Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History Project

Interview with Maureen C. McHugh

Interviewed by Alexandra Rutherford, Pelin Gul, Florence Truong, & Isuri Weerakkody,
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
March 3rd, 2012

When citing this interview, please use the following citation:

McHugh, M. C. (2012, March 3). Interview by A. Rutherford, P. Gul, F. Truong, & I. Weerakkody [Video Recording]. Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History and Online Archive Project. Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

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

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

Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History Project
Interview with Maureen C. McHugh
Interviewed by Alexandra Rutherford
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania
March 3, 2012

MM: Maureen C. McHugh, interview participant
AR: Alexandra Rutherford, interviewer
PG: Pelin Gul, interviewer
FT: Florence Truong, interviewer
IW: Isuri Weerakkody

AR – State your full name, and place and date of birth for the record.

MM – Okay, my name is Maureen Carol McHugh. Officially I use C. Maureen C. McHugh and I was born in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania on September 2nd, 1952.

AR – Great. So I'm going to start with a really easy question [perhaps], I'm not sure. How did you become a feminist?

MM – According to my father I was always strong-minded. I didn't think of myself that way. I did attend Chatham College, which was a college for women and at the time that I made that decision it was a practical one. In the 70's when I attended college, Financially [scholarships in] co-ed institutions went primarily to men and some schools, like Allegheny College in Meadville [Pennsylvania], still had quotas, so they only admitted so many women, which means that the admission criteria in competition was much stronger for women. So I got in all the schools that I applied to, but in terms of financial aid, I had a much better chance of getting financial aid at a women's college. Sort of my decision, (what I'm trying to explain) was not really feminism at the time. At Chatham there's a certain amount of feminist development because women are the presidents of the student class, women are the editors of the student paper, women do everything, but this was actually in the 70's when the women's movement was starting as was the anti-war movement, going very strong at the time. Some piece of that was part of it, but actually I...let's see, Tom Hershberger, who we just met downstairs, was my advisor and he encouraged me to develop my senior thesis, which was on women's problem solving. It was something that was hot at the time-- Matina Horner's fear of failure and fear of success. So I did students completing problems with men in the classroom versus just with women in the classroom, and problem-solving ability deteriorates. Today we would see it as maybe a part of stereotype threat, but it wasn't called that then. So then my dissertation sort of started getting me in these areas. I took the first women studies class offered at Chatham College in my senior year 1974, The History and Status of Women.

AR – Do you remember who taught that?

MM – Smith. A male person named Dr. Smith and maybe it was co-taught with a woman.

{2:41}

I took that first class and then when I applied to graduate school, I applied in social psychology primarily and I applied to people doing work similar to that kind of motivational achievement oriented. Irene Frieze was at the University of Pittsburgh at the time. She was recruited to develop women studies there. She came in 72' and I was also admitted to a few other places, like Purdue [University] where Kay Deaux was, but really the strength of that undergraduate thesis got me in connection with feminist psychologists, mostly in social, and Irene recruited me by phone, called me up and asked me to teach Psychology of Women with her.

AR – That was fairly early on.

MM – Yes. I graduated in '74 from Chatham. I started at Pitt in 75'. I immediately began teaching psychology of women with Irene on a team. It was one of the early psych of women classes. Her book wasn't even out yet.

AR – I was going to say what materials were you using?

MM – We were using chapters from her book, *Women and Sex Roles*. There's multiple authors, it was Irene and her friends. We were using chapters from her book and then eventually it was published while I was still at Pitt. And you know what else we used, this is sort of interesting from a historical point of view. We used pamphlets from KNOW called Now Press and it was affiliated with the National Organization of Women and Now Press was located in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. They reproduced them by mimeograph in a garage in Wilkinsburg. So you filled out a little flyer on which pamphlets you were interested in and then they mimeographed them and delivered them to you. A lot of those classic readings, like the non-conscious ideology by Sandra and Daryl Bem. Sandra and Daryl Bem were at CMU [Carnegie-Mellon University] at the time.

AR – Oh, I didn't know that.

MM – Yeah, so that non-conscious ideology is an example, or there was one called *Why I Want a Wife*, which is about marriage. There was a whole set of them. Some of them were later put in anthologies, now hardly any of them are left in anthologies.

AR – Was JoAnn Evansgardner involved in KNOW Press?

MM – Yes, yes she was involved in the press. She was a psychologist and an activist and she lobbied really in Pittsburgh. Women studies was started at Pitt in response to a very outspoken and grassroots effort led by JoAnn Evansgardner, but then of course they did NOT hire her. They hired Irene and two other people. Someone in English and someone in History. It was like a triumvirate thing going on there. Yeah and for awhile I think there were, I don't want to say hard feelings, but there was a little bit of an issue there. JoAnn Evansgardner wanted to direct that program and be the first feminist psychologist at Pitt.

{5:40}

But Irene and I both had connections with JoAnn Evansgardner and one time we went to a conference at Penn State and the three of us drove up together, so I have pretty fond memories. I mean she was you know, she was an outspoken person.

AR – Yeah, by all accounts.

MM – By all accounts. Exactly, but not really unpleasant or difficult in that sense that one wouldn't want to ride in a three hour car ride with her. She was nice in that sense. It was an exciting time to be involved at Pitt, to be involved in women studies at Pittsburgh. We had that year of the woman, remember that? And we had some kind of spirit conference in Texas. It was connected to the year of the woman, it was kind of an NGO, which we hardly have in the states, but we had this huge organization. We all learned how to do Robert's Rules of Order, parliamentary rules, so that the other side could not gain control of the conference and we could get what we wanted on the agenda. We sent Suzanna Rose, somebody else who you know, Dr. Suzanne Rose. She was my colleague at Pitt and she was actually our representative to Houston. We had great optimism, but of course no policies or changes in the American society occurred as a result of that. It was just like a huge practice for some other future revolution.

AR – I want to go back a little bit. I want to trace your career trajectory through psychology and how you have combined your feminist values with psychology, but I want to go a bit little further back and make sure we get a little bit more about your earlier life on the record. You said that your father considered you outspoken. Did you have any other family experiences that you trace to any kind of inchoate feminism?

MM – I am a middle child. I am one of five siblings and, I don't know-- some people think the middle child...I'm the child of working class. I didn't think of it early on in connection to feminism, but I have written...I wrote a review of [Bernice] Lott and [Heather] Bullock's text. [*Psychology and Economic Injustice*]…

AR – Oh yeah. Social class…

MM – on social class and I said in there, and this is how I feel, that there hasn't been within psychology we have not really opened up social class conversations, so I still feel sort of invisible as a child of working class. I didn't, I really didn't understand working class at the time, but I think it has something to do with who I am and my achievements.

My parents were very, very strong. I think my parents were both very intelligent people and they were not educated. My father actually had a college scholarship and he had to give it up, because he was the sole caretaker of his mom and also the war. The war was on, he joined the military. My mother, her brothers were college educated and became professionals. One is an engineer, one was a dentist, one was a doctor. Her sisters, not so much. None of them went to college, so it's that same kind of gender. My mother's...both of them were very smart and they were both very education oriented.

{9:02}

I was one of five. My oldest brother was in the military during the Vietnam War and eventually earned an undergraduate degree. I think he went on Saturdays to get some kind of master's degree. He would find this disparaging, but I said to him at the time that what kind of degree are you getting and what are you hoping to achieve and he just said to me like, "you should ask." So it was something about keeping up. My oldest sister is not college educated and my two younger brothers, one of them has a doctorate in geography and teaches at ASU and my other one has a masters, but he's in retail, retail management. I think I am, possibly the highest achieving person in the family, but my brother Kevin who has a geography PhD, might not agree with me.

This is what they would say about me, that there is some, I don't like to admit it, but there is some inherent competition going on there. Something about being one of five, there is some competition there, I would say that. I was always rewarded for being intelligent and I was also raised in a Catholic tradition, which I call, instead of the Protestant work ethic, I think of it as a Catholic work ethic. I'm not a practising Catholic today ,but I do think that Catholicism taught me that if you're given a gift it's your responsibility to use it for like general well being. It's a catholic idea. If you're very intelligent and you didn't use your intelligence, or you used it for the wrong purposes that was not appropriate.

AR – That's interesting. A number of the women we have interviewed for this project so far have spoken about Catholicism and how that has intersected with their feminism in different ways.

MM – I was raised by, I was taught by nuns in my early years. I went to Saint Albert the Great who was a great intellectual tradition, which they taught us and they were Dominicans and they were very proud of an intellectual tradition and they weren't mean. As opposed to people who went to other schools. [In other schools] the nuns were cruel or disciplinarians. I don't remember it that way. I don't think of it that way.

FT – I was just wondering if your parents were supportive did they encourage you to go to university? It didn't look like all of your siblings went to university, so I wondered…

MM – Right, they were, they really were. I think my sister had a reading problem, which they corrected, but it was corrected maybe at the junior high level so she had already developed a self image that she wasn't really a good student. She reads a lot today. I don't think she is less intelligent than the rest of us, but it was something about her early progress in schools that really held her back. I think that they were very anxious that we would go and get a college education. Now when I decided to go to graduate school there was a gap. For my father, he said to me "I don't get it." You know, because I had a federal job that he thought you know was the cat's pajamas. Well you have a great job for life, they hardly ever fire you from federal government, why would you ever want to go back to school? He actually asked me one time when I was thinking about it, "what's the most you would accomplish in your current job or in the offspring of it and what is the best you might accomplish if you know if you went on to university for a PhD program" and I said the best I could, I guess, in my federal job would be to be the US Civil Service Commissioner, which is a very high level cabinet position, but still like who wants to be that?

{12:55}

It seemed like a very boring kind of job to have. You know all I did was grade applications for people who wanted to be accountants for the federal government. That's what I was doing at the time and then I said "I guess if I went on and got a PhD the best I could hope for is to write a book and get on Johnny Carson." [Laugh] This was my aspiration at the time. To write a book that's so well read that I would be invited on Johnny Carson who you know … Jay Leno never has people on who write books come on anymore. That's not happening and also I have written a lot of chapters and articles, but I haven't written my first book yet so it's still on my aspiration list.

AR – Well and you've got one in the works.

MM – Yeah, so he in some ways wasn't supportive. He was really challenging me, but in another way the questions he asked really made it clear in my mind what I wanted to do. I think if the person who had...if I had gotten into graduate school into some other program I might have had a harder decision, but when Irene had called me up and said "do you want to teach Psychology of Women?" I'm thinking wow that's what I want to do and that's what I've done from that day on, that's really my main, that's how I identify myself as someone who teaches Psychology of Women.

AR – Okay so you mentioned to us a little bit about Chatham College and get started at Chatham and the kind of, I don't know if you would call it mentorship, but at least your connection with Tom Hershberger. Any other people who were influential for you at Chatham in terms of your future career?

MM – This is what I would like to say about Chatham. Most of the people I know from Chatham that are feminists are alumni and ex-faculty members. Except for one time when I was there I don't think it was a hot bed of feminism. I think that of all women's colleges, but it was very male dominated in faculty and at the administrative level. Even Tom, Tom was very supportive as a psych mentor. He recognized my skills and he encouraged me to do the best that I could and it turned out in some ways that he helped me find that project which had a women's orientation, so there was something else going on there. I had other teachers that I admired or classes I liked. When I was at Chatham this was what it was about. There were no graduation requirements. You just had to have a certain number of credits, because that was what it was in the 70s. It was self-designed education. You could take anything you wanted, but of course to get into graduate school you still had to be intelligent enough to have an English class, a Biology class, but really. And also grading was an option, but there were a lot of non-graded classes. It was a different time, people can't believe me when I say that.

AR – Well there are a few places still like that but very few.

MM – But Chatham was like a...I think really an exposure to me to a really mixed social class there were a lot of affluent of people at Chatham. So my first understandings of how social class operates were partly at Chatham and I think there were strong women there, but… I can't even think now, I had an interesting person in English. I'll have to think about his name.

{16:19}

He was a book reviewer for the *New York Times*. This was like a guest lecturer for one semester, I took him and he was sort of interesting.

AR – Well you know there was a lot going on outside the walls of Chatham College during the 1970s and you mentioned the anti-war movement.

MM – Yes, I was peripherally involved in the anti-war movement and we were in close proximity to Pitt [University of Pittsburgh] and CMU [Carnegie Mellon University] and we had some sense to what was going on in the world, so for example that's what I wanted to say. Some of my classes I took existential phenomenological psychology at Duquesne.

AR – Right, I saw Duquesne on your CV.

MM – I worked at Duquesne many years later for a year, but I had this, which is a different, very philosophical bent and I think you can see it in a little bit of my work. I have a philosophical bent that many people in social psychology do not have. I also took, I was saying, I also took Social Psychology at the University of Pittsburgh and I was taught by Valerie Valle and her husband Ron Valle and they were students of Irene's at the time and they were very, I don't know –"with it". They were, they encouraged a very social change orientation to psychology, which was a different kind of introduction.

Here's a little story about my parents and Chatham in the times. My parents said to me "we heard that Jane Fonda is coming to Chatham" and I said, I was being cagey, I didn't tell them everything that was going on in my life and I said "yeah maybe, yeah I think maybe she's coming later" and they said "oh, I hope you don't go over there because you know there is a lot of unrest, turbulence and it follows her around and that's not good. We hope you're not going to an event like that." So I didn't say anything more to them about it and then the day before Jane Fonda came, my mother called me up and she said "Isn't Jane Fond speaking on campus tomorrow?" and I said "I think so." "Oh I should hope you would know and I hope you plan to go and we suggest you go early and if she has any brochures or materials around please pick them up and bring them home for your father." This is what they told me. So Jane Fonda had actually had a very strong impact on my father, I think on the Johnny Carson Show [Laughs] but he had changed his entire attitude toward the war as a result of something including her, including her. So of course I did go to see Jane Fonda yeah and I talked to my dad about it and here's where my dad was at the time. He, when I went home he showed me a pair of orange plaid pants and he was proud, because instead of wearing these plumbing work clothes he was like "okay I'm with it now, I'm going to wear these orange plaid pants" but also his hair, he had very thick curly hair, he usually kept it very trim, but it was like all over the place. And he wore a construction helmet at work so it curled up crazy, really crazy and he said "Yeah, I told the guys at work I'm not cutting my hair until this war in Vietnam is over." Yeah, so it was like a complete change around that I didn't really, because I wasn't at home, I was at campus I didn't fully understand its development. So I went to see Jane Fonda. We had a lot of interesting speakers on campus.

{19:56}

AR – Well tell us a little bit more about your experience at Pitt. So you were recruited by Irene and you worked with her. Tell us a little bit about your work with her.

MH – I was, she was in something called the social personality program at the time and she had a team, this was I think important, that there was a team teaching Psych of Women. There were some undergraduate students - Suzanna Rose was on the team with me. There were people who came from out of town and just hung around to work with Irene and they were sometimes on the team and we had undergraduate students on the team, because we had a classroom of sixty and then we had little work [groups], so we divided that down into what we would call today recitations or lab sections and we each had our own section and we did assertiveness training in the sessions. We had specialty [topics] like socialization, I'm just going to deal with socialization in my session, or assertiveness training. The class, it was an amazing experience at the time, because so many of those people - we wrote journals, starting then we wrote journals, they wrote tons of journals and starting at that time so many of the students in that class would say "this class changed my life, changed my perspective on what's happening in the world, what the points going on what's up, what's up with women." It was really, really impactful and that's when I sometimes say that at different intervals in my life I have tried to re-think my course to figure out what it would take to deliver the material or have the students interact with the material in a way that would have the same impact on their life. It has the same potential, but it doesn't always have the same impact.

AR – What in reflection worked in that first experience you had? What was it that made people feel differently about the world? Do you have a sense?

MM – Um, I'm not sure. I mean I think the class is based on feminist pedagogy principles, like okay psychology has nothing to say about us or they have very limited things to say so we sort of have to figure it out for ourselves and compare it to anything theory or data that they have and does it make any sense. I still try to use that approach, but today when Andrew was talking about going into the villages in Uganda trying to tell people that they have been liberated. It's almost like that. It was sort of like that, we had a message of liberation. Look women can do anything. You can do anything you want and these are really problematized. It had the same effect on me, let me say that. That feminism was a lens that helped me just change my view of the world completely and it was a lens that somehow I was in tune with.

For example, this is an example I sometimes use, when I was in high school we read *The Old Man and the Sea*. I hated it. I was an avid reader, but I hated *The Old Man and the Sea*. I just detested it and I never had any interaction with anybody about that experience. It was a very private experience, but one time in a women studies lecture there was a lecture on *The Old Man and the Sea* and they did very good feminist breakdown of exactly what's wrong with *The Old Man and the Sea* and I thought "Oh my god, there's hundreds or thousands and maybe even millions of women who hate *The Old Man and the Sea* for the exact same reason that I do," and now somebody opened a curtain and I met those people. It's sort of what feminism was to me. Like, okay [you have] a sort of private discontent and then you adjust the lens a little and all of a sudden you can see so clearly.

{23:38}

I would say the other thing about feminism is, some people might say that I'm kind of a negative or critical person. I'm certainly been working with that, trying to be more upbeat not too negative person, but really feminism is a part of my life that appreciates that about me. You know, when I make fun of something or I can see right through it or see how stupid or wrong it is, that's a skill that I bring to feminism and feminism is a place where it's appreciated. To some extent a critique of psychology, like psychology sometimes rewards me for being critical and sometimes not so much. It's not that I don't appreciate it, it's actually one of the reasons why I loved feminist analysis. It just captured me.

AR – And how did you - this sounds like a redundant question but I don't think it really is - how did you, why did you get attracted to psychology? Because you could have gone into anything.

MM – This is tough question. I've thought about it a long time, but let's see when I was at Chatham I didn't really know the answer to this. At Chatham, when people asked me this is what I would say that as a child of working class parents that application to college was, I don't know, dramatic or significant and they asked me for my intended major and I didn't want to put unknown, because I thought that it looked bad to be applying to college and not know what you were doing, so I put psychology. This is what I tell people, well I just picked psychology and then I liked psychology and I never disliked it so I never re-declared. That's partly it, but see that doesn't really answer it because I took every psychology course offered at Chatham and I went down to Duquesne and I went to PITT, so there was a very strong pull of psychology which I wasn't really acknowledging at the time. And I really in some ways, I didn't really understand it myself and years later I have a different perspective on it. I … did you ever see the film *Dialogues with Mad Women*?

AR – No.

MM – Which is a most fantastic film. It's by Allie Light. It's a documentary.

AR – *Dialogues with Mad Women*?

MM – Yes, it's like five women, who are absolutely crazy and then she does like a full analysis of their lives and their experiences and at the end… at the beginning, you think these women are crazy nuts and at the end you think they are so resilient. They are very strong women and they manage to survive, including Allie Light herself. Her own story is in there, she was institutionalized. Anyway, that film has something to say, because when I saw that film, because I'm not a clinician, but I was showing it in my classes, I saw it, I thought I just love that film. It just meant so much to me and I realized sometime in that time of my life…When I was in ninth grade I wrote a book review. The teacher had requested a cumulative book review, I don't know if you ever had to write one, but you had to include five books. Obviously they had to be somewhat similar or you couldn't include them in a single review, so I looked at what I was reading and I was reading books about crazy women. I had read three, like *I Never Promised You a Rose Garde*n was among them.

{27:05}

I Never Promised You a Rose Garden was among them and then I had to find two more to make it five and so I looked at what I had read and I thought like I'll find two more books on crazy women and I'll write it on this. And I don't even remember what I wrote. I just know that I wrote that book report and that I had been reading books on crazy women while I was in the ninth grade. And then when I saw interviews, that *Dialogues with Mad Women,* it just reminded me that I think one of my early interests in psychology really had to do with crazy women. I didn't even articulate it, because I went to social psych and did achievement motivation. I wasn't working in the area of crazy women.

AR – [Laughs] Did you, I mean Phyllis Chesler's *Women and Madness* came out in '72. Did you...

MM – I didn't read it then, but I read it somewhere in the 70s because it was a part of teaching Psych of Women. I did read it in that context and I didn't fully appreciate until a little bit later, the full meaning of *Women and Madness*. You know who else I like on madness is Jane Ussher. I love Jane Ussher's work on that.

AR – We've interviewed her for this project. She's got a new book out, just off the press.

MM – On?

AR – Her same kind of women and madness and...

MM – She has one on femininity that is also something interesting, like I have developed some things around femininity and Jane Ussher is very informative. And sexualization, that I talked about today, femininity, sexualization. She is one of the few that has written about it.

AR – Well, I want to get you to talk about some of your work too, but does anyone have any other questions at this juncture?

PG – I wondering want what kinds of things about these women in the books made you think they were crazy. What was crazy about them and what things about them turned out not to be crazy?

MM – Well, I think the feminist crazy is really… this is at the crux of the matter. Crazy is something wrong with you internally, like narcissism. There is something about you that is broken and this is one of the most important insights I think of feminist psychology is that it's not internal to women, it's that the situations, the kind of problematic situations that they've been in has created this turmoil. That they are not crazy in the sense that they don't have something like the measles, you know something called crazy that is a disease that is the best that they could do to cope with the series of very problematic mostly sexist situations, so in the movie *Dialogues of Mad Women* almost all of them are subjected to forms of sexual violence.

{29:52}

Many of them are also psychologically abused or physically abused, abandoned by their parents or neglect. One of them is a clear rape victim. One of them is a little bit mad and I always did think that she really is. She has an ounce of crazy in her to start, I just can't get with her. She thinks that, she is delusional about Bob Dylan being her lover, but she says things like "in a different world I would be Bob Dylan" instead of fantasizing that I'm his lover. I'm thinking like wow that still goes back to that idea, right and I think that's a crucial point of feminist psychology is that it makes us question the age old tired tradition of blaming women for their own distress. Saying it's about them and motive to avoid success. It's a very similar kind of thing.

We love that explanation, because it made women's lack of success, it was all about them. Something that they had internally that drove them away from success instead of saying like oh we put such obstacles up, that the women who go to the most elite college in the United States still cannot succeed after they graduate from college. And the model we have about achievement, McClelland's model, need for achievement, doesn't have anything to do with women, because we only studied Harvard men, so we don't fault the explanatory theory that doesn't work and don't look at the social context of women's lives and that's a theory we can all embrace. We just love it, because it just puts that all the blame on women.

It just amazes me, you know, when I'm trying to explain it to my students how they don't get it. Don't you see what kind of problem it is? Because they really believe, they often fight with me "depression is a chemical imbalance of the body and you know some people are just depressed so they have to take pharmaceuticals." I don't know, even if that is true for some people, that's not true for all people. There are some people who are depressed, because we're just not treating them right and instead of drugging them up and sending them back out there into a terrible situation, shouldn't [we] really look at how badly we are treating them and fix it. If you have a very high percentage [of adult women on drugs]…., do you know what it is, I always ask people and sometimes they look it up and give me the latest. Maybe its 30% now?

AR – Of what?

MM – Adult women on psycho…mood altering drugs or valium. No, they don't take valium anymore, they take anti-depressants. Yeah, it's a huge number, it's a huge number of students sitting in my classroom that are on mood altering drugs or anti-depressants. I'm thinking, what kind of society is this where you have this many people have to take anti-depressants to get through a regular day.

AR – And this is actually interesting you put it exactly that way. I was working with a former student of mine who is now doing graduate work and she did qualitative interviews with feminists, self-identified feminists who also had been clinically diagnosed with depression to see how they made sense of the medical discourse around depression, that they had in fact been subjected to, participated in by virtue of being diagnosed and feminist analyses of depression and how they had experienced that in their own lives.

{33:05}

One of the women said "It just doesn't make sense to me that so many people would have to be on drugs, it must be something wrong with society and not with people." So it was exactly that kind of take on it, how is it possible to be this way, that it must be something in our society not in the person.

MM – Yeah, it's on my mind, because as you know as a part of this I was recently a co-author on a paper transforming feminist psychology, transforming the science of psychology. I don't know what the final title is. It's an *AP* [*American Psychologist*] paper, it just came out online today.

AR – It did. "Feminism and Psychology: An Analysis of a Half Century of Research on Women and Gender."

MM – Right, with Alice Eagly. Everybody did not agree on everything throughout the process, but at the end one of the crystallized disagreements was we took six different topics in psychology and sort of looked at how it had changed. Just a little narrative to go with these giant charts of how many papers had been published and we didn't take depression initially. Alice didn't want to do depression, but the editors challenged the six that we did and we re-did some of them and depression was added. There was just so much disagreement about how the depression part was written and I really I argued until I was blue in the face, but I was not successful. It is somewhat modified now ,but part of the idea was that they, Alice wanted to say something like this: "At one point we realized not just homemakers are depressed, but we moved to more sophisticated analysis that includes bio-social, you know biology, so some people are vulnerable." It still never even emphasized the external contingencies in their lives. It just was like we retreated, for me it read like we retreated from our original harebrained ideas and moved to a reasonable idea that it really is biology, or at least partly biology. And I was thinking I have so much trouble with this, because as I was expressing this is one of the most important insights of feminist psychology.

AR – And there has been so much good feminist psychology work on depression that has shown the structural and social variables play a huge role. Well, I wanted to ask you about the process of writing that piece, doing that analysis. I thought we might get to it a little later, but since we're on it now, and feel free to not to name names. I'm just interested in the process, tell us a little bit about the task force, what your charge was and how you decided to approach that charge.

MM – I was really interested in being on that task force, because of being the author of the earlier *American Psychologist* article guidelines, I don't know what we originally called it… guidelines for non-sexist research in psychology, or guide for researchers, non-sexist psychology guide for researchers. That had been a very important part of my life and identity, a potential contribution and I wanted everyone to look back years later, that was published in like '86.

AR – And that was a pretty influential paper, it has been…

{36:30}

MM – I hoped it would be and I wanted to be a part of anything that looked at what kind of transformation had occurred since those kind of early criticisms and that's why I joined.

Stephanie Riger, similarly, had a book called *Transforming Psychology*, who had covered similar ground as the guidelines in terms of the methodological critique and what could be done. Alice Eagly was the chair of the task force, with Janet Hyde, but there was a reason why Janet Hyde changed her… couldn't make that commitment, something else was going on, I can't remember what. So it was Alice Eagly.

AR – And just for everyone else knows, this is the task force on transforming...

MM – The Transformation of Scientific Psychology. Feminist Transformation of Psychology, it was a Division 35 Task Force and I can't remember which president commissioned it. Maybe Jackie White or it might have been someone earlier than that, I don't know we...

AR – Was the original question something like has feminism transformed psychology or not or was it framed differently?

MM – It was sort of how has it. There was an assumption that there was some level of transformation. I think we might all have agreed with that. I think Alice had, at one time she expressed to somebody on the task force a sort of personal agenda that she thought that it had and that we should be able to document that. Okay, and she was into, her main point was empirical documentation to that effect, which is a very complex thing. Ultimately I would say we were not successful. I think that even Alice would even agree with that, that we had to change the title of the paper, because we showed that there was more and more research done on women and maybe even gender ,but we couldn't discern or prove that it was feminist, because the way we were counting from journal key words and stuff, it did include certainly criticisms of feminism, and anti-feminist research on women would have all of been included in there.

Yeah so we couldn't really make that argument and we couldn't really do qualitative analysis of those thousands and thousands or millions of articles, so we just really… we actually did, Alice did, and some of her graduate students who worked with her, some analysis trying to use feminism as a keyword and we did look at what kind of journals, one of the things we were saying is has it all come together in one place or is it disseminated throughout psychology. You know, there were some interesting questions. I think it was an interesting approach to try and mostly look at what was published. We tried to, we had two other approaches. One to look at introductory psych courses texts and try to see how much of feminist psychology made it in and that also became problematic because through the process we ended up just looking where women, where the word woman was used. It was really...

AR – Oh my goodness. Because this is really one of the earliest insights, Mary Parlee wrote about this in 1975 or something in *Signs*. Psychology of women is not necessarily feminist. It's psychology of women, psychology for women, they are different things. And we run the risk of running a psychology that is not for women even though it is about women.

{39:58}

MM – Right and so originally I was going to do this analysis with a graduate student and Suzanna Rose (40:00) was going to do this her graduate student and really it got so unwieldy

and my graduate student really was not trained sufficiently to deal with this, so really it was Suzanna Rose and Asia Eaton who did the textbook review and they really wanted to do a qualitative review along with the page counts and they still might publish that, because they have a qualitative piece on whether you know. So one thing they would say is that evolutionary psychology is given a lot of credence in several textbooks. It isn't subjected to the same kind of scrutiny or critical analysis that feminism is. So Stephanie and I undertook research textbooks to see if they changed the methods, because we were into methods and really I would say about that process, which turned out to be really complicated, but I would say that really at root level the the problem is that the books do not reflect anything about feminist research in them at all. So we sort of disagreed about what you could say about that analysis. And I would say, what, there is no feminism in this, none whatsoever, including the books don't even have group comparisons. So if you're interested in male and female sex difference research, which is problematic in and of it itself, but if you're interested in it that kind of analysis, group comparisons isn't even really in most textbooks. Yeah, so we didn't agree on what you could include and that part was never suppose to go into the *AP* article anyway. It was supposed to be a separate article. So anyway you can just see it was fraught with difficulties and one thing I would say one it is, this is an easy inclusion, you know feminists don't all agree.

AR – [Laughs] And feminists haven't even all agreed on what a feminist research method is from day one.

MM – Actually, Stephanie and I, which is the weird part, Stephanie and I do agree. I think if you look at our work, we are very similar and both agree.

AR – You were clear on what you were looking for and it wasn't there.

MM – We weren't clear on how to look at the texts and what the conclusions were. Right, and partly it was because I would say at a starting point Alice didn't agree with us. She didn't share the same starting point that Stephanie and I did.

AR – Well, when you looked at the research methods texts and you sort of concluded that feminists, feminism wasn't there. What were you looking for? What were you hoping to find that you didn't?

MM – Well, there's a lot of cautions by comparing men and women, like that's what's in the non-sexist guidelines, but since they didn't even talk about the comparisons of groups they couldn't have that. They did have a little bit of stuff like don't over generalize, but they didn't really have the example of like "don't study only men and generalize it to human condition." Some of them, we actually did look at some of the examples and a few of the books had some interesting good examples and some of the books had some interesting really sexist examples.

{43:02}

For example, they, this is an example of one book where they really took [Shere] Hite to task, you know she does female sexuality. Everybody always jumps on her for her research method being biased, and garbage in, garbage out, but really [Alfred] Kinsey had similar flaws, so they

cite Kinsey without any criticism, then they cite Hite and they jump all over her and I'm thinking, like really? Interesting that they could pick those two examples. Yeah, exactly and decided to jump all over poor Hite, because her conclusions were really threatening.
AR – It's interesting we've spoke to another feminist psychologist who wrote a statistics textbook and she wanted to include more examples that were relevant to women's lives and the publisher thought that was very odd and actually said, "well, no you can't do that because three of your eight examples are about girls but you're going to turn off the guys" and so they… but she actually won in the end.

MM – Did she really?

AR – Yeah, she did.

MM – Because, you know, this is a problem. This is a general problem, that we realize it wasn't good to be reading like See Dick Run, look Jane see Dick run. Like the girl's the passive observer, while the boy is the active character and this is actually what my first grade reader had in it, these are actual lines. And so we switched, but really we switched to animals tales and the animals are all male and then we started switching back now and they use that argument all the time with the curriculum.

AR – Alienate the boys.

MM – Right, girls will be willing to read about boys, but boys are not willing to read about girls. But how can you just go along with that and say it's okay? So then we have to write all stories about boys, because then boys refuse to read stories about girls. I think, like, let them fail reading. [Laughs] You can either shape up or ship out, what the heck.

AR – Anyone want to jump in?

IW – I'm actually curious about what areas of psychology you think are still greatly lacking in feminist input and feminist research?

MM – Wow, I think…let's start with clinical. There's a lot of research relevant in clinical, but I think most students trained are not exposed to it. So for example, the DSM which is under a lot of scrutiny now, but there are so many problems with diagnostic, internalizing. I just think most students are not trained. So even when the research, the ideas, the conceptualization, the criticism is there, it's not clear who is being exposed to it, let's start with that part. But also I think, and I have so many students, okay here's something that I don't know if you've realized, but in cognitive development and memory classes they so are talking about, what are they called, oh I don't know, repressed memories...

AR – Uh huh, false memories.

{46:14}

MM – False memory implantation. This is what my colleagues are teaching in their classes. I think this really poor science, is not well established at all, no evidence for it and this is what people are learning, so I would say cognition and memory is a very problematic area. There are some feminists working in that area, but their work is not well known and I think most people teaching in that area have no conception of feminist or others forms of oppression and how that affects memory and cognition. Really problematic.

I think that the whole evolutionary, socio-biology area is very well respected in ways that it doesn't warrant. I think that it's often, some of it is scientific, but often it is not scientific, it's not empirical. Just because they claim biological processes somehow people think it is more scientific. I have students say that all the time in my class. They say like "well I know that general attractiveness is based on the waist-hip ratio." I'm thinking you know that? Have you seen a study like that in the United States? I think that most of the people considered attractive according to the media have no hip-waist ratio. They look surprisingly like male figures and the whole idea that it's androcentric and valuing the male look and being so fat phobic that you can't have an inch of fat on you. Like where is this? This is not explained well by socio-biology. I think that area is problematic. There are feminist socio-biologists, but I really don't think they are getting printed or getting publications. Social is one, and this actually what the transforming task force found. Social has the most influence, the most publications, etcetera. Social, very good.

AR – And many of the very first feminist psychologists who started things like [Division] 35 and AWP [Association for Women in Psychology] were trained as social psychologists. There's a natural affinity there, in terms of how you look at world, between feminism and some kinds of social psychology anyway, in my view. Just an insert.

MM – Right. Personality is really hard to infiltrate. You know because as a social psychologist and a feminist. Almost, into like throw the baby and the bath water out. I don't know if we want to save anything from personality. Okay, that's a kind of, that's an overgeneralization, but I would say it's not really moving forward in great leaps and bounds, I don't think. [Not] In a feminist way and maybe [not] in any other way.

AR – Let me get you to talk about, because you mentioned it, you mentioned sort of issues about physical attractiveness and size-ism and you've done some work on that. Tell us about how you got interested in that and what you've been finding on size-ism and anti-fat...

MM – Yeah, size acceptance. I don't know the origin of that, completely. I am still a fat person and I use to be an even fatter person, because I lost weight recently, so I guess, I really believe that many things in our interest area go back to who we are as a person, so of course I could understand size discrimination in the sense that when I would ride in some people's cars they would want me to put the seat belt on, but their seat belt wouldn't really fit around me, so it's sort of embarrassing for them to own a car with such a small seatbelt, but they wouldn't see it that way.

{50:00}

But they wouldn't see it that way. They wouldn't see it as a problem for them, they would just think like, "Oh my god, she's so big, my tiny little really tight seatbelt doesn't fit around her."

So on some level I would say I have personal experience, but I think, I'm sure that partly I was introduced to it through psychology of women. And my earliest work on it, I wrote a chapter with Beverly Goodwin and Lisa Touster. One is my colleague, one is my student, and we asked "Who is the woman in psychology of women?" We wanted to write that chapter for the book. I chased them down, you know my friend [Kat Quina] I have to think of her name, but anyway she had written an earlier book on diversity issues in psychology and I said "if you're going to go to press again we want a chapter in there on psych of women," because my colleague Beverly Goodwin had done stuff on texts and whether they included African American women—and in what sense-- and then I was interested in social class and the idea that social class wasn't really included in psych of women and then my student Lisa Osachy Touster had done a dissertation in which she looked at both psych of women and introductory psychology textbooks and looked at both the pictures and the text. I'm not sure how we came on that topic collectively together, but she had done that and we put all those pieces together in that chapter, which I'm very proud of "Who is the Woman in Psychology of Women?"

So my recent work, I don't know. I was part of a caucus at AWP and Esther Rothblum was the original chair and she's a really good chair and then that area of psychology has moved rapidly forward under her leadership, and I'm sure there are other people, but she wrote the *Fat Studies Reader* which we, my student and I, wrote a book review of, which just came out. And then we were also invited, because Irene is the editor of *Sex Roles* and there was a feminist forum piece on weight as a gender issue and it was written by Rothblum and a colleague [Janna] Fikkan. That's how those forums work. There's a starting piece and then other people read that piece and either extend it or argue with it or comment on it in some way. So my student Ashley Kasardo and I wrote a response to it. Ashley is a student in my program who, when I talked about size acceptance in a diversity class was very excited about it and then we started talking a little bit about it and then these opportunities came forward.

One of the things we did, it's still what somewhat informal and we're working to formalize it completely, is a replication of Touster. Ten years later we went back to look at introductory psych books and we didn't look at the pictures, we just looked at the content. Whether the content had moved forward, because it's an interesting area, because you know diets don't work. We all know this, but there's actually no one who can argue that diets work, because they don't work. You either don't lose weight or if you lose weight you gain it back. So 95% of people five years later will be at the same weight or higher weight. That's what failure is, honestly. And in every other area of psychology we're arguing for empirically demonstrated programs, but in terms of weight…Well, first of all a lot of those people even want to lose weight. They want to be healthy, this is like the idea of Health At Every Size, so for example, I'm a diabetic, but losing weight doesn't really fix my diabetes, that's like false and also skinny people do have diabetes, so it's like a risk factor, but it's not a cause.

{53:47}

It's not clearly a cause and I don't know if you know enough about diabetes, but you know the medicine you take for diabetes makes you gain weight. And actually, I think there are some people investigating this, I don't know that it's true, but the possibility is that diabetes itself doesn't comes as a result of weight gain, but is actually the preliminary push toward weight gain. So as you're developing diabetes you're getting fatter and fatter, but it's something about your metabolic system that's creating that weight, but they're not looking at any of these possibilities. Anyway, this idea that psychologists really are profiting from weight loss programs, we're implicitly very heavily involved and this is a serious ethical problem, to be constantly helping people to lose weight and then five years later they'll have gained it back. And we don't have information. We don't tell them "oh, I can help you lose weight, I might even be successful, but sure enough five years from now you will be the same weight or fatter."

This isn't what we tell people and really, it's not just in psychology. Obviously at a societal level, there's some kind of crisis. I don't know why we have the war on obesity and now we have the raging war on obese children. Why we decided to direct our attention at obesity. I think the same thing, sometimes obesity, not always, but sometimes obesity is really a way that people are coping with a lot of problems in their life. This is what my Tai Chi teacher told me. He was also a clinical psychologist with training in tai chi, but he was saying "there are many ways to react to trauma or distress in your life and really eating is one of the least harmful, compared to drinking, taking drugs, beating up other people." There's a lot worse avenues.

AR – And there's a lot of, again, structural variables that go into this, social class being one as well.

MM – Yes, exactly and I'm actually going to present on that at AWP. It's part of our fat workshop. Size acceptance workshop, the role of psychology. We were talking about this with Ashley, my student. And there's a really good reading in the *Fat Studies Reader*, and I'm sorry I don't remember the person's name, and his analysis is that being fat makes your poor. There's so much employment discrimination, educational. If there's any kind of indication of what you look like you won't get into college, you won't get a scholarship. That really, it's structural barriers against fat people that really make them poor. That that's as good an explanation for the correlation with social class as anything, but I think also it's partly of this idea. We're a colony of Great Britain and the Brits and Northern European types are still the favoured children of our nation and they tend to be thin compared to Italians, Greeks, Turks, Africans. That it's part of our racism policy, so I think that the people that are affluent come from a certain ethnic background and that ethnic background is genetically thinner. It's a very, I think it's a very racist issue and that woman who did the body project…Blumburger?

AR – Yes, Joan Blumberg.

MM – We don't have her name exactly right, but she wrote the *Body Project* and she was one of the first people who I heard would say this and I really thought seriously, but she said "look at me, I'm never going to be tall and thin. This is who I am." She's Jewish, her background.

AR – Brumberg? We'll look it up. [Joan Jacobs Brumberg]

{57:33}

MM – Yeah, probably. Sort of Semitic and that's what she's saying. Look it's about who I am genetically and racially, ethnically and how hard is that to see? But people don't seem to see it. Yeah.
AR – Well, let me ask a little bit about AWP, because you have been very involved for a long time. How did you first get involved?

MM – AWP is my primary professional affiliation, although I am very active in 35 right now too and I was active in the early time. Irene introduced me to both of these. Irene sent Suzanna and I to AWP in St. Louis and by sent, she told us to go. I don't think she even paid our way, I don't know if we got money from the institution or what, but we went down to St. Louis. I think we drove there and we went to, it was very exciting at AWP, there might even have been a nude swim party there, I'm not sure. It was certainly an exciting place to be and very interesting sessions. At the final session, they were talking about the next conference and Suzanna stood up and said that we're having it in Pittsburgh. So I don't know if they told me and I wasn't listening. Was I not paying attention for a minute or had they just failed to tell me or what, I never understood. I thought we're having it in Pittsburgh?! No kidding?

So the next year, and I think it was 78', we had it in Pittsburgh and we had a collective that was in charge of it including Irene, Suzanna and me, **Linda Grounds** , maybe two others. It was like six people, we rotated on and off. It was like a crazy thing. Some people were in charge of publicity, programming. One of the things I was in charge of, two things, the keynote speaker. We never had a keynote speaker at AWP, it was considered elitist to think that some of us were stars and others were not, but we had Sandra Bem. She came and spoke to a crowd of over a thousand people in the William Penn hotel. It was a huge session. At the time androgyny was very strong, she was very strong. You know, she's a very short person, so one of the things I had to do was get the little step for her to stand on. She spoke to over a thousand people. It was one of the largest AWP attendances in all of AWP's history. And we also had a very successful dance, which was crazy fun.

I was in charge of keynote speaker and I also was in charge of sneaking sandwiches into the William Penn, so that students could buy them cheap, because hotel food is very expensive. I didn't make the sandwiches myself, I was one step beyond that. I bought them at some cheap place out in Homestead and I brought the down and snuck them in in my car and sold them a corner of the room. People complained that they were soggy and they were, they were on white bread. That was before the fibre bread thing actually happened, but maybe some people were onto it and we weren't. There were a lot of complaints about the sandwiches and I was so mad, because I had so much time and energy and anxiety tied up in those darn sandwiches and I really thought if I had to do it all over again I would *never* bring those sandwiches in. Some lesson I learned from AWP.

AR – They're still talking about them huh? [Laughs]

{1:00:52}

MM – There was a big discussion at the end of AWP. This is so characteristic of this group. Somebody had gone to a session where a man had said something offensive and they said "we need better filter, we can only have feminists present, we can't have this, we can't have that." I'm sitting there thinking, we had hundreds of presenters in the program, it was so exciting and what were we suppose to do? Go in every room and yell at people if they said something sexist? That's crazy and even today sometimes it still offends me. I'm not going to mention any names, but there's someone in AWP who still stands up when there's a discussion and says, "I was in Pittsburgh and there was a sexist program." Like Pittsburgh, there were soggy sandwiches, there was Sandra Bell. There was so much more to that conference than one screwball guy who offended you in that session and we've been paying for it ever since. When you fill out AWP you have to still say how your session is feminist to make sure everybody addresses that in there. Maybe this last year I didn't have to do it. Maybe when we went to all academic they dropped that crazy [idea]..

{1:01:58}
{End of Disc 1}

Anyway, I was involved with AWP very early on as a result of this and very instrumental. Here are some of the things I did. I was a membership chair for a couple years and I had Christine Smith, who's now a professional, but she was a student at the time. She worked with me and did all the real hard work and I just went to meetings. I was the program chair for several years. I was the director of the whole kit and caboodle in '97 and Irene worked with me, so we had two committees. A committee at Pitt, which Irene mostly managed and a committee at IUP [Indiana University of Pennsylvania], which I mostly managed, but I went to all the Pitt sessions too and we did the program chair down there and I was the full director.

One time Irene and I had an argument over including a paper in a symposium and I said, "I'm just not going to let it, it's not going to happen." Anyway there was a thing and Irene said sort of like "I'm co-chair and I want it in there" and I was like "I'm the chair" and she said "Well what am I?" And I said, "You're the program chair." Okay that was funny. It was funny to me, I don't know if Irene thought it was funny. She was very, very instrumental, She was carrying half the weight by getting those people together down at Pitt. We had a very big group. We had a very good conference in '97 in Pittsburgh. It was at the Hilton I think the registration was around 800 and it was the biggest contingent of international people that we ever had. Irene had some international students working with her down at Pitt. Bozena Zdaniuk was one of them and they contacted all kinds of international students and the Beijing conference had been shortly before that, so we had contacts through that. Leonore [Tiefer] had contacts. We had a lot of international people there, it was a very fine conference. Deborah Belle was one of the keynotes. She does social class, so that was the beginning of that. See I was already working on that theme on some model on my life. There was a crone-ing. I think there still is often a crone-ing and my mother came down and was crone-ed and my daughter was there and I remember that part. It was very good.

AR – Is that part of…I don't know this tradition.

{04:20}

MM – It's the caucus on women in aging used to do it and they had a crone-ing celebration. A celebration of wisdom of older women and it's a kind of ritual. There's a ritual component to it. It's kind of tied to well feminist spirituality or something. It has that element.

AR – Do they still do that? Do they still have a ceremony?

MM – I'm not sure. I think that the original people in that aging caucus, they retired or quit coming, they were too old to come.

AR – Well, you've done a little bit on work recently on aging and activism.

MM – I know, I came back to it. Aging, I came back to it! That was Joan Chrisler, got [me] interest[ed] in that and she had that book on women over fifty, she asked me to write a chapter. My first one was on menopause, right, and women and sex over fifty. I really liked that chapter and I like when I present it, it's fun. And then again, it was her and Varda [Muhlbauer] they had another session and it was on women, aging, and power. I don't know where, this again came from, something I read. I'm interested in women in the future. Did you know notice that? It's another odd interest of mine. When I first came to IUP in 86', 87' they had these like 25,000 dollar symposiums and they said Women Studies should do one and I don't know, it just came to me that we should do it on women in the future, because it's multidisciplinary, blah blah. So in connection, I had this great symposium at IUP on women in the future including I had Marge Piercy come. Do you know Marge Piercy?

AR – I know the name.

MM – Okay, she's from Detroit! and wrote *Women on the Edge of Time*, which is a great book and one which every one of you should read immediately. *Women on the Edge of Time*, it's about crazy women. It's another part of my crazy women part. She has a future society in that. There's a woman who time travels. Right. She's institutionalized in the present, but she time travels to a utopian future. Yes, it's just a great book, but anyways she was instrumental in my interest in women in the future. Also Division 35. I was on Division 35 [Board] under Carolyn Sherif. She was the President, I was on the executive board which was a smaller group then. We could meet in a very small room like this and one time, during break, all the women who were mostly senior, I was a graduate student working with Irene. We're working on the guidelines for non-sexist research in psychology and I was going to these board meetings with Carolyn Sherif and I pronounced her name wrong, I'm sorry.

AR – I've heard Sherif and Sheref. I'm not even sure.

MM – It's Sherif the last time I said it at 35, five people jumped on my throat and I was very upset about it.

AR – So what is it?

{07:07}

MM – It's Sherif, not Sheref which is Arab pronunciation and they Anglicized it. Anyway, Carolyn Sherif. She was just a fantastic person to know, but anyway on break all the women started talking about what they were reading and they were all reading feminist sci-fi. And that was again, some kind of important point in my life. I thought like, I had read some of them, but I got on board. I immediately read all of them. I was into sci-fi. Irene's really into sci-fi. I read all this work. Anyway, that sort of fits in this women and the future. Marge Piercy came and gave us a talk. Where was I going with this? I was going to tie it all back in like Kathy Griffin does in her comedy routines. Do you ever notice? She goes off tangent like all the way over here, she brings it all the way back. You should go see her. She's fantastic, but she swears a lot.

AR – You were talking about AWP and then 35 and the future and getting money for the symposium.

MM – Yeah, I did a big symposium about women in the future and I've always had an element of futurism in my work and I taught a course called Women in the Future at IUP for a number of years, so I have a very strong futurism piece that is pretty much absent in psychology.

AR – It is.

MM – Right, not even that strong in women studies and a lot of the speculative fiction has really, the feminist future has really died down. Marge Piercy gave a really brilliant talk on that. When she came to IUP and she said, "why are women writing science fiction?, because it's like we're in a desert and we're dying of thirst." It represents what we want, what we need. We need this alternative future. She's a brilliant person. Oh, but anyway, I can't remember. What was the original question I was talking about? I could come back if anybody could...

AK – What made you interested in women in the future?

MM – It was before that, because women in the future…anyway I got interested in women in the future as a result of that symposium and that ties together AWP. There was an element in '97 of women in the future at that conference. It was called Forging the Future Feminist. The '97 conference of AWP and there was some people who wrote about the future on the speakers. Not sure exactly that was what I was going to say, but there is that connection that I have an interest in the future. That futurism, which is kind of dormant now.

AR – Well, this isn't I mean...this isn't exactly what you were talking about, but you mentioned Forging of Feminists Future and I was wondering if I could ask for your reflections on what you see as the most important place that feminism needs to go in psychology?

MM – Yeah, that's where we were going. That's where we were going, because I think aging is underdeveloped and I read a really good article on why we need feminist gerontology.

AR – Oh neat.

{10:20}

MM – And I think feminists, like we're starting to write on older women, but whether we're feminists in our "full" approach and this article on feminist gerontology had very high standards for what it would take and that's related to my interest in women aging and social change. Because something I read, some things I read years ago on women in the future, it was prior to 2001...9/11, prior to 9/11 it was a very optimistic book about how we're going to change the world. That there were so many women that are educated today that weren't, more than any other time in human history. Women with PhDs, but also more women that are literate, I'm thinking of Uganda and that women have experience in various kinds of movements. Just like what we're talking about today. I was involved with the anti-war movement, with the women's movement. I've had a lot more organization training. You know, I know how to write. I've done so many things and I'm just like many other women around the globe and we're just waiting, but we're trained in waiting like a reservoir of army and when the time comes with the right catalyst, we'll all march forward and make a beautiful future.

And it's the idea that we would really break completely from the patriarchal past. That we would really have a new paradigm for the organization of society and for how people would get along. It's a beautiful vision and that vision came to me when Joan [Chrisler] asked me to write a chapter on women, power and agency. I was thinking, oh I read some things years ago about how older women today are a special cohort and have a special potential and what would it take to tap into it and that's sort of what my chapter for Joan. There's a special issue that's going to be published and it's sort of that. I'm glad I found out, I was really struggling out there. Where am I going with this?

AR – Well, I want to be conscious of time. It's now almost 3pm. I have one more general question, but is there any...yeah Florence?

FT – I wanted to know, you mentioned your parents were working class people and you also went to Chatham college and there were lots of different people. Did you experience anything that affected your research in any way?

MM – It did, yeah. I recognized it when I was at Chatham. For example, I had a job with food services and I don't know, some of the rich girls were really snobby. They left their things laying around and you were like the clean-up crew. It was very, there was something wrong there. Well, one day one of the girls left an expensive ring her tray and it got dumped in the garbage and they had all the people sorting through garbage trying to find her ring, which she carelessly left on her tray. That sort of opened your eyes to some kind of social class issues. The other thing I wanted to say was, my mother was working class, but that meant she was a stay at home homemaker with five children and I think that my mother was not clinically depressed, but was not happy. I think she had untapped potential and when I was at Pitt as a graduate student, she came back to school as an undergraduate. That was when re-entry for women was a thing, women going back, being recruited back. In her interview coming back to Pitt, there were special offers to bring these women in, because you know they didn't have to take the SATs, because they were twenty-five years out of high school.

{14:07}

Anyway, the woman that interview her, talked to her, my mother, saying that her brothers had gone on and become professionals, but she hadn't been encouraged or there was no money to send her to college or encouragement. And the woman said her, "well, that's so horrible because if you had gone to college maybe you would have married a professional." She missed the whole point. Maybe *you* would have been a professional, or maybe you would have used your intelligence for a variety of things, or been more satisfied but I was thinking she was running the program and she still didn't really get the point. Even my mother got the point, because she's the one that told me "there's something wrong with this." Anyway she was in my psychology of women class, because it was team taught, so I didn't have to grade her work. So something about that…yeah, that was something special, she was in my class, she earned a women studies certificate. Was enough of a…I'm not sure what you asked me.

FT – Yeah, like other difficulties you face…

MM – Yeah, I'm aware of them, but I wouldn't say they were insurmountable obstacles, but like when I taught at Pitt, the associate chair of the department who I liked very much, Merle Moskowitz called me in an asked me about my accent, because I was teaching and he was in charge of the teaching people and he said something about my accent. I don't even know what he said to me, but I was saying like I really don't have an accent. The reason being I'm still in Pittsburgh. I have a Pittsburgh accent, but really only noticeable when I leave Pittsburgh. So since I'm in Pittsburgh it's not really called an accent, the way people here talk. And he was saying, and this is one of the things he said, "I was born and raised in Pittsburgh too, but when I went to Harvard I lost my accent."

AR – Really, he said that?

MM – And I said to him, I seriously did so maybe I was always a little bit outspoken, I said "if I'm pronouncing anything incorrectly, if my grammar is incorrect then please correct me, but if it's just pronunciation then I'm not willing to remedy it. I'm not willing to talk like somebody from Harvard." But, you know, there is an incorrect pronunciation, which I still have. I would say something like, "this room needs dusted" instead of "needs to be dusted." I have a problem with split infinitives, it's a Pittsburgh accent, it's a Pittsburgh way of talking. I don't ever say "yinz" which is a Pittsburgh way of talking and it is class related, but I never did say yinz, so I thought it would be really pretentious to start saying it, but I think it's perfectly legitimate. In the south they say y'all and people don't tell them it's an incorrect formation. 'Yinz' is you ones. It's a contraction for you ones. What are yinz doing this afternoon? What are you all doing this afternoon? And they actually say a version of it in Ireland. "Youse" they call it. What are youse doing? Yeah, it's plural, so it just makes perfect sense, but see what I mean, there's times in my life where it's clear that there's a class issue. You know, it's often been a size issue. Generally, a feminist issue. Like talking loud. I talk loud for a couple reasons.

{17:30}

One I taught to [large] classes of students, but I actually do have now a slight hearing impairment, but I'm just really sensitive to it and people say now, "But she's so loud!" I'm

thinking like, is that a sin? Do I deserve to be arrested? Or, vilified because I have a loud voice? It's like a diversity issue, but you see when people are loud there often is a hearing impaired person in their family. That's why they talk loud.

AR – Well, I love it that you speak loudly, I never actually noticed that you did, because I actually have a slight hearing impairment and it frustrates me.

MM – See that's probably why you like me, you didn't even realize it. People with slight hearing impairment are drawn to me. [Laughs] I also talk fast and sometimes people give me a hard time about that, but I actually read the studies that show that people who speak really fast are thought to be intelligent. They perceive them as intelligent. So I thought, well why slow down? There's a whole area we didn't talk about.

AR – Okay, well one of my questions is, is there anything we haven't hit on and I know there is lots, because we could talk for a long time, but that you would especially like to have part of the tape, in terms of aspects of your work...

MM – Yeah, because I think I most strongly identify with violence against women and I didn't talk about that at all.

AR – So tell us a little bit about the evolution of that project.

MM – Part of the reason why I do a lot of work on violence against women is that I'm trained as an attribution theorist, with Irene, and that has to do with victim blame. I started with the area of victim blame and in some ways I've come around full circle. I'm back with victim blame and rape myths and that's why I was saying in the session today, what's odd about it is that it hasn't shifted over twenty-five years. We have made, in some ways, absolutely no progress. So that's how I got involved, because I teach in a department where they have a PsyD and clinical students and no social students and so the intersection of where I am and where they are is violence against women and I've worked a lot on violence against women. And also Irene is pretty well known. I've worked a little bit with Irene on it. For example. I never collected a lot of data, but Irene had all that data. Actually, I have all the tapes, because I wanted to listen to them all, but I couldn't bear to. That's why she gave them to me, because she didn't want to have to listen to them again either. They're very hard to listen to.

Anyway, one of the things I'm proud of in terms of the violence against women and I just got tied into rape recently and that's really Florence Denmark. She and the people connected with her, Michelle Paludi, Donna Castañeda. I don't know, they quit asking me to write chapters on partner violence and they started asking me to write chapters on rape. I was into sexuality, I always have been, but now, I don't know, they just pulled me in, now I'm on rape. But what I'm most proud of, I would say, and it sort of pulls my research all together in some ways is the movement from being an empiricist, which I would still characterize Irene as an empiricist.

{20:35}

From an empiricist, to writing the guidelines and in writing the guidelines, working with Randi Koeski sort of moving, inching forward to thinking beyond empiricism. We can't just correct our methods and then have them turn out to be something transformative. We have to really move on beyond those methods. There's just a problem, that you always have an angle. You can never really be fully objective. I started to really understand that and then I was working with my colleague Lisa Cosgrove who was my student at Duquesne. She did her dissertation with me.

AR – Really?

MM – Yes.

AR – I didn't know that.

MM – On rape. I guess, coming around full circle. And then she because she's trained at Dusquesne, phenomenological, and she has this philosophical bent way beyond mine really, but together we wrote several chapters on feminist methods where we tried to move forward through a social construction to the post-modern. I would say the job we were doing, I thought of it as a kind of translation of post-modern for the common feminist psychologist. To try to understand the key issues, because it's hard to read the original work. They're kind of, they are hard to read, aren't they? Lisa read all the originals, [Jacques] Derrida, [Luce] Irigaray. I read some of it, but mostly I talked to Lisa and then we would write together and we really moved forward and I'm really proud of that work that I did together with Lisa.

But then I have taken it off on my own. I think it has really helped with the problem of violence against women that Irene was talking about today. I edited two special issues on partner violence with Irene, *Psychology of Women [Quarterly]*, and there were so many papers that we actually got a special issue of *Sex Roles*. We brought all those papers in and they all have to do with gender issues or women using violence. It's that divide between battered women, where males beat up women within an inch of their lives, versus Straus's idea that men and women both commit violence equally in relationships. There's a paper that I wrote, my students are listed with me because they helped edit everything and I was trying to bring them along, but it's really a post-modern analysis which says quit having that "either or" debate, there's more than one reality, it depends on how you construct it. I think it's really a contribution. I felt proud of that contribution, that post-modern solution helps us get out of certain kind of corners that we trapped ourselves in using this kind of either or thinking, or that there's an absolute reality that's correct, and which one of us has the best angle on reality.

I like the analogy of the elephant in the room with five blind men. Do you know that one? Each of them thinks they understand the elephant but they only understand one part of the elephant and the best understanding of the elephant is from the combination, so I really think that is a contribution that I have already made, but that's the kind of contribution that I see myself potentially making. Now, as I come, sort of to the end of my career, I think I have nine years left. I'm working on a nine year plan and I hope to bring the post-modern to the question of rape and sexuality and sexual violence and sexualisation.

{24:15}

AR – Well that will be a welcome addition especially in the US and some of the Brits have been better at that.

MM – Absolutely, they are much further along. Hey, yeah when I get a sabbatical I might have to either New Zealand or Britain, England.

AR – Totally.

MM – Right. Or if I can't make that, I should at least go to Canada.

AR – Well, there's a few of us up there.

MM – That's right. Exactly, I'm being serious, I'm not being facetious. So I think that that, see how that brings both the methods, the transforming the violence, I see that as the thread that ties them together. The development of post-modern view and I don't think it's original with me, but I just think that...again, I'm just part of an army of people. Part of a group, a collective. I shouldn't use army, that's a such an androcentric term. Part of a larger collective of people who are making an effort to move our thinking forward with more of a post-modern twist. I should say this, my brother who's in Geography, I mentioned him earlier. Kevin is his name. He is beyond me in terms of competition. He's moved beyond post-modern.

PG – Is it the social constructionist approach which is post-modern?

MM – Social construction is part of post-modern and post-modern includes something else more complex than social construction. De-construction.

AR – Yeah, de-construction and a lot of focus on language. We can get into it. So is he post-post- modern?

MM – Yes, and that's what he told me. This is what he said to me in one interaction recently, "post-modern is passé" and I'm thinking oh my god. I am working so hard to get up here to post-modern and to bring other people along and it's already passé. I'm really scared, so I asked "okay, what's next?" I read this chapter that said that Rhoda Unger was prescient in one of her early papers. I think you wrote it.

AR – Oh maybe? Okay.

MM – Yes, it's by you Alex and you wrote that Rhoda Unger was prescient. And I thought, this is what I want people to say about me. Maureen McHugh was prescient and in some ways, in some articles, in the guidelines, you could argue that I was, but I was thinking oh I need to do something stronger, I need to develop prescience. So I said to my brother Kevin, "what should I be reading? Give me an idea." So it's called the Performative Turn or it's also called, I don't know, something about the everyday. It's about the mundane, the everyday, the affective component and the performative turn. I looked these up and they are so...

{27:02}

AR – They are post-post- modern?

MM – They are so. Post modern still attempts to describe reality, or describe a piece of reality...

AR – It's more text based?

MM – Yes ,but it makes it historical according to these people. You want to get at life actually as it's lived. As it's lived and it makes sense...

AR – It's not just recordings of life, it's actual performances.

MM – That's right. That's why it's performative and you know who's really into this is Mary Gergen. Exactly. But, here's the thing that I think is interesting, this is the part I understand. First of all, women's lives are really at the everyday level and I have already done stuff on the mundane, like street harassment is mundane and unpacking the term mundane everyday, but also that emotions that are often associated with women are fleeting so you can't really very well record or articulate a feeling that you've had. It's really impossible. For example, child birth. People can say it's painful, they can go on and on about how painful it is, but really you cannot, this is the point of human psychology isn't it, that you can't really relive that pain. You can talk about it as something that happened in the past, but you can't really go there. You can't go back to that pain.

AR – You know it sounds a little bit phenomenological.

MM – It does, so much. That's what I thought, because of Lisa.

AR – So you are, you were prescient because you were influenced by phenomenological theory early in your career.

MM – Right, right and I will be even further, as soon as I get a grip and this is where I plan to go. First, right up the post-modern for femininity, sexuality, a few other things and then try to move forward to the performative, but I don't think I'll perform. My brother actually does I guess. I don't know what he does exactly.

AR – What are they doing in Geography? [Laughs]

MM – I don't know, but he's a special human, cultural geographer. He's in a special field.

AR – My stepson is a human geographer too. There doing wonderful things there.

MM – Okay, so that's what my brother is and he does fabulous stuff, but he's not fully appreciated where he is.

{29:07}

AR – It's hard. They are at the kind of fringes of geography. They are more radical and so…

MM – Yeah, you know what he's doing now? Thermo-imaging. He has a student and they go into a group of people and they just have this camera that shows thermo imaging of what's going on at the time. How much is that a version of the perfomative turn.

AR – Totally.

MM – I know and in here there would be certain red and blue centers, if we looked through the special cameras. Thermal cameras. Yeah, I don't know. He didn't present it, I only talked to him in email about it.

AR – Well, look we're…anything else you would like to add before we finish? We got to your aims for the next nine years, so maybe this is a good place to stop.

MM – Yeah, I'm not retiring for nine years, because I really need the support of a university to accomplish what I need to do. Some people said "you could retire and then do it" and I'm thinking really? I think not. What I really need is more people, like cleaning up my office and helping me get organized, so that I can move forward with this project. I'm doing a, I think I already told you, I'm doing a sex and gender conference and a slut walk at IUP, and Leonore Tiefer is coming, so that's my sexuality piece. And I'm doing the leadership institute and that goes back to the original work on intrinsic motivation, leadership, achievement.

AK – I have one more question. We were reading the piece that you wrote about yourself yesterday and there was something about a video game that you worked on regarding rape?

FT – Wasn't it about wages?

MM – Wages! Right, it's a game that Stephanie Shields who is the current president of 35. She developed it, it's a board game and you have different coloured people and you pick up a card and you roll the dice and pick up a card and you move forward and it would say stuff like, "you were asked to organize a graduate ceremony for your department and you did a good job. Move one step forward." But then a male colleague would be, "you were asked to do some kind of fundraiser with the basketball team. Move three steps forward." So by playing the game it seems like, it's very realistic based but you realize over time that one team is falling drearily behind and then you realize that it's women. It's not explicit, it's not too explicit although maybe at one part it's the dean seems to come onto you and you brush him off and then you don't get promoted. That would be more extreme. It has a couple extreme ones in there, but it's this sort of daily movement through an academic day, which moves you along and then, you know, members of a certain team, which is the equivalent of males, they get promoted and get a raise and the other team is lagging behind. It's called Wages.

{32:12}

So I got a little grant to buy some copies of this game and then our idea is to use it in classes, but also maybe to try and get the administrators at my university to play the game. Especially in science, places where they deny that any discrimination occurs. And Stephanie Shields is collecting information, so after you play the game…anyway, she's trying to evaluate it in terms of its effectiveness at reducing sexism. Changing sexist beliefs or something.

AR – Sounds slightly performative.

MM – It is. It is, isn't it? And I have a, I'm working with a librarian whose on the faculty at IUP and she's actually is doing a larger project on games as pedagogical devices, so we might do something there. I mean, I think it's really interesting isn't it?

FT – It's not related to psychology, but at York at our career center there's a game called *Who Am I*. It helps you discover what kind of careers you want to do and instead of doing questionnaires and stuff like that...

AR – Game format instead of just checklists.

MM – There's another one on gender, that I don't know the name of, but I went to a psych of women institute training session. You know pre-conference training that we do? 35 does it.

AR – Right, is that the leadership institute?

MM – No, it's the other one. It's like a CE [Continuing Education], they have it before APA. Christine Smith was in charge of it for awhile. They usually have a text book editor there. You know, like, no, a text book author. Like Yoder would be there or Unger.

AR – It's not the teaching of Psych of Women one?

MM – Yeah, teaching psych of women. So I went one time and we all played a game and it was a fantastic one, it was not Wages, but it had the same effect. Some people were falling way behind and we understood, this is what I love about this game talking about performative turn. We are falling behind, we know perfectly well why because we represent the oppressed group. Other people are doing better. But here's the thing, the people that are doing well understand that the game is rigged and it's demonstrating elitism and blah, blah, blah, but they're still giggling and laughing and loving this game and we are depressed and demoralized and want to quit. I was amazed that that idea, that this game that we could all see through, we knew exactly what was going on at an intellectual level, still was able to impact our mood. I do Star Power in my class. Do you ever play that? It's a social class game and you pull these tokens and some people move up and move down and so it represents mobility in and out of class groups, but really the bag they pull the chips out of is rigged. Some people get all the gold chips, but they don't realize it. They think they deserved it, because as they earned those gold chips through this stupid trading game. But it's rigged from the beginning, so it's a way of demonstrating to the students: this system is rigged. You know, if your dad's rich, you're going to be rich and whatever you do in life you didn't really earn it.

{35:20}

AR – The silver spoon in your mouth.
MM – Exactly, the whole questioning the meritocracy. Just the other thing is that student's mood is affected by the game, and the people at the bottom, sometimes they're very chipper though. They're very connected, they have a very strong collective of spirit, but there's no point. It doesn't matter what we do, we're not trading with anybody because the game's rigged.

ST – That's your pessimistic and critical side.

MM – Exactly, it's pessimistic and critical. If you could get all those students to be the same way without actually talking to them about it. Just put them in that game.

AR – Okay, why don't we stop there.

{36:03}