

**Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History Project**

**Interview with Lisa Goodman**

*Interviewed by Alexandra Rutherford*

*Boston, MA*

*November 21, 2007*

**When citing this interview, please use the following citation:**

Goodman, L. (2007, November 21). Interview by A. Rutherford [Video Recording].

Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History and Online Archive Project. Toronto, ON.

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

Alexandra Rutherford, PhD  
Project Director, Psychology's Feminist Voices  
[alexr@yorku.ca](mailto:alexr@yorku.ca)

©Psychology's Feminist Voices, 2011

**Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History Project**  
**Interview with Lisa Goodman**  
**Interviewed by Alexandra Rutherford**  
**Boston, MA**  
**November 21, 2007**

LG: Lisa Goodman, Interview Participant

AR: Alex Rutherford, Interviewer

---

LG – Lisa A. Goodman, 08-09-61.

AR – Great. Well let's start off with a question we have asked of almost everyone, and that is how did your identity as a feminist, or how did your feminist identity develop or evolve?

LG - I think just from my mother's milk I was nursed on feminism and psychology. My mom's a psychologist and although she would not define herself as a feminist, it's just not her thing, she would certainly say that she's a feminist, but not a feminist psychologist. I grew up with two parents who worked full time, in Berkley California, until I was 12, and then in Philadelphia. And it was just, my family was politically active in civil rights and other political issues, and feminism was just a part and parcel of growing up and thinking about the world. I'm not sure I ever gave it sort of focused thought though until I went to college and met Jill Morawski.

AR – Oh neat.

LG – She was at Wesleyan University, where I went in 1979. It was her first year and my first year there, and I just fell in love with her. She really just embodied so many things that I had never seen before in a teacher; the way she thought intellectually, but also just personally, the way she interacted with students and the level of respect she gave students and the friendship she allowed to develop. She was 10 years older than me and so it felt like I could almost be her friend!

AR – Yeah.

LG – She was just a really, really important role model and helped me start to think about all of the ideas I had already come there with, feminist psychologist ideas. So I think that that's where I really sort of formulated the identity of feminist psychologist.

AR – Okay. What made you decide to go into psychology?

LG – I didn't then. At Wesleyan, everybody makes up their own major, not everybody but a lot of people, and mine was called 'the place of psychology and history, and the study of the individual.'

AR – Oh how interesting.

{2:19}

LG – And consistent with Jill’s interest, sort of how social and political trends and context shape psychological thought, and then the other way around. So I ended up working, I had gone back and forth between whether policy or psychological intervention was the best way to create social change, or individual change. So my final project at Wesleyan, that I then continued for the next couple of years when I moved to Boston, was to understand how the threat of nuclear war, which was then much more tangible, affected adolescent development.

AR – Oh interesting.

LG – And it was during the nuclear freeze era, and Helen Caldicott, you’re too young to remember that stuff.

AR – No, no.

LG – So I moved from Wesleyan where I was absolutely not sure, I mean I was interested in psychology, but not sure that I wanted to create social change at that individual psychological level only. So I worked on this project for a couple of years with John Mack who was a psychiatrist here and ended up working as a public policy person at the IPPNW, International Physicians for the Prevention of Nuclear War, the year that they won the Noble Peace Prize, which they did. So it was very thrilling. I was kind of public relations, so it was really thrilling. I was trying to see whether policy was what I wanted to do, and that was sort of a really good context in which to learn. And I really decided that I didn’t, because you can’t just go and change policies, that’s the thing.

AR – Yeah.

LG – You have to work in coalitions for a lifetime and maybe something changes, and maybe it doesn’t. So after that I went to work with women and men with schizophrenia, and decided that it was just an incredibly powerful experience, and I felt like I really was transforming lives doing it.

AR – It was a direct kind of relationship, as opposed to the policy which would be...

LG – Yeah, exactly, and it felt very, very moving. I also saw things about the mental health system that were harming, I thought, really painfully harming the people I worked with. So I thought there’s plenty of policy change to do here, so it was after I spent a year doing that that I decided to go into psychology.

AR – Okay. Well interesting that almost from the very start at Wesleyan, that you were thinking about this in terms of a policy level, or more of a structural level, versus an individual level of change.

{4:45}

LG – Right.

AR – And what enabled you, do you have any sense, I know I'm asking you to kind of reflect on this, but any sense of what enabled you to even think that way as you were going through your undergraduate education?

LG – How I was able to think about policy, about sort of structural and individual change, and their interrelationship?

AR – Yeah. Well did it come from this sort of activist background that you have?

LG – Yeah. My dad's a lawyer, my mom's a psychologist, and you know, this fruit doesn't fall too far from the tree. So I just grew up that way. I've been struggling with that, again, always. You know we would go out to peace marches in Berkeley, we lived there, and I would say, this is fun, it makes you feel really good about yourself, but is anybody really changing because of it? And my parents would say it's a practice, it's not necessarily about us changing things at this minute. So I've been struggling with sort of the nature of how to intervene to create social change. And Jill was less interested, the faculty that I worked with at Wesleyan, and not just her, were less interested in that. And by the way, the psychology faculty were not at all interested in that.

AR – Yeah.

LG – Less interested in that than just understanding how political and moral values in a society evolve, whether or not they are changed by people.

AR – Right. They're interested in an intellectual project.

LG – Yeah, just how do these things evolve, how do we know that big white man in the sky versus the little people on the ground are creating social change. But not particularly from an activist perspective, from a more intellectual perspective.

AR – Right.

LG – So I don't think it was any single event or any single experience as much as just growing up with activist parents and an activist community. I also lived through [a time when] my school in Berkeley California was the first to engage in voluntary bussing integration.

AR – Oh okay, right.

{6:50}

LG – And so I sort of lived through this era of social change in the 60s at Berkley, and it was very difficult and painful. And so it sort of again brought the structural down into the individual, it really brought it home to me; what this really meant, that we were doing this. It felt really different from the way that it was discussed in the newspapers, and the way that even our parents would talk about it, the experience of being in school everyday and that kind of context. So I was

always interested in sort of the individual experience, and then the sort of more abstract level experience.

AR – Okay. Well tell me then a little bit about your doctoral training and what that experience was like, and then the research that you did during your doctoral training.

LG – So I went to the clinical-community psychology program at BU, Boston University.

AR – Can you describe the clinical-community? Because at least in Canada, and maybe not here, that's not a common combination. Often clinical is in one place and community is in another, but how was this sort of combined?

LG – It wasn't, honestly, integrated very well. I went because there were some professors that were doing community psychology, which really meant just working in community mental health centres and trying to think about levels beyond the individual, as sort of potential contributors to mental health difficulties. But in fact it was a pretty, not even psychodynamic, but psychoanalytic program, in fact is what it was. We didn't get beyond Freud much. I mean it's Boston, but it was nevertheless striking. But I found a couple of mentors in the program, both within the clinical program, Fran Grossman being one, and then in the larger psychology department. Debbie Belle was an important mentor of mine.

AR – Oh yeah.

LG – She does research on poverty and social support. And in fact my biggest mentor was this guy named Len Saxe, who always carried a *New York Times* around with him, which I really appreciated because the real world didn't enter into the program much. He was a social psychologist interested in lie detectors, and their influence. He was very involved in public policy, and he just really gave me the courage to break away from what the faculty was doing at BU, and to do my own thing, which I did. So while I was there I worked for many years, to make money on the side, with Ellen Bassuk, who is a psychiatrist who started the Better Homes Fund, which was a research and policy institute on homeless families.

AR – Oh wow.

{9:41}

LG – So I worked with her, and she just gave me an enormous amount of freedom and responsibility as an employee of her foundation. I did this series of city reports through the nature of services for homeless families in different cities across the country. So I was doing that while I was in graduate school, but what I found I was that, and I always tell my students, that I was that graduate student who couldn't find a place; the frustrated acting up supervisee, who everyone thought was angry, angry, angry. But I didn't yet know that I was trying to develop a theoretical framework that is actually now, I'm 46, meaningful.

AR – Okay.

LG – I feel like it makes sense and was coherent, but it felt like what I am, because everything was interpreted psychoanalytically. Am I just resisting? Like, what is my problem? Everyone else seems to be going with the program and I'm never going with the program. So it was very painful. I mean although I found these outside places where I felt more at home, sort of going through the mainstream program, my cohort, who I was very close with, many of my fellow trainees and students in the program would just laugh at me like, alright Lisa, what's your contradictory comment? And I just struggled with thinking I'm onto something that they're not getting, versus why do I always have to be so, rocking the boat, rocking the boat? Why can't I go along with the program? And there were plenty of people wanting to analyze my rocking the boat.

AR – Oh yeah.

LG – So it was a very mixed experience. And I'm just thinking mainly of, you know, we worked 20 hours a week in a clinical context the whole way through all the years that I was there, so [I got] a lot of clinical experience while I was there. And it was mainly making individual interpretations of things that felt to me like social problems that these people were contending with, like poverty for example. There was a lot of psychodynamic interpretation of people's pain; when you look at what they go home to, and you're thinking this is not rocket science.

AR – Right.

LG – But it was made to seem to me like it is rocket science because you can't – it may look to you like it's obvious, duh, why they're so upset, but in fact it's much more complicated.

AR – Oh wow. So that's how your concerns would be deflected in a way?

LG – Yeah. What's up with you that? You don't want to look inside?

AR – Yeah well, that's an interesting strategy because they were doing sort of to you what they were also doing to their clients.  
{12:15}

LG – Exactly! Exactly, exactly. And I sometimes hear hints of it with some of my own students when they describe their supervisors' reactions to them. If I only knew then that it would serve me well as a mentor now. So that part was painful, but I did learn early on to be an independent researcher, just because I longed for a mentor. I'm very big on finding mentors, and I've been searching for them my whole life because I had some really good ones early in life. And I just couldn't find someone to really stand by my side as a doctoral student. And so I did learn to work on my own and develop my dissertation, which was on violence among impoverished women, housed and homeless low-income women. I was interested in the relationship between homelessness and domestic violence.

AR – Did that come out of your experience working in...?

LG – It came out of my clinical experience. I mean, I knew I was interested in feminist theory and in the lives of women, and the more clinical experience I had the more I understood violence, particularly domestic violence, violence by intimate partners as sort of the epitome of the oppression of women. [It's] the most blatant, visceral, in your face form, in this country, of oppression. And so it felt like it really integrated my interest in the individual emotional well-being and social and political forces that impinge on that, so it felt like my niche. I worked a lot with people who were in various homeless shelters and I also worked a lot with women in domestic, you know, homeless shelters and domestic violence shelters are what the two groups are called in this country.

AR – Oh okay.

LG – And they were the same women although they were treated totally differently. In the domestic violence shelters there was some awareness, not as much as there is now, about trauma and its impact, and there was a lot of attention to how to not make this experience re-traumatizing for women. And then in the straight generalized homeless shelters, people were thrown in with no attention to what might feel triggering or coercive, or abusive, in the context of prior violence. So it's just interesting exploring that domain of what is the link between abuse and homelessness, or is it really just about poverty, and have we just decided to focus laser length on homeless women because that's what sort of gets the dollars right now. So that was my topic.

AR – And how did your graduate student advisors and colleagues react to your sort of feminist approach to this? Was there any feminism in your environment, professionally at that time?

{15:06}

LG - You know, I was very well protected just because I picked my readers really carefully. So I got to say, I only got encouragement. In fact, the one person who would not have defined himself as a feminist psychologist particularly, Len Saxe, who was on my committee, was the one who said you need to apply for funding, to [TANIMH] (15:30). This was at a time when research wasn't really even, I mean everyone did dissertations, but very few, if any, BU graduates went into academia.

AR – Oh really.

LG – Yeah, it really was very much about the best clinical training, not the best research training. But he pushed me, he was the PI [principal investigator] and I was the co-PI, that's how we did it, but he didn't know anything about the topic. He pushed me to write a first draft and then redo it, redo it, redo it, and I'm really so grateful to him because without the whole feminist spin on life that I had, he really had so much confidence in my capacity. He really was a feminist in the true sense. There was no sense in which he felt that I was hobbled by my topic, by my being a woman, in any way at all. So no, I have to say that I really did not feel any resistance at all.

AR – That's good. And then, I take it from your CV that after you finished your dissertation you went first to Maryland, and then ended up here?

LG – I went to APA [American Psychological Association] first where I was a public policy fellow for a year.

AR – What was that experience like?

LG – I want to say that I went to DC because my husband was a lawyer, and all lawyers end up in DC somehow at some point. So that was agonizing, really agonizing, to go with my husband. Like who does that? I really didn't want to do it. But I just felt like he had stayed in Boston for me to finish and it was his turn. So I was a public policy fellow at APA for a year, and that was fantastic. I worked in the public policy office and wrote some amicus briefs for the Supreme Court, which is really exciting, and worked on violence against women, the Violence against Women Act some, and put together a task force on violence against women for APA, and got to co-author a book. I met some of my next generation of mentors, like Mary Koss, Nancy Russo, Louise Fitzgerald, Gwen Keita, who is still at the APA, and Angela Brown, I mean people who have been with me since then as I've developed my career. And I've always been able to call on them. So we co-authored a book, *No safe haven, violence against women: At home, at work, and in the community*. So from there, I was deciding what to do, and got pregnant. There was an opening at Maryland, which I felt entirely unqualified for, in the clinical-community program. I wasn't really clear that I was going to go into academia. I really wasn't sure what I was going to do. I was still doing this policy psychology. Where do I go?

AR – Right.

{18:20}

LG – But I thought alright, it's good practice to apply, and if I'm lucky enough to be one of the finalists, I could practice doing a colloquium. But it's out of my league, is what I felt, in this typical girl way. I felt like it was out of my league. But anyway, I put the final envelope in as I was going into labour, and then three weeks – this is a good story – three weeks after I gave birth to my son, my oldest son Caleb, I got the call that they wanted me for a colloquium for a week later. And I was nursing, I was a mess, a mess! But of course I said yes.

AR – Oh my gosh.

LG – And I said yes, hung up and thought, how on earth am I going to do this? I'm nursing constantly. I can't go far without a wet shirt, you know! It was like, what did I just do? I was panicking. I got a call from someone that I didn't even know at Maryland, a woman, saying, 'I heard you just had a new baby.' It was a colleague, [well,] she became a colleague. 'I heard you're nursing and you must be freaking out. Well guess what, I'm going to bring my babysitter that day and I'm going to ask the department chair, who is sort of an older man, to set up some breaks for you. And nobody has to know why.' Not that I cared, but she thought I might [care]. 'And you can go nurse your baby. But in the meantime, my babysitter will stay with your baby.'

AR – Wow. That's great.



LG – It was just one of these sisterhood moments that I just really, really appreciated. So I went and did that, and the timing didn't work out well, so I ended up nursing my way through the interviews in this department. I wasn't wearing the right clothes.

AR – I was going to say, what do you wear?

LG – You know what, it was so awful because I was in such a muddle. Sleepless, and I didn't wear good stuff. It was very awkward. These people had not seen a nursing woman, it was obvious, ever, except their wives maybe. There was one woman, eight men, in the clinical-community program.

AR – Oh wow. That's courageous.

LG – It was intense, it was intense. I remember nursing with nine doctoral students interviewing me, surrounding me, thinking 'oh to hell with it. This is me.'

AR – Well on the other hand it makes it a very memorable interview for everyone.

{20:38}

LG – Well, little did I know, because they had eight men and one woman, they had to get a woman. They had to have a woman in there. And by the way, a feminist woman is like icing on the cake. It's just like a double slot.

AR – Yeah.

LG – So I filled two spaces with that. So I got the job, and I was there for five years I think, through two children.

AR – Okay. So this is one of the questions that we often ask, if it's appropriate, is how did you manage then to sort of balance, negotiate, navigate, your obviously really intense personal domestic situation, and your professional career, which is at this point, I'm sure, just sort of picking up pace and credibility?

LG – Right, I then was at one of the most competitive psychology programs, at least in my area, in the country, and trying to get tenure. I had this one boy, and then another one three years later, and it was really, really hard. I was told by several people that you can get away with having one baby, but to be a serious scholar with more than one child is impossible. Several people in my department said things like that to me. And I think that for me, the ticket to being able to be sort of fairly prolific while having this other life is amazing graduate students.

AR – Oh yeah.

LG – I mean I can't say enough about the amazingness of graduate students, my graduates, my female graduates. I had one wonderful male graduate student, the rest of them have been female, and they are my daughters and all my friends, and colleagues. And that's how I did it.

AR – Yeah.

LG – It's not hard when you collaborate with smart people. And I found some other really good collaborators [and] colleagues in the community. Mary Ann Dutton and I collaborated on a lot of things, and I found some clinical people in the community to work with. And I definitely had to move to sort of slightly secondary interests when that became just an easier path.

AR – Right.

{23:02}

LG – I took lots of shortcuts both as a parent and as an academic, and I didn't spend as much time with my kids as I theoretically wish I had. In practice, I'm not so good on the floor playing with my children. It's just not my thing. I remember friends of mine would say god, by seven o'clock, are you ready to kill your child? And I said 'I don't really know what you're talking about.' And I'm a killer. I kill people, I yell at them, I get sick of them, so it wasn't a personality thing. And I realized just way into this that, well of course I don't get sick of them by seven. I just saw them for the first time at 6:15. And it did have that distinct advantage of my feeling always so excited to be with my children despite the fact that I never really was a kid person.

AR – Yeah.

LG – It felt like it enabled me to be a good parent during the time I was with them. And then I had a third kid when I left there, as I was leaving I got pregnant with a third kid. So anyway, it was tense at times, scary, and really anxiety producing. But I think that what helped me, and I also always tell my students this is to, for me, personally, having children was something I knew I wanted. I have three siblings of my own and we come from a very close family, and that was a priority. So I thought, let the rest of the chips fall where they may, and I know that's good and I know there's no good time. There's no good way to do it, it's always bad. So I just sort of tried to clear out a space to figure out separate from everything else, what do my husband and I want for our lives and then let's see how everything else falls. This was just a lark. It was sort of a fluke that I got this job, I felt, a fluke, and so this is what's most important.

AR – I think that's so important, because this is one of the issues that professional women in our field, and in many other fields, just continue to face: how to navigate this whole having families, being in relationships.

LG – Nobody doesn't.

AR – And it's still unsolved. And so it's good for people, I think, to hear how other people have kind of dealt with that.

LG – I think so too. And I think the good news for me is that over time more and more of my male graduate students are struggling with it too.

AR – Yeah, that’s neat.

LG – That’s the really, really cool thing. It’s a struggle for us all, and I do wish that there were different paths within academia. I think it’s [very] rigid. People think that it’s this wonderfully flexible career, and it is in terms of time. You could do the work, if you don’t need to sleep, late at night, and not during the day. But in terms of the pressure and the amount we have to do and the absence of sort of multiple pathways.

{25:58}

AR – Yeah.

LG - My mother got tenure when I was, I don’t even remember. She started in academia when I was 15, so she had her four kids and she was very sought after because there weren’t very many women then, and because she was good. But she was able to not produce for ten years and then start producing, and that was acceptable for her.

AR – Right.

LG - But for us, the minute you’re done graduate school you better have five publications and you better keep on going from there on. It’s just an impossible bind for people. But I do think that what people do is think that they have to choose. They choose one or the other, and they don’t just try and bulldoze through and do both. I think that the people who do bulldoze seem to find success often, not always, but [often].

AR – Yeah. Well tell me then about the evolution of your research, and I’m especially interested in methodological developments. That is, how your thinking about how to do research, the development of more community based participatory approaches, and how that’s all taking form in your work. So I don’t know how you want to approach that, but we were chronological. So you spent a few years at Maryland and then you come here.

LG – So I came to BC (Boston College) mostly because Maryland sort of evolved in the direction of becoming a fairly traditional clinical program. It started out with some people who were sort of leading lights in community psychology. When I got there, they were there. And over time they left and new people came in, and it became traditional and not a place that felt rejuvenating or exciting anymore. And I feel very lucky, since my husband and I both lived in Boston for so long before moving to DC, we wanted to come back anyway because we missed our community and people kept moving away in DC.

AR – It’s just that kind of place.

LG – So I had a friend, [Dion Aldarondo], from my internship at Cambridge Hospital, who was at BC – this is a counselling program. Counselling had never occurred to me, but he was a clinical person who had been at BC for a couple of years and he called me and he said ‘this is different, you need to check this place out, and they have an opening and you should apply.’ I had this idea that counselling was for sort of well-adjusted happy people interested in studying

well-adjusted happy people. And the clinical world was for all of us dark neurotic types, interested in studying serious pathology.

{28:37}

AR – Deep seated.

LG – Big problems. And he said no, they're really screwed up here too!

AR – It's everywhere.

LG – Right. Basically what he said about BC is that if you want to do social justice work, this is where you can do it. They do community psychology, they may not call it community psychology the way you learned [it], but they're doing it anyway and they're using an even broader array of theories and approaches and they walk the walk. When I interviewed here, Mary Brabeck was here and was the Dean, and she's amazing.

AR – Yeah, we've interviewed her for the project.

LG – I figured. I asked her in the interview, if I had a choice between getting a big grant or – I mean this is such a stupid question in a way, but it did get to something I cared about – or doing a piece of writing that I thought might make a difference for some people, where would you encourage me? And she said 'that's a no-brainer. We're about knowledge for change, that's what we're about.' And that was really moving.

AR – Yeah.

LG – That would have never happened where I was before. So I felt lucky to get this job, and so we came here. And in terms of the evolution of methodologies that I've used, when I was at Maryland, [and] that was in 1994, even then, between 1994 and when I came here in 2000, there was a growing interest in qualitative research. So when I started at Maryland, I knew that my path to tenure required solid quantitative research. I was interested, especially for doing policy and trying to create change, you need big numbers.

AR – Yeah.

LG – Plus I was scared of qualitative research and I had never really learned it in graduate school. So qualitative research didn't enter my mind in a big way, but over time while I was there, several of my students became very interested in qualitative work. [Anne Brodsky], someone you should interview, is one person who was a student of mine.

AR – Oh neat.

LG – I was one of her readers for her qualitative dissertation, and I loved it.

{30:53}

AR – What was it on?

LG – It was on resilience in African American women living in poverty, and it was called *Making It*. But she really did a very deep exploration of what is resilience and all the ways that we've misused that term and what it really means. [It was about] the idea that all of us have resilience at some level and it's about ferreting it out in different people, even people in difficult life circumstances. She's a very, very rigorous and thorough methodologist, and so as one of her readers, I had to learn a lot to keep up with her.

AR – Yeah, yeah.

LG - [Elliot Levine] was another student I had who did a great dissertation, and I got very interested. But they did it for real, and it took years and years to finish, and so I became increasingly interested and increasingly scared about the methodology. It wasn't really until I got here, like now, that I'm really starting to use it more and more. Brinton Lykes had a series of workshops for us lagging faculty on qualitative methods, and I've read a lot, and half of my students now do qualitative dissertations.

AR – Oh wow.

LG – And I'm just starting to sort of lead qualitative research projects, and more than qualitative, more participatory kinds of studies. And that was just about beginning to work in the community, creating programs with collaborators in the community. One of the programs that I helped start, I guess four years ago now, is for low income women struggling with depression. The women really started with some consultation from me and a couple other professional types.

AR – Right.

LG - And it's been an incredibly important and moving experience to sort of try to be a respectful consultant and observer but allow the community to do what it needs to do. And to be as a researcher, truly the tail that the dog is wagging, and not the opposite, which is usually the way it is when researchers go in to do interventions in the community. There have been a million challenges to being an evaluator and consultant and researcher with this project, and to have absolutely no power or control over the constantly evolving nature of the project.

AR – Yeah.

{33:17}

LG - So that's taught me a lot about participatory action research and using creative methods. I've gotten looser and looser and looser over time, I mean I'm using that term, but I think looser in my mind about what's acceptable and what's not, despite the fact that I've taught about feminist research methods in my classes. To finally adopt the identity and really do it and take the risks that are required, and take the time that is required. I think you have to have tenure, honestly, to really take the enormous amount of time that it takes to play with research, to really think deeply and then even more deeply about how you listen to women and whether you are, and what it means to sort of give women [a] voice, and who is doing the giving, and what if

someone else was doing the giving. I mean to really deeply consider those questions takes a lot of time.

AR – Yeah. What have you found? This is the ROAD [Reaching Out About Depression] project that you've just been talking about?

LG – Yeah.

AR – What have you found then, in doing this, has been the most challenging part of doing participatory research for you, as a researcher? What has been the most challenging or difficult aspect of that?

LG – That's a really good question. There have been so many challenges! I'm trying to sort through [them].

AR – You can say more than one. I'm not trying to constrain you to one.

LG – I mean at every level there are so many challenges. For this research project, I am tasked as an advisory board member and as a friend to ROAD and as a co-developer, with doing the evaluation in a way that serves funder needs and it serves the women's and program's needs, and also serves my need, my desire, to disseminate this amazing model to the world. I also supervise the advocacy component of ROAD, which brings Masters students to work with women in what we call feminist relational advocacy, this very intensive way with the participants in the program.

AR – Okay.

LG – So I'm wearing all kinds of hats. My roles are totally mixed up and evolving. Yet this is really a program by and for the community, the women who are in the community who are, themselves, struggling with the same thing that the participants who keep coming in are struggling with. So you have this layer of facilitators who are low income women in Cambridge who facilitate the program for their neighbours and friends and others in the community. I think that I've spent a number of years starting off with this, I think, kind of naïve perspective that it's yours, what do you want from me?

{36:35}

AR – Right.

LG – I am here for you. It is your voice. I will record it, either in terms of doing focus groups, focus group methodologies, or interviews in qualitative analysis. Or you tell me what kind of quantitative outcomes you're interested in and we'll make it work. I think that over time I have realized how naïve that is and how my stake in this research does matter. It exists, how it works, what the outcomes are, what I think about what's important about this program matters. And it really is a collaboration where both parties have to get something out of it. I care about publications, I care about my professional standing, and I mostly care about getting the word out.

AR – Yeah.

LG - So for example there was an issue about who gets to say whether anything I write gets to be published. At first I [thought], 'Oh of course! You guys decide. This is about you and it's your words. I don't get to decide.' And halfway through this project, it has taken me several years I think, to say, 'Wait a second. These are my words. We need to have a contract at the beginning that says that I do, even if I produce evaluation results that you don't like, I have a responsibility to disseminate those as well.'

AR – Yeah.

LG – I'm sort of presenting this in a bit of a confused way, but there's been a lot of struggle about power and control and responsibility and accountability. What does it really mean to collaborate, and just sort of recognizing increasingly that the person in academia also has to have her voice heard too, not just the people in the community. It's a joint venture, not one person amplifying the voices of other people.

AR – Right. It's not just you completely giving up your power. It's about acknowledging that there is power and working to equalize it in a collaborative way.

LG – Right. That involves dialogue, and in this dialectical process, you end up with something different because that involves my shaping the voices of the community, just as they're shaping mine. And so it ends up in a much, I think it's a much richer stew of voices, but it's complicated to figure out how to talk about that, how to think about that, and what it means to produce something that has been more of a collective enterprise than I would have thought at the beginning.

AR – Yeah. What has been, then, to turn this around a little bit, what has been the most gratifying or the most positive or the most pleasantly surprising thing about engaging in this very complex kind of set of relationships?

{39:12}

LG – I had this epiphany moment when I was writing up the results of this qualitative study. I was asking, as I always do, whether anybody from the community wanted to be a co-author and help do it. And often people say 'no thanks, that's for you to publish in some place that nobody will read.' And then when we get to the reports that people are going to read, the sort of policy, [where] we always write something that the women will be able to disseminate to their community, then they might want to get involved at that level, they do get involved at that level. But anyway, I had this epiphany when I was writing up an article for publication. I realized that, of course, even if nobody wanted to be an author, I was going to have to give this final product to every one of my friends in ROAD to read and edit and give me feedback on. Did I really like the way I was talking? I mean, I had an academic audience in my mind as I was writing it, and sort of midway though I remembered that these ROAD women are going to be reading it. And I re-read it and just had this epiphany like, no, I don't like it. I'm embarrassed that they would be reading this. The examples are so subtle, but it was just a tiny level of interpretation of, what even just a little bit of interpretation of what women said in these focus groups. I thought, 'I can imagine someone feeling incredibly deflated and disempowered about my taking their words and

wondering about what that might mean.’ Even just that. I used someone talking about reconciling her hope about what advocacy could do for her in terms of transforming her life. This woman who had just been given so much crap to deal with in her life [was] reconciling her hope that advocacy could do these amazing things and her quick sort of reading very early on that her life wasn’t going to transform. It could maybe change a little bit but it wasn’t going to transform. And I titled that code, which kept coming up, “expecting miracles”

AR – Okay.

LG – And I don’t know, this is very subtle, but I realized afterwards, how is she going to read her words, that I put on top of that the interpretation expecting miracles? It feels demeaning, a little patronizing, and it made me see how much I do that, even though I’m all about not doing that, so automatically. So that was gratifying. I felt like, wow, I am going to deeply change because of this project, and my students as well. We will never do research the way we did, because I will never now not consider – I want to be able to give this paper, and be able to explain every word of it if it’s written in psychobabble, to the people who it’s about. I think that just sort of having the faces, and they’re my friends, you know having the faces in front of me of the people who are going to be reading that and wondering how they would hear it, sort of radicalized me in a way.

AR – How do you do that though without completely leaving their words at the level of, how do you do that without doing any interpretation?

{42:42}

LG – Well I’m struggling. I think there’s a difference between interpretation and abstraction. But even if I do interpret, it’s in the most respectful and sort of tenuous and possibility kind of way. It is with so much less authority than I think I otherwise would have done. I think, ‘You know what? Reconciling hope and disappointment is rich enough. Why do I have to do that other thing?’

AR – Right.

LG – Why do I have to do that? I mean it sort of brings me back to my days as a graduate student when I would sit there with my supervisor and say why are you, what they say is the truth. Their roof is leaking! Why is it something else? I feel like in some way I still am struggling with the same thing about authenticity and giving voice and not imposing my academic voice on top of the population of interest.

AR – Right.

LG – I’m still struggling with how to do that, and how to make it relevant to people who, like in this particular case, this is a model of advocacy that I would really like other people to adopt because it’s working. I need to speak in a language that will allow people to see that it’s working. So I can’t stay at the same, I can’t use the language of my participants. I have to use a different language, a language of persuasion. But that’s different than interpreting and shifting and



changing the meaning, or speculating about the meaning without being really clear about the speculating part.

AR – Wow. That’s really amazing because I’m working with a student now who has had a form of that exact same problem when she went to interpret some interview data with women she had interviewed. She went back and forth with them about the meaning, but she was so shocked when she went back to them with her first draft and they said you’ve got it all wrong, you’re misrepresenting what I said. And so she was put into this horrible ethical dilemma, you know, what do I do with this? Do I have any authority at all to interpret? Anyway, we had some interesting conversations.

LG – What did you tell her?

AR – Well I said that, and I’m no expert in qualitative research. I’m a historian, which is a form of qualitative research, but very different. I said well I do think you have something also to offer. That is, I don’t think that you have to completely let the participants determine what the outcome of the research is, but you do have to kind of go back and forth with them to make sure that what you’re saying does reflect their experience and what they meant, otherwise it’s not in any sense of the term a worthy project.

{45:30}

LG – Right, but I think even in the discussion, even in the implications, and that’s where it gets tricky, I think those are the places where we’re less inclined, or it’s less of a tradition in qualitative research to go back. Of course it depends on your method. I just think that when you have such vulnerable people, when your participants are so vulnerable and so unable to speak for themselves, you really have to be so careful of not taking that extra step.

AR – Oh totally. Let me ask you about the full frame model.

LG – Wow, you did your homework!

AR – Well I have your CV! But you talked in graduate school about seeing homeless shelters and then shelters for women who had experienced domestic violence and how those were separate, and it was separated out, these issues for them. So I was starting to think, was this already a foreshadowing of the kinds of problems that you saw that then evolved into the full frame approach. But I wasn’t sure if that was [right].

LG – Yes. From then, when I was working with women and men with schizophrenia back when I was working at a day treatment centre before graduate school, all the way through all of my clinical training, all of my research, I have been struck again and again by the benefits but also the harms of specialized services.

AR – Right.

LG - And I think mental health is one of those specialized services that is so problematically

separated from other services so that women have to divide themselves into little pieces, and then come to define themselves by those fragmented pieces. And especially poor women who have to check off the boxes right: I'm homeless, I'm substance abusing, domestic violence, you know check off them as if they're this array of problems. That's at an intake, that's how they have to greet the people who are supposed to help them. Then they get told to go here, here, here, and here.

AR – And then they have to run all over the place when they don't even have a means of transportation often.

LG – Right, and then when they don't they're called resistant or non-compliant, and not ready for treatment. So that has felt like a bind to me, yes, since then. And in all the work I've ever done with poor women, that's the first thing they say, 'Another service where I'm going to be the fuck up who has some big tall white man tell me how to be, and what I need, and drugs.' They're all deathly afraid that drugs will just be thrown down, or they'll be forced to never invite a relative over again because that's the rule in the only subsidized housing they can get, where it's restricted visiting. So the full frame approach came, these inchoate ideas that actually became the full frame approach were what propelled me to get involved with ROAD and to help develop ROAD, because it is a program that tries to address all of a woman's needs in a context of safe relationships and peer support.

{48:26}

AR – Okay.

LG – And then I met Katya Fels, who is a collaborator now, who was the executive director of On The Rise, just this amazing, fascinating, program for marginalized women, mostly homeless, mostly mentally ill, many substance abusing, women who were living under bridges and for whom mainstream services have entirely failed. They're not running around anymore, they've given up. She developed a program that I came to understand and see as just really working for the people for whom nothing else was working. And ROAD, from my evaluation of it, seemed to be working for women for whom nothing else was working.

AR – Right.

LG - And she and I got together, and she's very intellectually curious, and we just decided that we should just sit down and talk our way through what it is that makes these programs work, makes them different from other programs, makes them sort of the same as each other, even though their target population is entirely different and their program elements are entirely different. What is sort of the animating spirit of both of them, or are there principles we could derive? We spent countless hours at my dining room table just talking and talking and talking. And then we talked to other people, too, and programs that seemed to be like ours, and out of all this we developed a set of principles which we have decided is a way of thinking about services that work, and as a model for thinking about replication differently. Rather than sort of replicating program elements the way most people do – 'oh I like this, you have this target

population, and you have this many visits, and you have this outcome' – it is the idea of having programs replicate principles.

AR – Oh okay. So the form could be different as long as the underlying principle is duplicated.

LG – Exactly. So we've written a couple things about these principles and practices. It really is the full circle of my policy versus practice dilemma because she is the most amazing fundraiser and mover and shaker and social changer. I mean, it is unbelievable. She has already obtained hundreds of thousands of dollars for the full frame initiative. It's hers and I am a big help. I'm the lesser partner with a different full time job, but it is really her baby. This full frame initiative, her vision is that soon, one day in America, you will be funded as a full frame program, that foundations will put out calls for proposals for full frame programs.

{51:12}

AR – Right. If you don't have a full frame program, you don't get the funding.

LG – Exactly! And there will be this view in the land, this is how she talks, throughout our country there will be a view that specialized services are the bricks, and you need mortar. So there's nothing wrong with specialized services, but you need the mortar between the bricks to prevent the women from falling through the cracks.

AR – Yeah.

LG – So I am her sort of academic partner. I'm helping her think through the ideas, and think through the evaluation implications of the ideas. She's the one who sets up meetings. We just had a meeting with Federal Health and Human Services, and John Kerry's chief of staff, and she's meeting people constantly to sort of promote these ideas. And it's 2007 so check with me in, I don't know how you do this stuff, because I just keep telling her, you can't say that, we have no data. And she's like, be quiet little girl, that's not the way we do things in this world! So it's been really interesting for me as an academic to see the worth, but also the limits of data and evidence and proof. You know even I, who unabashedly leads with my values, nevertheless feel that data has a really important role.

AR – Yeah, and she's like...

LG – Yeah. You can do it, you can spend your life like a little drone getting one little piece of information to add to the wall, but meanwhile while I'm changing the world. So if you want, come with me and we'll do it. It's just been really interesting. And then she says, I got another cheque today, and it turns out she's got something. It's not just talk, she's creating a structure.

AR – The data will come, the data will come. You have to build it first and then the data will come.

LG – Exactly!

AR – Oh wow, that’s amazing.

LG – Yeah, so I feel like it’s one of the things that I do. It isn’t yet, or I don’t think it can be, the main thing I do with my time, but it’s a really wonderful place for me to sort of funnel my ideas and my data and to reach these policy goals that I’ve always had.

AR – Yeah. Well talk to me about some of your collaborations with students, because I know mentoring is such a big part of what you do. And congratulations, by the way, on your recent award from SPSSI [Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues] for your mentoring and teaching.

{53:45}

LG – And Division 35, that’s the big one.

AR – And Division 35, my gosh.

LG – Both of them are big.

AR – It was a good year for awards. So tell me about some of your collaborations with students and your mentoring. Would you say you have a philosophy of mentoring? How does that work for you?

LG – Yes, well it’s a philosophy [with a small p?] (54:04). But I think my students, my doctoral students in particular, I have to admit, are by far the best part of my job. I mean I really deeply, profoundly, love being a mentor, and I couldn’t do the other parts of my job without them. And I really feel like it benefits me and them to really take them on in a big way. We work very, very closely together, and I spend hours with each of them every week. We start out with them working on my projects usually, unless they’ve had a lot of experience somewhere else, and they come with me to meetings and they help me think about ideas, and they write, I mean they do all the things that I do. Then at some point, I like them to do something out in the field, too, in one of my projects. They’re not just following me around doing research, but they’re really working in an area, and with a particular program, that I’ve been involved with.

AR – Right.

LG – And then as soon as they are ready, we switch, and I am the second author on whatever they want to do, and I’m really supporting them. Often they’re working together, and I don’t think it’s a model that’s different than many, many, many others, but I think maybe what distinguishes my, not uniquely, I think many feminist mentors are this way as well, but it’s just that I really am open to a deep and close relationship. I find that, at least among my colleagues, that’s often not the way it goes. And there are some, like it doesn’t always work out so beautifully that way. It usually does, it usually is really, really useful and just emotionally gratifying for both parties. But you can get a bad match and that’s very painful.

AR – I'm not asking you to name names, but have there been bad matches, and if so, how have you kind of dealt with that?

LG – There's been a bad match and mostly because I think that person was not used to the flexible boundaries, to be honest. It was a he, one of the very few he's, and it didn't work out, which was interesting. I had one of my most wonderful students, [Tom Cocaw], [he] was my first student. He died when he was done with his dissertation, almost immediately, from cancer. There's a picture of him there.

{56:47}

AR – Oh okay, let me see if I can zoom in there.

LG – Yeah, could you please? He was my age and we started at Maryland together, and we were very close and I miss him. But anyway, I had another student who just didn't like that. When I went to conferences with my students, I would go to the yoga class they found for everybody. It just wasn't something he could handle. And it was painful for awhile because there's this power differential, and how do you tell your advisor that you feel uncomfortable with something they're doing. It's not easy, even when you're invited to do it because there's some weird vibe going on. But the person ended up being able to tell someone else, so we're not working together. So it wasn't a big deal, it didn't even last a year, but besides that, most of my students, many of my students, I now write with. A lot of them have become academics, or are in research positions.

AR – That must be a lot of fun then.

LG – It's so fun, it's so fun. Some of them are so much better than I am in whatever it is that they're doing. They're so much better, and I have the one that has to edit everything I write because she's such an amazing writer, and I have another who's a stats wiz that I go to. It is just so wonderful to have that kind of deep friendship, and we've just been through the trenches together, so there's just no bullshit. It just feels very easy, like a family member. And so now you can see with my students, I now have a first, second, third, fourth, and fifth year student.

AR – Oh wow.

LG – And they're all such good mentors to each other.

AR – Okay. I was curious about that, if there's inter-student mentoring.

LG – So much, so much of that. We all get together with one or two projects, and it usually just sort of falls out this way that one person's really good with methods, and one person's really good with stats, and one person's the good writer, so people on the team use each other. I've just learned so much just from hearing about their lives and from trying to understand – it's funny, I was just talking to my husband about this. As I get older, my students stay in their 20s, for the most part, and then they cross over to 30 at some point while they're here. But usually they start in their late 20s, I have an exception now who started right out of college, but usually they're in their late 20s, and I feel very lucky to get to stay so intimately involved with, and sort of

knowing deeply about the lives of people who are younger than me. I think that's going to get more and more important as I become an old bitty, to still understand.

{59:36}

AR – Yeah, that keeps you young.

LG – Yeah. You can do it a little bit in class, like you hear about the contours of life in college life, or high school life from the position of being a teacher of classes, but you don't really hear at that fine grain level about the experience of being a woman in the US. And they come from various classes, and races, and religions, so it's just an incredible, incredible privilege.

AR – Neat. Based on your experiences to date, would you have any advice for a person entering psychology who is feminist and wants to make their way in psychology? Would you have any strategies or advice that you have gleaned from your years of being a feminist in psychology?

LG – You know, to find a good mentor. I'm sure that every single person that you've interviewed says that, but just find mentors that you can really trust, and preferably ones that have invested in you already and want to invest the time. I have scrambled to find those, though I didn't have them so much as a doctoral student, but I've had them at APA and since then. And these are people that at pivotal moments, I could deeply, deeply trust to sort of show me the way.

AR – Yeah.

LG - So that's one thing, and even if it's a risk to ask – it's amazing to me how scared graduate students, or people who are deciding about the next steps in their careers, how scared they are to speak the truth to people who have more power at senior levels. I was amazed that one of my graduate students waited, I hadn't seen her in a very long time, she's post-internship, but waited five months to tell me that she was pregnant with her second child because she was so scared of what I would say. I was so shocked because I told her, 'how many times have I told you, that comes first?' But I think people get these ideas in their head, and anyway, back to the advice, to sort of be brave. And if you've picked your mentor right, and if it's a feminist psychologist, you can really hope that you'll get the answer, that you'll get someone who's really interested in what's best for you given your values, and not what's best for you given her values. So to pick your mentors carefully and then to take the risk to be honest about seeking support or help. And if that one doesn't work, then try somebody else.

**[End of DVD 1 – DVD 2 Starts here]**

AR – Okay.

LG – So I was going to say that if having a significant other, or having children, or travelling to China, is something that is really important to you, to not wait and not think that eventually you'll reach the point in your professional life where – to sort of do what you need to do and let the professional pieces, within reason, fall where they may. I think that's a really useful strategy,

within reason, but not to sacrifice too much of your personal life for your professional life because I've just seen so many people have such pain and regret about making that choice.

AR – Yeah.

LG – And collaborate, collaborate, collaborate. Don't do anything alone. People don't seem to need, like tenure committees, this is just very pragmatic, don't seem to care whether there's one author or there's two or three. So why would you do it alone? I still don't quite get why people would feel the need to go it alone when you don't have to. That should have been up there number one, to spend the time to find collaborators who are not going to be dead weight and who share a vision and who have something to offer, and who you like.

AR – Yeah. You know I totally agree, and so many times that has come up on these tapes actually, both of those: collaborate, don't go it alone, and the other thing you just said too, find good mentors. But here's kind of a personal question. Collaboration sounds really good in principle, but I find it very hard to collaborate really meaningfully and productively. I tend to think, oh well it'd just be easier to do it myself on some level. I think there's a real art to effective collaboration, and I'm trying to develop that art. Do you have any kinds of insights about that?

LG – That's such a good question. You know for me, first of all I have had several failed collaborations that are agonizing, and it is so hard. I feel like it's sort of like a marriage where you have to make sacrifices, and some people, the benefits really don't outweigh the costs. For me, they do. I don't like solitude. That was my hesitation going into academia, I just don't like solitude. And so for me, not getting things, like having to wait for other people's time frames when I could have done this months ago, or they're not the best writer and I have to re-write everything they say, or I really thought she was going to put more thought into this, she obviously dashed it out (they're always a she), those sorts of annoyances are well worth it.

AR – Yeah.

LG - To me the most painful, and I think for a lot of women, the most painful part of academic life is sitting in a room alone with your piece of paper and your notes. Then all the self doubts come pouring down: what am I doing this for anyway, who's really going to [read it]? And to me the amazing thing about collaboration is being able to puke out your ideas onto paper and then press a button and they go away, and you know that somebody you trust, who is flawed but that you trust, is going to read them now and add her own and give back to you something different. That you're not alone with the same damn set of words that you were the last time around. I mean to me that's a magical process. I just finished a book with a dear friend who is a law professor, and that's the other thing, that sometimes collaborating with someone who has something really different to bring is a good way to get out of that sort of quagmire of, I could have done that, but better.

{3:36}

AR – Right, because you really could have.

LG – You really could have. So this was my most successful collaboration ever. She was very busy and she didn't have as much time as I had hoped. She got a big promotion right before we started writing, so it took a longer time, but she was committed to however long it takes. You don't have to look at it until I add my stuff and give it back to you. And that was just an amazing process. And once you have students, you create your own best collaborators because you've worked together for so long, that they just decide to pick up where you have slack.

AR – Yeah.

LG – They decide to develop the skills that you lack. I mean more and more, it's mostly now just my students and former students that I collaborate with. But I don't want to glorify it because there have been plenty of power struggles and first authorship struggles, and feeling screwed, especially when you work with people who are much more senior than you. So I have learned that you have to spend the time, and there are going to be false starts, but finding the right collaboration, and don't stick with just one, have a couple. But for me anyway, you have to make sacrifices and the costs are worth it. That's how I see it.

AR – I'm skipping around now, but you've worked for, it looks like quite a number of years, on a Division 35 task force on violence against women?

LG – It was an APA task force.

AR – An APA task force on violence against women. Can you talk a little bit about your work on that task force, some of the issues you dealt with, some of the things you did?

LG – For the most part, a lot of what I do now is for Gwen Keita. If there is an issue related to violence against women that she needs feedback on, she can ask a task force member. What it was earlier on was we helped draft APA's stance on the Violence Against Women Act, which has been brought back for reauthorization several times since the original, [which] I think was in 1994.

AR – Okay.

{5:37}

LG – So over the years we've helped APA develop its stance. They have a resolution on violence against women and it stands on various issues involving violence against women. The APA sponsor and the task force wrote this book that I mentioned, *No safe haven*. Really, if there's anything on domestic violence awareness month, or something, we're the APA's go-to people on violence related issues.

AR – Okay.

LG – There was another task force that developed after ours on domestic violence in particular, that I wasn't on, that I think helped APA develop its stance on issues like custody for women



whose partners are abusive, which is still often lost. But ours was more sexual assault, domestic violence, sexual harassment. It was sort of the broad overview. APA [and] the public policy office was, when I got there, was trying to develop a series of orientations to violence that we helped them develop over the years, and that they're still using.

AR – Okay. Now let me ask a question that is in a way both related to and not related to the fact that you're a psychologist. It has more to do with the fact that you are an expert and that you've had so much experience working with women who have experienced both violence of various forms, and domestic violence. What do you think are some of the biggest reasons why we haven't been able to get rid of that problem? Your thoughts?

LG – Oh my goodness, that's such a gigantic problem. I should add that to my list of questions that I'm so fearful of when I go talk about my book. What are all the horrible, horrible questions I can get!

AR – Yeah, it's a huge question.

LG – Despite the fact that we have poured so much time and money and energy into the problem, and we have, not enough, but we have, it's barely made a dent. And I think that has to do with patriarchy, gender roles, and all of the things feminists talk about. I also think it has, on more of a sort of fine grain level, I think that our response to domestic violence has sort of been at odds with what women actually need. And that is the subject of this book. I think that we made a decision as feminists, in the '60s and '70s, to focus a laser beam on the idea that domestic violence, for example, crosses class lines. That it is a problem of rich white people just as it is a problem of low income people. And of course that's true, but it's not the whole truth, because in fact it is a class problem. I mean, domestic violence occurs much more in impoverished communities, for obvious reasons.

AR – Yeah.

{8:35}

LG – I think they're obvious. Women can't escape, and they have no choices, and there's a lot more stress in the family, and male unemployment is associated with domestic violence. So I think that many of our efforts have focused on the sort of middle class white, this ideal of this completely blameless victim, when in fact women often hit back, and they have millions of problems in their lives with domestic violence being one among many. And so we, in our sort of white middle class feminist way, focus on this cannot be happening to you, this is a gender problem, you have to leave your family, your community, your partner. And in fact the women who are being victimized don't understand it that way, and see it as one among a whole complex set of problems. And they're not about to leave their community, or even their partner necessarily, and they're certainly not going to leave the only economic stability they have, or often they're not. So I think some of the problem is that our responses in the criminal justice system, and our advocacy responses, and certainly our mental health responses, don't address the needs of the people who want to escape violent relationships.

AR – Right.

LG – That doesn't get to the root causes, it's sort of like how we cut it down as it happens. But I think the root causes, there are just a million theories out there. I buy the patriarchy one, with complexities and nuances, because women do have their share of aggression to. But I think we don't really know. I think that it's a big fat mystery why, even despite patriarchy and gender role socialization, and traditional views of men and women, we have not made a dent in it over the last bunch of decades.

AR – Okay. Well let me wrap up by asking you if there's anything, I mean there's lots that I haven't asked you, but is there anything that I haven't asked you that you particularly would like to include in the tape?

LG – I think you're amazing to be doing this. I just want that on film! I love so much that you're doing this. It's such a great project and it's been really fun. And is there anything about my life or my thoughts on feminist psychology? Oh my god, I'm sure there'll be a million once you walk out the room. I guess I can say that it's such a good life to be a feminist psychologist. I'm so glad I am, and I feel like it's a window onto our profession and onto academia, and onto social issues and social justice. It certainly works for me, and I think it works for so many women. You know my young graduate students coming in, I think it's a way of sort of seeing that is really, really, really rich and nuanced and valuable. So I'm sad that when I ask who among you is feminist in my psych of women classes, no one ever raises their hand. I'm happy that I get some by the end, but I hope that it's a field that is going to blossom, because I think it's really a wonderful career path.

©Psychology's Feminist Issues, 2017