Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History Project
Interview with Maria Gurevich

Interviewed by Jenna MacKay and Tal Davidson
Toronto, ON
June 17, 2015

When citing this interview, please use the following citation:

Gurevich, M. (2015, June 17). Interview by J. MacKay and T. Davidson [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

©Psychology's Feminist Voices, 2015

Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History Project
Interview with Maria Gurevich
Interviewed by Jenna MacKay and Tal Davidson
Toronto, ON
June 17, 2015

MG: Maria Gurevich, interview participant
JM: Jenna MacKay, interviewer
TD: Tal Davidson, interviewer

JM: If we could start with you stating your name, place and data of birth for the record that would be great.

MG: My name is Maria Gurevich and the date of birth is December 25th, 1963.

JM: And what was your place of birth?

MG: My place of birth was Odessa, the former USSR. So I guess it's now controversially considered part of Ukraine.

JM: So maybe we can start with you telling us about the emergence of your feminist identity.

MG: Right, I looked at that question and I was thinking about the fact that it was actually quite a long story. I feel like the feminist identity predated me, so I feel I was fortunate enough to be born into a family where it was a given that feminism would be my identity even though there wasn't necessarily a language for it. Having said that, I was born in Russia to a long line of women on both sides of my family, grandmothers, great grandmothers, who were all really well educated. On my mom's side my grandmother was an army physician and then an emergency medicine physician for her entire life. My mom has a PhD in comparative literature and has been an academic for most of her life as well. On my dad's side, my grandmother trained as a nurse. She didn't actually end up doing nursing work but certainly she was well educated. So I come from a long familial line where the assumption is that women have the same rights in terms of employment. Certainly it was not the case that there was always equality in terms of other family roles and household duties. Those kinds of things continued to be problems in Russia, as it is here in Canada and elsewhere. But certainly there was an assumption that a women's voice and a woman's place at work and at home was equal, and sometimes even more than equal in certain domains. Feminism started before I was there. I was an only child too, which in some ways was probably quite helpful because there were no comparisons about anything. I was treated as a very loved, cared for and respected person from an early age by both my parents. Expectations for participation in math and science were never a question. I loved math, I loved playing with numbers, I loved science, that was never discouraged [2:43]. There was never any discussion of "you need to do something else" I feel like it's a long story in some ways, but a really good story in the sense that the language of feminism wasn't always in the household, but it was in the environment that I lived and breathed in. There was no question that there was an interest in equity and justice. Not just about justice and rights that have to do with men and women, but activism and political discussions and conversations were always had in the house. Political discussions, access to art and literature and history, an awareness that to be a full citizen one needs to be enculturated in a range of ways about a range of issues.

JM: What a great environment to grow up in.

MG: I'm not saying it was a blissful home environment in every other way. Families are always complicated. But certainly in terms of those issues there was never any question. Being a woman was not a barrier to anything; I never had to explain or fight for those kinds of things in my family. And certainly as I was getting older, there were more explicit pronouncements and coaching about that from both my parents, because they were aware of the fact that as a woman, as a young woman, and as a woman who might get certain kinds of attention, there were conversations about, "What do you want to be valued for? What are the priorities in appearance versus intellect?" and those kinds of things. We had conversations about those kinds of things, what you want the world to pay attention to. So it started pretty early.

JM: You said that this predated the language of feminism; do you remember when that label or theory or movement became a part of your identity more formally?

MG: Probably in high school, although again I don't remember the word feminism used explicitly, but I certainly remember teachers who were using assignments to deconstruct and address gender and discrimination. Discussion topics and debates were being set up as assignments for us to look at sexism, the lack of equity and those kinds of things. So again, it's interesting that I don't remember the use of the word "feminism" explicitly until university, but those conversations were being had in other ways.

TD: Were you in Canada at the time?

MG: Yeah, those were Canadian days. I left Russia when I was 8, and travelled a circuitous route to Italy, Israel, the US, and I was 13 by the time I got here. Most of that is pretty formative, but my most formative upbringing was here [in Canada]. So feminism was in the air, always, but the language wasn't always there until I took - I was going to say until I took a gender course, although I forget what it was called in those days as it was more than 20 years ago, I think a "sex role differences" course at U of T [University of Toronto] as an undergraduate. But actually it was happening before because I was interested in feminist issues, activism, even though the language wasn't necessarily always there [6:24]. So I was getting involved with groups and students who were doing various kinds of things. That was happening even before the course.

JM: Can you tell us about some of the things you were involved with on campus at that time?

MG: Yeah, mostly there were informal things. Gatherings where we viewed or screened films that would have been relevant, so *Killing Us Softly*, which is a primer for so many young men and women getting introduced to some of those issues. Kind of just being drawn to and gravitating towards groups of women mostly, although occasionally there were a few men in those groups, who were interested in discussing those issues. It was activism at a small 'a' level. It wasn't necessarily that we were always doing something but we were having conversations, engaging in larger debates about the kinds of things that were interesting to all of us. Talking about what the climate was like for women on campus, those kinds of things.

TD: What was that climate like?

MG: Mostly good, I would say. But it's hard to say. I know that there were some things that I was finding a little discomforting. It's the memory of having a sense that things weren't quite as equal as they could be, but it's hard for me to actually pinpoint what those individual particular cases might be because some of them are in that realm of benevolent sexism, that terminology we have now that we didn't have then. This is going back thirty years ago (8:16), so it's hard to remember some of the specific instances. Part of that, I think, is that you're at that age where you're awakening and you're [becoming politicized] in a different kind of way and lots of other influences are happening. Some of that stuff was happening and some of it was just sort of being hypersensitive and attuned to things because I was suddenly vigilant about things I hadn't been vigilant to before. It's hard to say there was something pivotal. I didn't have any specific experiences where I felt like I was specifically discriminated against, or things that I witnessed. It's more just the sense that sometimes you're viewed a little differently, and sometimes your words don't count as much as you might like them to.

JM: At this time you're in university, did you start out with Psychology? What attracted to Psychology, how did you end up studying it?

MG: Yeah, so the attraction certainly was not Psychology, initially. In fact, I'm not even sure I knew Psychology existed as a discipline at the time. It certainly wasn't on my radar. I started off, because I was on the science and math track, I started off in sciences. I was going to be moving towards a track of speech pathology. Don't ask me why. It seemed like an interesting idea at the time, there's a boring story about that, but that's what I thought I'd be doing. I thought I'd be doing speech pathology, whatever that was. I didn't know exactly what that was, but I thought it would allow me to pursue some of my interests in science and to work with kids, because I thought that's what I want to do at the time [9:57].

Then, very quickly I realized I was no longer interested in those courses. I think I got a D in biology my first year, so that was the first hint, which was very different from what my high school experience was like, and I was just bored. I was bored taking physiology classes, even some of the early stats classes although later ones in Psychology were more interesting. I was not stimulated, and I took some of the range of things like Psychology, Philosophy, English. Those were the things that were more interesting to me so I felt more of a draw, an affinity, particularly to Psychology and Philosophy, but I stayed with Psychology for a little while longer.

Then after a while, as you know, the restrictions are such that you have to declare a major. There's not much room to pursue other things. So Philosophy's sort of been a sideline love that I would have liked to pursue had I done it all over again, but Psychology certainly satisfied some of my boredom at the time. And my curiosity about the potential, at least, for certain kinds of questions. Those questions were not always being asked, certainly not always being answered. But I felt like it opened up a world to some of the kinds of questions that I was interested in about human behaviour, human motivation, assumptions that we make about what we think people are like or really like. Ways in which we think we know ourselves but don't really. All of those kinds of things that felt compelling to me. So it became interesting pretty quickly. And I had some wonderful profs - as you know, often that's one of the things [that inspires you]. I had wonderful science teachers in high school, so that was useful then, but I had these wonderful Psychology professors in university right from the first one, which was in Convocation Hall [at the University of Toronto], so 1000 people, you don't really think you'd be able to make a connection with a professor in that environment, but this was somebody who was just a very compelling, dynamic instructor who was only there for a few years. She was a young instructor who was there I think maybe for a post-doc. Karen Hollis was her name, I don't know whatever happened to her, but she was a wonderful professor. She was able to make you feel that in a room of a thousand people like she was actually talking to you and interested in everyone. That made a difference. There were a few professors that were like that, that were dynamic and inspiring. So then you just stay [laughs]. And then I started working in a psych physiology lab as a research assistant and got to know the grad students. Even though psych physiology was not what I ultimately ended up wanting to do, I enjoyed the environment and the kind of intellectual and collegial atmosphere that was happening there. So it started to feel appealing to be in that environment.

TD: Do you recall any other professors that come to the front of your mind in how they helped you along in acclimating to psychology as something you were ready to bring into your identity?

MG: In those early years, I have to say probably almost all of them. I really was really lucky. I got an amazing education. I was at U of T [University of Toronto] at the time. I know U of T sometimes gets a bad reputation for being a cold place, maybe I was there at the right time. But apart from that initial class of a thousand people, later there were smaller classes that felt like [13:44]- I was fortunate enough to get to study under Endel Tulving, Gus [Fergus] Craik, some of the people who were the early figures in cognitive psychology. And some younger folks who were in social psych, gender and other kinds of things, memory. It was in many ways a very conventional undergraduate education, in terms of the topics, but really interesting, really gratifying, and I found myself really interested in all of it. So I would say all of them. Doug Creelman I can certainly remember as one of the important ones in terms of my later undergraduate years, because that's when I took history of psych and theory. And Diane Reilly, a sessional instructor who also worked at CAMH [Centre for Addiction and Mental Health] at the time, who did the theory course. Doug did the history course and she did the theory course. It was a group of really fabulous professors who weren't just researchers. Researchers get maligned frequently for just being researchers, and sometimes rightly so. But these people knew how to be in the classroom as well, so I was very lucky.

JM: Did any of these professors introduce you to critical perspectives in Psychology, or did that come later?

MG: And that's why I mentioned the history and theory, because those were the courses where that was introduced for the first time. That certainly was an awakening and really exciting. I didn't even know what to do with it afterwards. I didn't get a chance to pursue much of that at the graduate level for a range of reasons which we'll probably get into, but certainly that was the opening to "here's another way." That was the first time I read [Mary] Gergen, Rom Harré, all of those folks, it was the introduction to all of them.

JM: So we can talk a little bit about your graduate training.

MG: Sure, sure, what would you like to know?

JM: Maybe where was it, what was your experience like? You mentioned that you weren't able to explore some of those more critical interests or questions.

MG: Right. Yeah, it was at York University. The first year was actually the best year for the possibility of exploring critical perspectives because I actually had a history course with Kurt Danziger, whose book is on the shelf there, and David Bakan. So it was a wonderful introduction. I thought the rest of my graduate career would be like that. It made me excited, but the rest of it was nothing like that [laughs]. That was my one exposure initially. After first year, there wasn't anything else that was like that. There wasn't anything else that was in the critical domain. I was working with a supervisor who was really wonderful, but not interested in the same kinds of things that I was interested in. I was okay with that for a while at the Master's level. I think I was on automatic pilot a little bit and just excited to be in grad school like a lot of students are. "I'm in, yay!" And just going on the treadmill for a while, doing something that was sort of a compromise position in terms of my Master's thesis which was somewhere between his interests and mine [17:24]. That worked out fine, and then at the PhD I continued with him, but I was starting to get restless about "I'm interested in other things, I don't know what they are yet, but they're not what I'm working on now." I certainly had a sense that critical approaches were interesting, historical, more theory, more analysis of gender. I knew all that was buzzing in my head, but I didn't really know what to do with it because there weren't, frankly, that many people [interested in these things]. I'm not sure how many there are now. There weren't that many, and some people who were explicitly feminist were not necessarily people I had things in common with. So I was kind of treading water for a while.

JM: Can you explain a little bit about what you mean about people who were feminist that you didn't have anything in common with, maybe what those differences were?

MG: Right. Some of the topics they were studying were not things I would have been interested in. So I don't want to get into names, especially because it's part of the archive, where some of those people you may have interviewed or will. But they just were not asking the questions that I thought - I wasn't sure exactly what I was interested in, but I knew I wasn't interested in those questions. So that was part of it, I guess.

Also, I was well versed at that point, and trained in, experimental methodology, and statistics and positivist epistemologies. I needed to move away from that, but I wasn't sure how yet. A window was opened in those one or two courses at the undergraduate level, but I still didn't know what there was to be done. And certainly there were a couple of people who were doing qualitative work, but again, it wasn't qualitative work that resonated for me in terms of the critical piece. It still felt like positivist qualitative work, and although I didn't know what the next step was, I knew it wasn't that.

So yes, the graduate years were kind of a struggle in terms of finding that identity and then switching topics. I got funded to do my PhD, which is now CIHR but then was MRC, the Medical Research Council fellowship, that's how long ago it was, it was a different council name [laughs]. I got funded to do a project that was a continuation of my Master's, so that was great at first. I got money and then I spent the year doing a major research paper that was an offshoot of that and ended up doing more of a feminist critical analysis, this was premenstrual symptomology that I was looking at. So I ended up doing a historical overview and getting kind of disillusioned with the area. I was able to publish the work, great. But it got me to do something else, but I realized that I could no longer do the project that I was funded to do, so I abandoned that completely and started from scratch to find what else I was interested in. It eventually led me to do what I ended up doing, which was work with HIV positive women and looking at identity renegotiation, doing qualitative work, and training myself to do all of that [20:49]. It was a kind of isolating experience in that sense, because I wanted to stay with my supervisor because he was safe, he was a very decent person and still is – we're still in touch a lot and I'll be seeing him at APA [American Psychological Association] soon – so I knew he was a known quantity and I wanted to stay with that because I certainly heard some horror stories about some of the supervisors. He was very supportive of my interests, both in content and methodologically, but it's not like I could actually get real guidance about what I was doing. So I was auditing courses in sociology, and I ended up petitioning to get Deborah Britzman, who is a faculty of education professor, who was the closest person who knows something about the work I wanted to do, ?. When I look at it in retrospect, I was piecing together, in a very piecemeal way, in a choppy way, things that I needed to nourish me intellectually. But it wasn't really ever enough nourishment. It wasn't really happening, it took a long time for that to happen and it didn't happen until I got out of grad school, actually. So when we come to the advice portion, I'll have some advice about that [laughs]. I learned mine the hard way. It was timing, being at a particular time and place and I think my reluctance to do something less safe, to maybe stop the clock for a year, get out of grad school, think about what I really want to do, come back. You know, there are other options, right? But I wasn't going to take some of those options, so it took longer in some ways because of that.

JM: As you were kind of figuring out what you were looking for or what you needed, you mentioned that you kept identifying what it wasn't, or what you didn't want to need. Did you ever find what fed you, or were there any key books, or was it piecemealing these learnings from different disciplines, different courses, little nuggets rather than an "aha" moment?

MG: I don't think I had the "aha" moment until I was out of grad school. I think there were certainly periods where I was very committed to the work. On an interpersonal level I knew it was important work and there wasn't much being done with HIV positive women and there still isn't, shockingly, 30 years later. So I knew that I was doing something that was important, that was valuable. I knew I could make a contribution. I loved the actual interviewing piece, getting to know the women. It was a really long process of getting into the community as an outsider, so that took a long time. So all of that was really gratifying. Doing all of that work and what I was able to learn from them, what I was able to produce later as a result of that, and I followed that up in my postdoctoral work too. So I guess it continued for a long time. It was certainly very gratifying in a lot of ways, but it still didn't feel like "ahh, this is the thing", the way I feel now where I can't wait to be in here every day and I can't wait to write the next thing I'm writing or read the next thing I'm reading. I didn't feel like that for a very long time, actually. It's okay, it happened later.

JM: So can you tell us about what happened after grad school?

MG: After grad school, I was fortunate enough to actually do a post-doctoral fellowship in Halifax with a woman whose work I came across accidentally while I was finishing my PhD. Cynthia Mathieson was her name, and she's elsewhere now, but her work was actually on cancer and identity renegotiation [25:02]. So I came across some of her work and I just felt like it was a little bit of an ‘aha’ moment where I felt like, “Oh, I’m lost, but here’s at least a methodology,” “Here’s someone else who’s interested in questions of identity,” which were things that were consistently interesting to me and continue to be a thread. So I ended up doing a post-doc with her. I was fortunate enough to be able to do that, get funding for that and then go work with her for a couple of years in Nova Scotia. And that was great, so I continued to learn more about qualitative work.

Then that was over, that was two years, and I did some teaching, which was great. It was the beginning of being able to do teaching, which is incredibly terrifying but also incredibly gratifying. That was wonderful because I got to teach courses in gender, sexuality, all the things that I actually enjoy, so that was wonderful. Then I started looking for a job, and as you know, academic jobs are never that easy to come by. About every 30 to 40 years there’s a little bit of a glut, but certainly it was probably one of the worst times to graduate at that point, so I spent about a year looking for work, getting a few nibbles of interviews. At least I was able to get some interviews, but nothing panned out. I then had another opportunity to come back to Toronto and do another post-doctoral fellowship at the Princess Margaret Hospital that pulled me back into an area that I was not interested in, yet again. But it paid the rent and allowed me to continue to do research, which I wanted to do. But I got pulled back into doing quantitative work and positivist work and there wasn’t really any room for critical anything. It’s a hospital environment, there are different considerations. The political and funding considerations are different. It served its purpose for a time. There are things I enjoyed about it, things I didn’t enjoy about it, but it wasn’t until I started my job here at Ryerson in 2001 that I actually - you can see, it’s a long, long trajectory, right? Makes you really take a breath - before I started to feel like there’s some room now, I have a real job that’s permanent, I can start to do the kinds of things I might want to do. It was a long road to get into that.

TD: Were you able to pick up your interests wholesale once you got established here at Ryerson?

MG: No, that took a while as well. Your past follows you always. So my CV looked like it had huge snippets of feminist and qualitative work, but it looked like a more conventional CV, and that’s what people hired me for. They wanted me to teach certain things and do certain things and apply for certain kinds of grants and that’s what I was here for. So it took a while to kind of get off that train. That work follows you around, then you make commitments to people to do other projects that you’re semi-interested in, but not completely. And if you take those commitments seriously, which I did, I wanted to finish them before I could move onto other things.

So it took a while to kind of say goodbye to all of that and finally say I’m not going to have my attention dispersed in three different directions anymore. I just want to do the gender and sexuality piece. I don’t know how many years ago it was that that happened, but that was the second part of my career here [28:56]. It was closing those doors, finally, in a way that felt like I could live with myself because I didn’t let anyone down when I closed those doors. And being able to completely give myself to the work that I'm doing now. Once I was able to do that, I was able to feel like this is home in every single way. I'm able to give so much to my students as a result of that, I'm able to have students that are just incredible. It's a big lesson in doing what you really love to do, because then you could do more for other people as well. I'm getting ahead of myself in terms of that question later, but it doesn't hurt to say a few times!

JM: This relates to one of the questions I had, which you kind of touched on, but I noticed in your CV there's the more, you know, mainstream health psychology, and then the really critical, qualitative work.

MG: Right, a bifurcated identity [laughs].

JM: What was it like having a foot in both of those worlds, and having to speak almost two different languages?

MG: Yeah, I think that's a really lovely way of putting it. It really is speaking two different languages, and I think it took a toll. I think it's okay to do that for a while -

JM: It probably helped, right? To open up doors for tenure, or…

MG: Exactly. It opened up a bunch of doors. It is what got me this job initially, although I don't know if I wouldn't have gotten a job if I wasn't doing anything else at the time. Given what they needed at the time, I was a fit. So yeah, it did certainly open up a bunch of doors, and doors of legitimacy. But I wouldn't advise that as the way to do things, because other doors close and you waste a lot of time. I feel like I could have spent 20 years doing what I absolutely adored instead of doing things that I kind of was partially interested in and good at, but my heart wasn't really in it. It's a big price to pay.

So yeah, definitely two different languages that were kind of even fun for a while – for a while it's sort of a challenge to say, "Oh, I'm multilingual," to continue your metaphor. And given my background of moving, having this peripatetic existence as a kid, it's almost in a way very comfortable moving between different worlds. But after a while it just started to be annoying and a burden and it felt like I wasn't understood in some of those spaces and I got tired of not being completely understood and having to explain myself.

JM: Were you ever able to insert your critical perspective into that world?

MG: I think I was always inserting it at every possible opportunity, because I'm not somebody who easily keeps their mouth shut. So the insertions happen whether I try to keep them in or not. They just happen because I ask questions that people don't always ask, or that people don't always want to hear. But it fell on deaf ears much of the time, so it was kind of frustrating at various points [32:11].

TD: Can you tell me about if, in your more health-oriented or positivistic research, it was hard to find a community of feminist academics. Did they sort of become your audience when you were able to make that shift over to critical work?

MG: Audience in what way?

TD: Did you find a group of feminist peers, or were you able to continue producing the work but for deaf ears?

MG: I have to make the distinction between feminist peers that were academics, but were not my academic feminist peers, if you know what I mean. Because of who I was drawn to personally, my closest friends and colleagues were always avowedly feminist, so we still had that in common. I certainly wasn't isolated in that sense. Socially, interpersonally, that was never the case. It's just that we weren't always doing the same work. Some of those close feminist friends were also in similar positions, where they had their feminist identity the rest of the time, or even critical identity, if you will, but were doing work that was mainstream, and that continues to be the case for a few of them as well. I suppose in terms of publications or going to conferences, those kinds of things, the audience shifted, but I always had a strong foot in SWAP [Section for Women and Psychology] and Division 35 of APA [American Psychological Association] in some ways. So I continued to always go to the conferences and the smaller meetings, where even if I wasn't presenting I wanted to listen and just be surrounded by that space, because my connection was always very strong and it just grew, I guess.

TD: In those meetings were you able to find pockets of work that did nurture that spark in you?

MG: Yeah, there were, even while I was at PMH [Princess Margaret Hospital] I was involved in a special issue for *Canadian Psychologist* that was kind of a retrospective of "Where is psychology of women 20 or 30 years later?" So I think you might have seen that somewhere in the CV, and I worked on that with a bunch of people. Then a bunch of women that had been the foremothers, I guess you would say, of feminist psychology in Canada. So there were pockets of that happening, where I was able to have that as a sideline, so I could still do that. And because I was involved in SWAP for a ridiculous amount of time, I think it was 13 years I was the abstract coordinator. I think that one of the reasons I held onto that position was one of those cases where I could still be part of a feminist community and identity in some way while I was doing work that mostly wasn't. It sort of kept me in there, plus, you know, people always need volunteers, and if you don't say no you just get rolled over to the next year, so that just continues.

One day, I literally woke up – I know people say literally a lot these days – but I actually thought, "Oh my god, how long has it been?" and realized that it had been 12 years at that point, and I stayed on for an extra year. [35:50] It went by very quickly. But it was good work, it was important, and also being involved in the student adjudication of prizes, I loved doing as well, because I loved working with students always and that continues to be really important. So it was nice to be able to be part of providing bursaries for students and awards and seeing what the talent was, and what kinds of things junior researchers were doing. That was really exciting as well.

TD: What kind of mentorship role have you taken on for junior researchers?

MG: You'd have to ask them, I guess! Which you can. In fact, I don't know, that'd be an interesting offshoot of the project if some of the people you spoke to asked their students what they'd say about them. It's certainly something that's really important to me. The things that I learned about integrity, about loyalty, I learned from a number of mentors I've had all along, that were mostly not in the feminist camp but had other features that I really valued, like my supervisor at the graduate level, and at the undergraduate level as well. They had qualities that are incredibly important to me, like treating students with respect. We all say those things, but really doing it is a different thing. I felt that I got a lot of respect. I was very lucky that I actually had people, that even when I didn't know what the hell I was doing on any level, to be under their wing at various points and they were very kind and provided a lot of guidance, even if it wasn't within critical or feminist or qualitative psychology. I feel like I learned a lot there that I continue to do.

But in terms of the feminist piece, I feel so fortunate to provide an environment where you walk in the door and you know you don't have to self-label, you know what this environment is, you know what we're reading, you know what we're talking about, we're all kind of on the same page, we speak the same language and it's funny you said that because those are words I use all the time. I work with people, with my students, who speak the same language that I do. That language grows, it gets reconfigured and it gets richer and it becomes more interesting. I have learned an incredible amount from them, what things they read that I hadn't read, but also their creativity, their writing, not just my writing. There's a lot I give to them in terms of teaching them how to write, but they also bring a lot in terms of their creative pieces about "Here's a different way to say this, here's a different way to analyze this piece of text." They're full collaborators, and if you look at my CV, I don't think I've had a single publication that's solo authored in many years, my students are all involved in everything that I do because I just feel like it's a joint effort. It's hard to separate, often, where I stop and they begin, because we do so much of the work together. It's a really critical piece, I mean, they're my colleagues here.

Ryerson University is a wonderful environment in a lot of ways, but I am really the only explicit feminist and the only explicit critical psychologist here. There are a few people that do qualitative work, but it's not of the kind that I do, so my students are my colleagues, and they're valued colleagues. My work has grown exponentially as a result of working with them, so yeah, it's wonderful [39:48]. I don't know how much of that is the mentorship piece. It's more what I feel I get from them, but it's one of those things were you don't want to kind of toot your own horn. I know from my interactions with them, it's not just the awards they nominate me for and all those things that have to do with mentorship, you know you're working with people that feel happy they're working with you. They enjoy what they do, so it's worked out really well.

JM: Sounds so collaborative. Sounds really lovely.

MG: Yeah, it is, yeah.

JM: Now that you've switched gears and you're only doing critical work in sexuality and gender, can you talk a little bit about what that experience is like? On the one hand it sounds like it's awesome, but then you're the only one in the department doing the work.

MG: You know, that has both a benefit and a cost. The cost is that there aren't like-minded people to collaborate with, so when you're looking at committee members that's one thing that I think is the biggest cost. When I'm looking for members of a committee for my students for theses and dissertations, that's a little bit tricky. I can get the qualitative piece, it's a little bit harder to get the critical piece. I have to say I'm fortunate there are a number of colleagues here that are very open and receptive, even though that's not their training and their language, they're willing to learn, and they're becoming [more receptive] as a result of having now been on a few committees and reading a few comps [comprehensive] papers and all of that. They have been surprisingly on board and receptive. There are certainly a few people that I know that the wheels are also turning for them, which is interesting, seeing them kind of say "Oh, maybe this is work I'd like to dip my toe into." There's a little bit of that happening.

The benefit, in some ways, surprisingly, is that I kind of get left alone to do what I want to do because in some ways people don't understand it. So it's like, people are very respectful. We have a really good, respectful environment, but there is a kind of understanding that "what Maria does is not what we do" and "she's talking about these people called [Michel] Foucault and [Judith] Butler and post-structuralism and epistemology" and "what is that word she uses all the time?" And so we have a joking, really nice playful way of addressing the fact that there is a difference between me and what the rest of the people do, but I feel really respected and valued. So I feel like I just get to do what I want to do.

In some way there's not any competition about "am I producing the same amount as the other people," or do I have the same number of publications or grants or any of that. I'm not involved in that world. There are these sorts of clusters of people who are all involved in the cognition group, or the neuro group, and I see more of that [43:08]. Some of them are always comparing, and I have nobody to compare myself to, so it's kind of nice. I get left alone, so it's just my students. And then people I interact with at conferences, and through my editorial work, and those kinds of things. So it's worked out fine. I mean, it'd be lovely to have – we've had a few opportunities for hiring a few feminists actually in the last couple of years, and unfortunately it didn't work out. It's certainly disappointing, it would have been really nice to have one other person to play with here in that way, but maybe it'll still happen, who knows. Before I retire. So far it doesn't detract from what I do, I don't actually even have enough time to do all the things that I want to do, so it hasn't detracted from my idea generation or productivity or any of that stuff. And maybe I am just used to being an only child, so I'm okay playing by myself, I don't feel lonely, it's fine [laughs].

JM: You kind of touched on this, but one of the things we were hoping you'd talk more about is your relationship to methods and epistemology in psychology.

MG: Yeah, what would you like to know about that?

JM: Perhaps your evolution to more post-structural theory, you often take a discourse analysis – what draws you to these ways of thinking and these methods? What do you feel they offer psychology?

MG: In some ways, I feel like when you asked about the 'aha' moments, those were the 'aha' moments for me. Once I actually felt I understood, not just got a taste of, which happens for a lot of people for a long time, but actually immersed myself in that work and read it really closely and read it over and over again. I felt like I found home in a way that I never had before in psychology. It's both the epistemology but also the methodologies and they work together, but it's really about thinking about what claims you can make about knowledge, what claims you can make about knowledge production, about truth, about what counts as legitimate knowledge. Having that approach and being immersed in that allows me to be much more intellectually honest about the utility of what it is that we do.

I still am a big believer that experimental methods are really useful for a lot of questions that we have, including a lot of feminist questions that we have. And in fact I think they have a lot of political power and expediency. Good experimental work is something that I always use a lot in my teaching, still. It's very compelling, there are decades of good social psychology work in that area. I think you can make a lot of changes by demonstrating facts of certain kinds. But we also know what the problems are with assumptions about objectivity, neutrality, and the omission of subjectivity; the claims about universality, about representativeness; the kind of people we continue to study, which are mostly self-selected university students of a particular niche – a demographic niche, an age niche, et cetera. So yeah, I feel like I'm able to do more honest work that feels like I'm not claiming to discover the truth of humanity, but I'm able to ask really interesting questions and get a layer of depth about parts of humanity and aspects of humanity that are interesting [47:09].

And I'm able to do the political analysis, so that's the other appealing part of post-structuralism and discourse analysis that I do, at least. It's inherently a political enterprise. So we're always asking questions about what are the legal, economic, cultural pressures and filters through which we ask and are allowed to ask certain questions or not. What are the filters through which we become this thing called "I," this thing called "self," this thing called "self-concept?" All of those cherished concepts we have in psychology about self-efficacy and internal locus of control and all of that stuff – I'm able to look at those questions through the lens of "what are all of those forces that shake that? What is our historical location?" It just feels like a fit for me on so many levels about how I kind of think – I was going to say instinctively, but I don't even know that. That's a problematic concept as we know from a critical perspective – but certainly from the way I've been raised, the fact that I've travelled so much as a child, the fact that I had to speak multiple languages and still do, and think about multiple identities. There are some universals, there are very few that are complete universals, it's much more of a fit for me in terms of the way I see the world and how human beings come to be, develop, how they're shaped, what their potential is. It fits all of those levels that allow me to tie the politics together with questions of research and science.

And I love the analysis, that's the other thing. I love doing discourse analysis. There are few things that I love more than actually sitting with text and analyzing it. Whether it's someone's words, or visual text, or other kinds of text. My mind enjoys doing that, I enjoy doing that. Unpacking, pulling on the threads, what does this actually mean, what claims are people actually making as they say this, what subject positions are they adopting, what kind of identity do they want to present, what are they justifying, what are they saying they don't want to be a part of? These are things that fascinate me, so I can do that all day long every day. I get to do that.

JM: I know that one of the areas you were focusing on is discourse of desire and female sexuality, can you talk a little bit about what these approaches bring to that field of psychology?

MG: Yeah, again, I think it comes back to this idea of what we think we know about things like sexual health, sexual identity. There are a lot of assumptions that we make, both from popular discourse, but also in sexology or scientific discourse about sexuality. Assumptions about normalcy, about health, about what pleasure means, what satisfaction means, what having control means. The buzz words, like "empowerment" which is very popular these days, or the debates we've had the feminist debates which you may be familiar with as well, recently, about the bifurcation that seems to happen sometimes, the polarization between empowerment and oppression. I find those questions really interesting and I'm interested in getting underneath those divides, those polarizations that I think are artificial and don't address how complicated the question of desire is, how complicated the question of pleasure is, of owning something as your own, of saying either to yourself or to others what you might like or what you might not like, what it might mean to protect yourself, what it might mean to give yourself over to something [51:44]. Those are incredibly complicated questions that I don't think are answerable by two or three variables that we can measure, and they are questions that involve, again, politics, largely. Sara McLelland and Michelle Fine have done some really wonderful work recently on a concept they call "intimate justice," which is a beautiful concept and not only is their work incredibly rigorous and very thoughtful, that's the kind of work I'm interested in. What I would aspire to do is to look at those complicated questions of desire, pleasure, of what's possible and what's not possible, by looking at a range of things that influence people's lives and deconstructing the assumptions that we make about all of those concepts and what makes it possible to have the things that we call "empowered things." It's incredibly difficult to do that in real life. Those are ongoing interesting questions for me.

TD: Those are such relevant things to the way we interact everyday with almost everybody, and I'm wondering if there are any pressing changes to the discourse that you think, in the kind of work you do or otherwise, should be happening?

MG: Yeah, it should. Do you mean in the discourse of psychology, or the popular discourse?

TD: I think in popular discourse, because the popular discourse permeates the psychology research we do with empowerment and desire.

MG: Yeah, that's why I asked about the popular stuff, because I think you're right, I think that piece is really important in a bi-directional kind of way. They're feeding each other in a loop constantly. One of the circulating discourses that I find difficult and troubling, and difficult in the classroom to actually discuss that's an ongoing thing – because I teach courses in sexuality and gender both at the undergraduate and graduate level and it comes up everywhere, and gender and health so it comes up a lot – is this concept of choice. Empowerment is one piece, and then the buddy, the twin of empowerment is choice these days. For young women in particular. For young men as well, but they're less likely in our classrooms to speak up because there are fewer of them, because psychology is more female dominated at the moment. Even in the classes that are not exclusively psychology, there are still more women that tend to take these kinds of courses.

So this idea of choice and that whole neoliberal concept of self-actualization, empowerment, autonomy and being able to exercise a range of playful pleasures, all of that – I think that is a conversation we need to be having more both in psychology and in the larger culture, and those are things that I challenge my students to think about. What does it mean to say, "I chose to wear this" or "I chose to perform this act" or "I chose to say this?" What does choice actually mean? Where does choice come from? What are the constraints of choice? What are the things that make choice possible? There are a lot of questions to be asked about that concept [55:55]. It can be a very deceptively comforting concept for all of us, but particularly I think when you're trying to figure things out as a young woman it can give you, and understandably so for a while, a sense of control and a sense that you are your own decision maker in a lot of ways, which can be useful for a while.

But there is a price to be paid when some of the choices you make then make you unhappier or create unsafe conditions for you and you don't know how to talk to yourself or others about how that was ostensibly a choice. All those grey areas, the conversations we have about sexual harassment that continue, unfortunately, of various kinds; even your run of the mill sexual harassment at work, all the stuff you're hearing the news lately. But also, sexual assault, sexual harassment, acquaintance rape kind of stuff – I feel like these conversations are still operating at a level that is sometimes shocking to me how archaic it is, and how backwards we still are about all of those questions. The levels of blame, the levels of misunderstanding about what are the ways in which one can feel sexually violated and betrayed in a range of ways that is difficult to name and to speak about publicly and to have a real civil, adult conversation about what that all means. I still feel like we have a long way to go on some of those fronts. We have a long way to go on, when we talk about choice, about things like women choosing to stay at home, or to raise kids, or to take time off work, we're still not having conversations about what that means when women get paid less in every single sphere, including academia, for every job that a man does. That we don't have proper subsidized daycare in Canada. We use these buzzwords of choice and equity and empowerment a lot, but there's still a lot of legislation and policy work and political work that hasn't been done. Those are things that I think we need to be having more conversations about. At the same time, though, we're having a lot of cuts happening provincially and federally in a lot of the programming that people have worked very hard to make sure that we could get *somewhere* in those areas.

I tend to be a pretty optimistic person in a range of ways and I focus on that most of the time, but I'm also a pragmatist and I see that there's still a lot to be done. We need to keep having conversations and politics is an important place, the legal system is an important place, economics are an important place. So yeah, deconstructing choice.

JM: Given that a lot needs to be done in the political realm - the papers that you sent to us, even though I did discourse analysis for my masters, it's been several years since then, I felt like it was so difficult to read. And I remember during that degree, I really wrestled with it because it was so theoretical, it didn't feel grounded and practical and connected to the changes I wanted to make on a grassroots level. Is that something you ever think about with your work?

MG: I have to say, I know that's a conflict a lot of people have, but it's not a conflict I have for a number of reasons. One of these reasons is that I happen to love that way of writing and that way of thinking, it's just incredibly intellectually gratifying to me. So it's hard to give that up no matter what else I'm doing. I also really believe that that kind of work is really necessary. It's not the only way to do activism, in a small "a" or big "A" way, it's not the only way to make change or do politics [1:00:33]. An example is Butler's work, a lot of people malign her, including some of the older feminists including Gloria Steinem, I know she's been highly critical of people like Butler for the arcane language and "what are you actually really doing?" I have to say quite honestly, I feel like that criticism comes sometimes when people don't read the work really closely. That work has to be [done] line by line, 20 thousand times sometimes, yes, but it's actually really important to do because, for instance, deconstructing the idea of what a man or woman is is actually highly, highly relevant work in practical terms. When you read Butler's work, for instance, and I'm using her as an example because I know she's one of those examples that people give a lot about the difficulty of understanding her and what is she actually doing that's practical – and interestingly enough, much of what she does is activism in the way most activists would say is activism, except that work never gets paid attention to –

JM: And a lot of activists take it up and strategize around it, right?

MG: Exactly, exactly, with those ideas. But the idea of being able to say there is a real identifiable claim that we can make about what a man or a woman is. There are a lot of feminists that are in opposition to that because they want to take up the mantle of, "we need to make practical changes." Some of the things that affect women, like sexual violence or lack of pay equity, clearly we're talking about female bodies and female subjects. Yes, that's all true, but at the same time, that idea of a rigidity of what *female* actually looks like has worked against us for much of history. Those same ideas about saying *this* is what a real woman is like and acts like and can think like or not think like has actually mostly, as far as I can tell, throughout history has backfired.

So to me it makes sense that some of those very complex ideas and those cherished concepts that we all hang onto, no matter how much critical reading or work we've done, we're so imbibing that stuff with the pablum. The air that we breathe from day one about the rigidity and fixity of an identifiable identity called *male* or *female* and what male or female behaviours or traits are like, or in these days the language of neurons and brains, and male brains and female brains, whatever that means. I think there is such a wave of that coming at us all the time that we need that other wave, and that other wave unfortunately does necessitate sometimes a more complex language to be able to get underneath and really unpack what this one word means in five pages. A word that we're used to just using, it rolls off our tongue and we think we all have the same bubble in our heads about what it means, but we don't, and there are actually five thousand ways to look at that word sometimes and it's important to do that to make some of that political change. And I really see a link between that and some of the changes that then get translated into policy, into the law.

One great example of that for me, and a very practical one, is up until 1986 in Canada, we didn't have a criminalization of rape in marriage, because the assumption was that we understood what marriage means and what consent means [1:04:33]. So you had to unpack those concepts, and in order to do that – yes, it's possible to do that those concepts without sometimes the arcane language, but the arcane language is part of what allowed us to get to this idea that consent is not so simple, marriage is not so simple, partnership is not so simple. So I think we need both. I'm more comfortable in this land, because I like sitting around reading those words and thinking about those words, but yeah, I'm also enough of a pragmatist to know that that stuff is important to be running in a buffer while that other stuff is going on out here. It's not always about placards and going in and… both things are needed. So for me there's no conflict, I know there is for some people, but for me there's no conflict for that.

JM: That's great that you don't have that conflict, I feel as though that just helped me resolve my own [laughs].

MG: I know, right? [laughs] We can have more conversations about that, if you want, because I have these conversations with my students all the time. These are discussions we have all the time, about what's the difference between discourse and doing.

JM: I know that although now I'm doing very community-based work, there's an intellectual part of me that misses that other –

MG: Right, and they don't need to live separately, they can coexist.

JM: Right.

TD: So is there any particular way you like to link more cerebral and practical work for your students when unpacking that sort of thing?

MG: Any way as in a particular technique?

TD: Yeah, or a key message to resolve that discrepancy for students who are just starting with this.

MG: Yeah, one of my messages is the first one that I said, which is that you gotta do your homework. You have to read this stuff really carefully. So that's part of it. When something is difficult, when you have a new puzzle to solve, it's like the "math is hard" stuff – I don't know if it's my background in those kinds of things where I can sit and do calculus for hours and hours and I found that fascinating – but sometimes you have to struggle with a question or a problem for a while. So I feel like some of it is, yeah, you've got to sit with something for a while, do the hard work, see if you can actually find something underneath. Maybe it won't speak to you, but do that first, and really, really understand the concept first. Or the theoretical construct. So that's part of it [1:07:13].

And I think living with it for a while. Understanding it, and then looking at what changes you're interested in making, what are you dissatisfied with, how can you generate some potential examples of ways in which we can build bridges between these worlds. Some of those examples I give sometimes, when something comes up just on the spur of the moment if it comes to me, and some of it is tasking people with that difficult task of also paying attention to what is going on around you and don't keep these two things in different compartments. Don't sleepwalk, don't dissociate. Think about what's going on here as well as what you just saw on the street, what you just saw at home, the argument you just had with your partner, what you just watched in a film. Connect those dots as much as you can, and it takes time to do that. It takes work to do that. It will always be the case that people are more drawn to certain kinds of work or certain kinds of thinking or certain ways of doing, and that's just finding what's appealing to you.

I'm not so interested in influencing always, I feel like people are self-selected already when they work with me by being interested in certain kinds of things, but I am interesting in modeling the fact that I'm just very excited about what I do all the time. That I'm really gratified by what I do and I feel settled and content and I'm a complete human being because my politics finally align – and it took a long time, as you heard – with the rest of my life. I think you can't get a better model, and I know from my students who started off thinking they wanted to do more clinical work or something more practical, and actually over time have moved more towards the possibility of academic work, not because I ever say you need to publish more, you need to do grants, that's not my approach at all. My approach is, let's play with these ideas, and if these ideas are interesting to you, you'll play with them more, and if not, then you'll find something else to play with, and that's fine.

I feel like I lost the thread of that question from the beginning because my answer was so long [laughs], as all my answers. I tend to give long answers.

JM: Which is great, though, for interviewing.

MG: Right! Exactly, then you don't have to say as much.

JM: I wanted to step back to when you were talking about SWAP. You were involved with SWAP for 13 years really actively and you talked about finding these feminist communities in psychology through conferences and organizations like SWAP. Can you tell us in a bit more detail what SWAP has meant to your career? Or I don't know if you're also involved in Division 35, or AWP, but –

MG: Yeah, I've been involved with all of those over the years, as well as POWS [Psychology of Women Section], which in some ways has been more pivotal for me in more recent years, which is the British analogue of SWAP and Division 35, so it's the Psychology of Women section of the BPS, the British Psychological Society. That's the conference that my students and I go to every year. Although this year we're actually going to ISTP, which is the International Society for Theoretical Psychology. That's another really good home, although that one I don't attend as much [1:10:57].

Starting with SWAP – Part of it is that SWAP is home because it was literally geographically home, so it's easier to get to. It was also a place where I could just meet friends that I haven't seen for a long time because we had just dispersed, doing the work that we do. But it really kept me attached to feminism when I didn't feel like that was always being lived out in my academic life. It's always being lived out in my personal life, but it wasn't always being lived out in my academic life. So yeah, it was really important in that sense, I don't know how much more I can say about that other than it just felt like a rock in my community. You see the same faces, it's something about familiarity, about recognition, about speaking the same language, where everybody knows we're not all doing the same work, and we're all interested in similar issues in some ways in terms of the broader issues of feminism. It's just being around people that are likeminded in a range of ways.

Division 35 I was less involved in terms of conference stuff, although I'd go. But my biggest involvement has been through editorial work. So the editorial work that I've done for *Psychology of Women Quarterly* for quite a long time now, both more recently as associate editor and consulting editor as qualitative expert, but also prior to that as consulting editor and guest editor for a bunch of things. So that's been really important, I find that the editorial piece is actually a really important part of activism for me. For PWQ in particular, my time on it, I know – and it's been facilitated by having an excellent editor, as well, Jan Yoder in recent years – that allowed me to play a really strong role in expanding the epistemological, methodological bubble at PWQ. I feel like I've had a lot of latitude there to do a lot of education about both my peers and other colleagues, and a lot of mentoring and shepherding of papers that probably wouldn't have gotten published in PWQ at other points. Both feminist papers, psychoanalytic papers, queer theory stuff, a lot of stuff that wasn't going to be on the radar as much, and that's been incredibly rewarding, actually.

And then at POWS, POWS just feels like home to me, the British Society. That's a conference I go to every year, it's very small and my students now go to it all the time. The UK is a really hospitable environment for critical work and feminist work. There's much more of that going on in the UK and there has been for a long time. When I go there, you don't have to define discourse analysis, you don't have to define in your presentation or your paper what poststructuralism is, everybody's read it and thought about it for a hundred years and it's easy.

JM: And that's true of psychology in Britain?

MG: Yeah, exactly. This is a psychological society, but yeah, most of the work that I do, most of the people that I read, they're mostly – there are definitely some from US and Canada – but mostly the UK. New Zealand, Australia, Britain, and South Africa, interestingly enough. There's a really wonderful community of critical psychologists in South Africa as well. Those feel like pockets of home, and these days it's a lot easier to connect with those people [1:15:08]. In that time when I was making the transition from doing trauma work and health work and also doing this feminist thing on the side and critical sexualities culture from the side, that's the stuff that kept me alive, actually. And AWP for years, as well, I go to those every few years too. When you start to feel a little isolated, just get an infusion of that. Go back to those people. In many ways, when I started to feel most disconnected and most dissatisfied with what I was doing – and it was interesting, it was actually my partner who said at the time, who's also an academic, said "you haven't gone to these conferences for a little while." There was a point at which I stopped for a couple of years, and the suggestion was, you gotta go. You've got to start going. For the first couple of conferences, I actually went and didn't present and just sort of sat back and thought, "oh wow, it's a world I've forgotten about." And I don't know how to be in this world a little bit, and I haven't done anything with that for a while, so it was really discomforting for a little while. And then gradually those muscles get build up, and you start to read the same things that you lost track of for a while that these people are reading. All of these have been hugely pivotal in keeping connected and being able to climb up again into the world I wanted to be a part of.

TD: So participating in these societies is something you encourage your students to do as well?

MG: Hugely, hugely, yeah. And not just the larger APA or CPA or whatever, but particularly the sub-committees and divisions and sections that are particularly relevant to what you're interested in, whatever that is, whether it's cognitive neuroscience or whether it's feminist or critical stuff or whether it's history and theory.

JM: Since we're on the topic, do you have other advice you'd like to give to students?

MG: Now that I've dispensed a whole bunch of advice unwittingly? [laughs]

JM: Particularly those that identify as feminist or those drawn to critical theories or methods.

MG: I think the main advice is, (and advice is easy to dispense, like a lot of things), so I can frame it as advice but I hesitate because I think you don't know what conditions people are living in at the time when they're making use of that advice or not. If it's possible in some way to try to create as much as you can an environment of convergence between your politics and your practices at work and at play, I would say, to make a life that feels more coherent and feels more honest and it feels like you don't have to keep your feminism in the closet or your critical psychology in the closet. And I do see, actually, a number of students here that are not working in my lab but have strong feminist identities outside of this place but once they step into this threshold, their research is not tainted by that in any way, it's not touched by that in any way. And I worry about that for them. I worry about what that cost is going to be, knowing some of my own costs, and I think mine weren't even as fractured as some the ones I see here [1:19:22]. I think students worry a lot about, and understandably, whether they'll get a job, and I don't think that's actually a real concern. I think if you do what you love to do, you will do it better and be more productive and ultimately that's what people care about. They're going to look at how much you've done, and if you've done a lot in the area they're interested in, they'll be happy with that. There are always places and pockets everywhere where people are interested in critical work, in feminist work, in a range of the kinds of things that we've been talking about. I don't think that's going away, so I would say don't keep those worlds separate because it's a cost that wears after a while and it doesn't actually buy you as much as you think it's going to buy you. That's probably my biggest advice. And be a little courageous. Seek out, take some time, step off the track. Some of us didn't [laughs]. And I mean even about grad school, I was thinking about this in anticipation of this interview that I think one of the things that would have helped me a lot 20 years ago was if I didn't get into grad school the first time around. I think it would have been really helpful if I just had that extra year or two to sit and think about what I really want and what I really want to read and who do I really want to work with and do my homework better about who I'm targeting to work with, rather than just being so happy to get into grad school. I think those are all important lessons.

TD: That's super encouraging, I identify a lot with your undergraduate experience. And I'm grateful for the fact that I didn't get into grad school the first time around.

MG: Yeah, it's a gift. People don't realize it's a gift, but it's a gift. And I've seen that happen with a number of people, including some of the people who are working with me now who didn't get in their first time and that extra year was really good for them.

So I don't know, I can't think of other advice. Other than all the things that I already said.

TD: Is there anything else you haven't said that you'd like to?

MG: Umm... No, I don't think so, I think that was pretty comprehensive. My answers were pretty long so I think I probably embedded as much as you could in there. But it's been a pleasure to actually do that, I guess the one thing I would say is thank you for asking, which I really appreciate. It's actually really nice to be able to do a retrospective. I haven't done it for a long time, I haven't sat down with somebody for a long time to talk about all the things that I would've done, could've done, should've done, wished I'd done, and all the things that I did do. It's a great opportunity to do that, the answers may be a little too long in some cases, but thank you so much for giving me the opportunity.

JM: Well thank you so much for being open to being interviewed for the project. I know Alex has wanted to include you for a long, long time [1:22:36].

MG: Well It's an honour to be included amongst the panoply of people that I've seen. I certainly haven't made the kind of contribution that a lot of those people have made, but it's nice to be sort of on that continuum in some way.

JM: And you also have made important contributions, and will continue to I'm sure. Do you have anywhere you see your career going within the next five years?

MG: Probably just hopefully continuing on the same path. I hope it's not a peak, because I'm at a really good place right now. I'm really happy with the work that I'm doing and the students I'm working with, including the ones that are graduating and where they're headed. I feel like it's a really good time, so if I'm fortunate enough to have health and all of those things that keep you going, then I'd want to do more of what I'm doing now, more of the same for however long I get to do this for. That's pretty much it.

JM: Well thank you very much for your time.

[1:23:50]