those, but just looking at it generally, what is your assessment of where we are at now in terms of that field? Have we moved beyond sex differences? Have we complicated it? What are the challenges here or successes?

KD – Well, it's interesting you ask that because Monica Biernat and I are currently writing a chapter on the history of gender and social psychology. You know, the 20th century, basically, which is a huge challenge. And in a limited number of pages it becomes totally impossible to complicate or to appropriately represent the complexity and the extent of work that has been done. I mean, you know, it's really quite remarkable how much work has been done in the last thirty years on gender. I mean, you know yourself, you've tried also to get a hold of this kind of body of work and it's very hard. And I think we've made some major advances. I mean, I think, again, you mentioned the Price Waterhouse case, but in issues of understanding how stereotyping and categorization can affect judgments of men and women, I think that work has

made a big impact in a lot of legal cases and in a lot of corporations, even. I mean, lawyers have used our work a lot on gender, both in stereotyping issues and sexual harassment issues.

There was a group that a lawyer put together on studying the maternal wall, basically the discrimination where the judgments that are made of women who were mothers. So maybe there isn't so much discrimination now of women versus men if they are just single people or married people without children, but once women have children, then a whole other set of assumptions get layered on that. I've been actually amazed at how much lawyers have made use of our work and I think that has had ramifications in all sorts of cases, not as many as we would like, but I'm sure that if you did lit searches in the law libraries, you would find enormous amounts of it. I am frequently stunned by how much some of these lawyers know about our work. Some of them are far more up in the literature than I am, at this point.

So I think that case, that kind of area in particular that I am familiar with, there has been a lot of difference. I think we know a whole lot more. We know about the complexity and we know quite a bit about conditions that encourage or discourage sex differences. The discouraging point is that the popular media sounds like 1950 again! I mean, you know, the *Men are form Mars, Women are from Venus* kinds of arguments; you know, the specials that will be done on some network show that sound like we haven't done anything.

AR – And it's all about the male brain and the female brain…

KD – And now that we've got brain things in there, there is another way to reduce and essentialize the stuff that is totally exasperating. And I don't know what to do about that! I mean, somehow, our message just hasn't gotten out or people are so invested in wanting to understand things as they want them to be that we can publish all the articles we want…(Laughs)

AR – And there is a whole body of psychological science that will back up that point of view, too. I mean, people on that bandwagon, even within our own discipline.

KD – Yeah, I think we've really made a lot of understanding. I mean, part of the issue is it *is* complicated and simple answers are much easier. And, you know, I think now people are bringing more biology into it. I mean, there is a period when we just wanted to…

{END OF DVD 1}

AR – I think I should start to wrap up and shift to asking a bit about SPSSI, but looking back now on your career, you are still very active, but looking back on the body of work you have completed this far, is there any contribution that stands out for you as the one that you would say you are most proud of or has had the most impact?

KD – Oh, I don't know. I don't spend, as I suggested before, a lot of time looking back at my laurels or resting on them, I suppose, but, you know, certainly there are some key pieces. I mean, the Deaux and Emswiller study I am still very fond of. *The Behavior of Women and Men*, I am still very fond of. I still have copies of that little bitty book, which, you know, at the time it was a very small book, because there wasn't a whole lot to say yet, but it really stood the test of time very well, I think. You know, in that book I tried to review all these areas of sort of basic social psychology in terms of how men and women might or might not be different. And often I had to go dig in footnotes or little sentences in discussion sections because there wasn't a lot of it and then I sort of drew my own conclusions. One of the things that pleases me or certainly has

©Psychology's Feminist Voices, 2010

pleased me about that is that, as more meta analyses and much more sophisticated ways of analyzing what, by now, is a much larger literature base, most of the stuff stood up pretty well, I think. My, sort of, leaps of interpretation have, for the most part, held up. And it's interesting, I went back and looked at my final conclusions in that book a few years ago and, I don't know what it means, but, first of all, I thought, "Oh! That sounds pretty right on." And then, of course, I thought, "Well, have we made any progress at all?" Because, back to your progress question, if I could say that thirty years ago, you know, what's new? And (Laughing) I don't know. So, that's two ways of looking at that, I guess, but I've always liked that book.

I like the steel study. Unfortunately, I lost my hardhat. Someplace I had a hard hat that I used to wear when I did this study, with my name on it, but, somehow, in one of these transitions, it disappeared. That book wasn't marketed in psychology as much as it was in business and in labor relations and that kind of thing, so I don't really know, as much, how much impact it has had, but it was certainly a very interesting, formative, educational experience for me in doing that study. I think we had some important things to say, really, about how, basically, women were doing quite well in the steel industry and that, once again, the ideas that people had about whether women could do well were explaining more the variance in things than how women themselves were doing. And also in that study, we showed that the closer the men were to working with women, the more positive they were. So, you take an upper level manager who just heard stories or wasn't working down on the floor, they thought women weren't doing as well as people who were more closely associated with women doing work, which is an important kind of statement and, again, shows the power of stereotypes that can then distort the path of women in a way not based on actual data of their performance, but on hypotheses or judgments or stereotypes.

©Psychology's Feminist Voices 2010

Another piece of that I thought was really important, at the time, and have continued to think so, was the differential assignment of women of color to the crummy jobs, to the jobs as janitors in offices, which were not on a track to promote them through the line to get to be a higher level person and a higher paid person in the steel industry. Now, one of the sad parts of that case was that, shortly after we did this study, there was a huge recession in the steel industry and huge fall out and women, being the most recently hired, were the also the first to be fired. The steel industry never did recover from, you know, that downturn. So, it was a historical case study in more of a way than I wish it had been.

AR – Right, right.

KD – But, nonetheless I think the messages from it probably can be used in other industries as women come into them. So, I don't know. And then you always like your most recent child, so my book on immigration, *To be an Immigrant,* is on my list of favorites at this point in time.

AR – Well, would you have any advice to young feminists, well, emerging feminist psychologists who want to bring feminism to bear, feminist values to bear, on their work as psychologists?

KD – Well, I think, I think people should, I would hope, always keep that as part of their modus operandi in whatever they are doing. I mean, I think there are certainly lots of areas where we still need data about issues that are important to feminists, whether it's issues of maternal leave and childcare and whatever it is. There are a lot of data from economists, for example, on some of these issues, but perhaps not as much from psychologists. So, I think there are a lot of places where there are still important policy practical issues where research could help do it. So, I think

that's important. I certainly think it's important, as I mentioned before, to do research that you think – for anybody, whether it's feminist or not – the research that you think it is important, not that someone else necessarily thinks important, but that you really feel is important, that makes a difference, either in theory or in policy or in practical lives or something. So, that's just a general message, I think, that I give always to students of any sort, whatever their interests are.

Then I think it's important when you are in settings, whether it's academics or others, to try to create conditions that make it better for feminists and for people of goodwill to operate, you know, in the mentoring that you do and the discussions that you have and the things you do or don't support within your faculty. I think there is a constant vigilance issue here. I mean, you know, sometimes I feel we've slipped in some things. I suddenly see committees that are all men again and I thought I'd never see that. (Laughs) Those were the old days, weren't they? So, you know, panels that are all men suddenly. So, I think it really is a constant vigilance and even though, certainly, the situations are much better. I mean, I can't imagine the psychology department without women faculty now. Students can't believe there were such things! So, you know, obviously things have changed in some counts, but that doesn't mean that everything is fine and we can just rest and relax and assume that it will all merrily go along because that isn't the case.

AR – Yeah, let me switch gears. Let me get you to say a few more words about SPSSI. Why don't we start by having you talk about how you first got involved in SPSSI?

KD – I don't even know. I joined SPSSI, I can't remember when. I'd have to go back and look at the records, but I was either a graduate student or very beginning assistant professor.

AR – You knew Hal Proshansky, someone there probably…

KD – Yeah, yeah, it could have been…I joined, you know, when I was a graduate student at Brooklyn College. I was two years out of graduate school. I can't remember when, but I certainly joined it very, very early. And I wasn't heavily involved in it for some time. I was more interested in gender issues and that had something to with SPSSI, but it had more to do with Division 35 and I think that's where I oriented myself more in terms of activity and involvement. I was, you know, also very involved in research, so I wasn't doing a lot of committee work in those early years. But I think the values of SPSSI just have always been important and I think, again, that sociology-psychology piece of me, I mean, if you had those interests, would you find a home in APA? SPSSI just seems to me clearly the place where that would be. So, it just always seemed right for me. One of the things that SPSSI always has done to varying degrees is try to work with how we apply science to policy. And so, in more recent years, when I was on council and president and everything, and, I mean, that was really the focus of my involvement: to try to see, "Ok, we've got good social science data. People need it to make good policy. How can we make this happen?" And SPSSI, again, for me, is the place where we can do that the best.

AR – Yeah, and what is your assessment of how SPSSI is doing in that regard, in terms of its policy agenda, because it's certainly something that you know is a real focus and the move to Washington was part of that. Can you give your assessment of where things are at?

KD – Well, actually, there is a panel tomorrow, you might want to go to that.

AR – (Laughs) So, you can rehearse.

©Psychology's Feminist Voices, 2010

KD – Some people I know are on this panel, yes. Yeah, I think it's actually done amazingly well. I mean, I was reviewing, in part, because of this panel I was reviewing past notes when I was president and on council. I wasn't involved in SPSSI when the decision to move to Washington [occurred]. That happened right before I came on council and became president. That whole decision-making process was difficult and there were arguments on both sides. I mean, it had been in Ann Arbor for a very long time and a lot of people were very comfortable with that. I wasn't involved in that decision, although it struck me as definitely the right decision, as long as it could be financially stabilized or whatever. Philosophically, ideologically it seemed very much the right decision. And so I really made it, I think, the major issue my presidential time to first set up a task force and then to get the task force to become a standing committee and then to try to see how we can make policy happen.

{10:58}

But the main question for me is, "Ok, we are now in Washington. We've said we want to go there because we want to influence policy – how do we do it?" And there was no apparatus, really, to do it initially. In the initial move to Washington, the first steps were really finding a place to live, a building, a house – and that took a lot of time – the real estate issue, and then finding a director and personnel issues. It took some time, even after getting to Washington, to figure out what to do. So when I became president, it was a time that some of those problems had been resolved and it was now time to think seriously about the policy things. So we went from a position where we didn't have a lot going, in terms of what we were doing, to now, which is only five years later. And, you know, if you look at the webpage, I think it's quite extraordinary, if you look on the policy webpage. I was just doing it this week and I hadn't actually checked on it lately and I was really amazed at how much is done. Five years isn't that long to get an organization, particularly an understaffed, under-resourced organization to be able to do so much. And I think there has been just remarkable progress, not to say that we couldn't, certainly if we had more resources and more staff and whatever, we could do a whole lot more. But I think we've done a great deal and we are definitely on the right track.

I'm not involved in governance anymore, so I can't speak to the nuts and bolts of what's happening. But I think it really is the case that we're making a great deal of progress. I think SPSSI is, as I said, just such a natural to do this on issues that I care about. I see it as an obligation. I mean, I've always been more of a researcher than an activist, in some ways, so maybe it's not appropriate for me to say, "People should be doing this," but I wish I had gotten more training early on or thought more about that, but I think psychologists, particularly social psychologists are often too hesitant about doing the policy kind of work in a way that other social science people aren't. I mean economists aren't hesitant. Sociologists aren't hesitant about having their work affect policy and for some reason I think psychologists often are more hesitant. I think it…

AR – There is a lot of ambivalence around advocacy versus objectivity I think in psychology. Is it your sense that's the case, or has that been part of the dialogue in SPSSI?

KD – I think it is part of the dialogue and I think there is a basic versus applied distinction that is way overused and way misunderstood. I mean, even European social psychologists don't fall under that trap and, certainly, as I said, other social scientists don't. I mean, to study something that's happening outside of a laboratory does not necessarily make it applied. And to study something that real people are doing doesn't make it wrong! (Laughs) It's not bad to know why people do the things they do in their offices, in their homes, in their corporations, or street

©Psychology's Feminist Voices 2010

corners, or whatever. I mean, those are what we really need to do. Again, economists care about what the real economy does. They may use pretty artificial models sometimes, and they actually may be wrong half the time or more, but they care about what the economy is doing, not what people are doing in a laboratory with poker chips or something. And, similarly, sociologists in immigration, for example, care about immigration policy. It's not just studying what an immigrant would say if they brought them into a room. So, there is no reason for us to have those… but I think you are quite right, there is this applied basic and advocacy policy distinction, as if they are splits. If you are doing one, you can't possibly do the other. I think those are really artificial and I think they are detrimental to a lot of things. They are certainly detrimental to our ability to have voices in issues that matter and that we have something to say about.

AR – Right, right. One last question, SPSSI, as you know, will be celebrating its 75th anniversary next year in Washington, DC. What would you put on your wish list for SPSSI's next 75 years?

KD – (Laughs) I am not very good at that at all! Oh, I have no specific ideas. I mean, more of all the good things we've done, but that's pretty vacuous I realize, but, as I said, I think the wish is that we would be increasingly effective in using our science to affect policy in positive ways and to perhaps encourage the science to define problems and interpret problems in ways that can be relevant to the application, but that aren't weakening the science in any ways, that are maybe just making better use of it for things that are important in a world that's got a lot of problems.

AR – Ok, why don't we stop there?

{END OF DVD 2}

©Psychology's Feminist Voices 2010