Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History Project

Interview with Meredith Kimball

Interviewed by Laura Ball
Montreal, Quebec, Canada
June 12, 2009

When citing this interview, please use the following citaton:

Kimball, M. (2009, June 12). Interview by L. Ball [Video Recording]. Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History and Online Archive Project. Montreal, Quebec, Canada.

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 Meredith Kimball
Interviewed by Laura Ball
Montreal, Quebec, Canada
June 12th, 2009

MK: Meredith Kimball, Interview participant

LB: Laura Ball, Interviewer

LB: For the record, if you could state your name, date of birth and place of birth.

MK: Okay. Meredith Kimball and I was born in Hastings, Nebraska on March 1st 1944.

LB: Wonderful. Okay. So the first question I am going to ask you is a very general question that we ask everybody. Can you could tell me a little bit about how your feminist identity emerged or developed.

MK: Okay, I guess it would start when I was a child, although I wouldn't have labeled it as feminist at the time. But I was quite a tomboy, so I was really into sports and I was very excited about playing little league baseball. And, still remember the day, I must have been 7 or 8 years old, that my parents told me "no," I couldn't play little league baseball because that was way before Title IX or anything like that. It was only boys. And I clearly, thought that was really, I would say now discriminatory. That wouldn't be a word I would have known as a kid, but unfair. Unfair. So that proceeded on, I probably also noticed it, the only sports we had in high school for girls were intramural so I played basketball and I was tall enough to be pretty good at basketball. But there were no girls teams. Period. Except for playing in the school. So I did that and I was in the pep club, which was the group that cheered on the boys, right. I didn't notice it in terms of intellectual things. I did not feel like any of the teachers treated me lesser because I was a girl or thought I couldn't do certain things. I mean both my parents are teachers, both had college educations, so it was a foregoing conclusion that I would go to university. So it was a fairly standard middle-class background that way. And I didn't feel any unfairness or discrimination about school. But sports was clear, sports was unfair. And I still love watching the state basketball championships now. But anyway, I graduated from high school in 1962 and I went to Macalester College in St. Paul Minnesota and for me that was a move from a very small town to a big city. And I really liked that. I really liked the anonymity. Because in a small town everybody knows you and everybody knows your parents and if you do anything you shouldn't do it gets back to your parents. And in St. Paul that didn't happen, at all! And so I was a psychology major as an undergraduate and again, I didn't, I was trying to, I have to think back a bit about university experiences. Certainly in terms of the psychology profs I had as much encouragement as the males did. I did an honors project and I also worked for Anne Pick as a research assistant. She was an assistant professor there before she went to the

University of Minnesota. And doing, testing little kids on size/weight illusion basically is what I did. So I got that position and she sought me out for that. I got very good grades. I learned early on if you could get good grades that got you positive things. And I knew very early I wanted to go to graduate school. [3:21] That is, I talked to a prof in my intro psych course and said I wanted to go to graduate school and he encouraged me to take calculus. Because he said statistics in graduate school will be easier if you had calculus. And he also brought me into, he gave me an IQ test, which was a very interesting mentoring exercise. He said, "just to see what it is like I could give you an IQ test, would you be interested?" and he was a clinical psychologist and so I said, "sure" and he gave me a IQ [test], told me what my IQ was and basically said, and this is where it became mentoring, he basically said, "you are smart enough to do anything you want to do, graduate school is not a problem in terms of your intelligence." And he, starting even from intro psych then, and then I was involved in a…I can't even remember what I did but I did either observed what he was doing, he was doing some work in a mental hospital and I either got to give some tests under his supervision, or something. Minimal, very minimal. But encouraging. Encouraged me to identify as a psychologist very quickly. I decided on a psych major because for the orientation week there's a book, every incoming freshman had to read a book and it was *Walden Two* by Skinner and I loved it. And I got in this discussion group and everyone else was horrified. Right? You can see where the two sides of that would come from. I thought it was great and it was logical and it made people happy and blah, blah, blah. Whereas other people, well you know the anti-deterministic kind of thing. So that sort of brought me up short, but I still liked it and took intro psych and then from there wanted to be a psych major. So I did that my first or second semester at university. Then went on to be a major and do an honors. There was one professor, Walter Mink who was particularly, in my view, mentoring. He, I had a boyfriend at the time from high school who had gone to the University in Nebraska and then went to the Peace Corps, so we spent a lot of the time separated. But, it kind of solved the dating problem for me. 'Cause I had a boyfriend right, I didn't have to worry about dating. And at some point, I was worried I was pregnant after a summer we had spent together, it was just my period was late, I wasn't pregnant, but this was before birth control and this was before easy or before legal abortion in the States. So George had said he would marry me if I was pregnant and I really didn't want that and I got a lot of support, well not particularly from Walter Mink I think, but from the first prof, I can't even remember his name. Ray? Roy? Anyway, to say, "No, you shouldn't get married," and really supportive in that. As it turns out, since I wasn't pregnant, this was a big relief and then the next year birth control pills came in and we could get them on campus. Which I did immediately. So that settled that problem. But Walter Mink did a couple of things. His wife worked as a professional psychologist too, so you know at times when I was talking to him he would tell me about that. And how she worked when their kids where young, and that was really important to both of them, this could be done. So that was good. And I also went through a bit of a crisis in my junior year, in which I had decided I wanted to be a famous psychologist, not just a psychologist. So I kind of went into him and said, "Look I want to know now if I am going to be a famous psychologist or not, because if I am not going to be a famous psychologist I'm just not going to do it." And he was great. What he said was, "well, I can't tell you whether you are going to be a famous psychologist or not. There are many,

many factors that go into that. You could be, but many of us aren't." Put himself in the other category. And he said, "but I can tell you one thing, every famous psychologist felt like you feel now at some point." So that was great. You know I just said, "oh okay, so I'll just go on and do it." I went directly from undergraduate to graduate school. I went to the University of Michigan in Ann Arbor, in developmental psychology. [08:02] And I applied in experimental, I applied to a number of places and I wasn't accepted everywhere I applied. But I was accepted several places and Michigan accepted me in developmental, which I was slightly insulted about, because I had applied in experimental. I was into being a hard nose experimental psychologist in those days. But was I was given a scholarship, or you know some kind of support, and worked with David McNeill at first, but then later shifted over to John Hagen, who was new on the developmental program there. In fact, it was a very new, very small program. T here were about 8 of us that went in that year and I think John was the supervisor for most of us. We didn't do an MA, because you didn't in the States. You were accepted in a PhD program. But we did a research project, which could count as an MA thesis if you had to leave the program, or were asked to leave the program, you could get a compensation MA or something like that. And I did that research project with Philip Dale on language development in little kids. He at the time was a PhD student of David McNeill's but mentoring Philip, he had him mentor me though the 619 project. That was the name of the course you took for an MA program. And I did later publish that with Phil. After I got a job, that was my first sort of real publication. Then I worked with John Hagen for my PhD and there was a woman on my committee, I may have to tell you her name later because I may have to look up my thesis to remember it. She was one of the women who… she had worked the whole time her kids were growing up. She was married to someone in the department, but of course didn't have a position in the department, had a kind of associate position in the department. And she was on my committee and she was important in terms of just a model of somebody who could have a family and be okay with that and continue on. I knew she was kind of undervalued in the department, but she was there and she was on my committee and she was encouraging me to get a PhD. Otherwise my committee were males, all males. And, so I did the prelim exams, which were very good at Michigan. All the programs weren't the same but in developmental, you would give them a reading list and said "I want to read in these three areas." And they approved your reading list and then you went off and read it and then they set an exam. I think you had some choice about what kind of exam. I wanted a… it was a closed book exam, I'm not sure it was required… I think maybe it was required to be closed book. So for one day, for 8 hours, I got to write three questions. But, sent away to the library to write them, I mean, honour system about not cheating, etcetera. So I got through prelims and then did my thesis on infant object constancy, Piagietian object constancy, which came up with some very unstartling, uninteresting results. It never got published. I was looking at whether babies, it was 6 to 12 month old infants and whether… I had a little puppet show. So the puppet would come up one place and then sometimes the puppet would come up the place they had seen it before and sometimes it would come up in a new place. So I was looking for surprise as a non-motor sort of… 'cause you usually, the object constancy is the kid has to reach for it. You hide it and do they pull the barrier, etcetera. So, it was whether you could get an earlier measure of an indication mentally of object constancy without the motor component. Well, it was awful

hard to code surprise on a babies' faces. As I remember, they were non-significant results. But it was a kind of situation, which I think many schools do, we certainly did at Simon Fraser. There was a proposal and once I passed my proposal, if I did that, I got the PhD. And, that last year at Michigan, was 1969-70, and there was a women's lib group and I joined it. So that was in the department. [12:53] It was mostly students, it was a few faculty, a few women faculty. And we kind of met as a consciousness raising group. So I had a lot of … So I joined the consciousness raising group, so I would say… Actually I have to backtrack. My very first exposure to feminism as a word, or women's liberation as a term, was reading Betty Friedan and that happened in 1963 when the book came out and I was in college at the time. And I was all excited about the book, but not many of my fellow students were very excited about the book. But I latched onto it, but there wasn't anywhere to take it in '63. So, then in '69 there were a lot of places to take it. There was a lot of literature, there were a lot of things to read, there was a lot of stuff going on. And I also was applying for jobs at that point and I had married George, the same guy from high school. And he was threatened with the draft at that point, because this is the middle of the Vietnam War. We had already decided that if he got drafted he was going to Canada and we would move to Windsor and from there I would finish in Ann Arbor. Of course that was pretty convenient. So we already thought about going to Canada. It turned out he got, he had malaria when he was in the Peace Corps so he got a medical 4F, as we call them, that's what the term was in those days. I think that maybe had something to do with the fact my father was on the draft board, but anyway we never talked about that. My father and I never talked about it. And I wouldn't have asked him and he wouldn't have said anything to me. But the advantages of a small town. Anyway, that didn't become necessary, but when I applied for jobs the first interview I was given was at the University of British Columbia. I flew out there in February for an interview and I loved it! Not the psych department. It looked kind of scary and it turns out it was pretty scary, but the city - I mean this was one of those Februarys in Vancouver where it turns spring and the crocus were up and there was ocean. I did my interview and did the best I could, but I was just enthralled with the place. And a lot of the people in developmental, which is obviously what I was being hired into, seemed pleasant and nice, good to work with and then that turned out to be true for the developmental people. So I was offered the job and I took it. And later I was contacted about a couple other interviews, but of course didn't do them. That was the beginning when things were starting to be tightened up a bit from the '60s. So it was beginning to be it wasn't just automatic you got your PhD and got a job. In the mid to late '60s it pretty much was, because things were expanding. Places like York were opening up. Simon Fraser was opening up. A lot of Americans were coming to Canada to take jobs, etcetera and there weren't that many PhD programs in Canada producing that many PhDs, and in the States too. I mean there would have been a job for them in the States, but it was a little harder and it got increasingly harder through the 1970s. So I took the job at UBC [University of British Columbia] and we packed up and drove the Volkswagen up there. I started in the psychology department in 1970 and I didn't like it much. The department itself was very big. There were thirty, thirty-five people in it. The developmental people and the social people were fine, other colleagues in developmental and social, and I made some friends with them. But the overall department was very clearly oriented towards, "we want to be Harvard of the north," and "we expect you to publish three articles a year." I was kind of

scared, I didn't t know what publishing was all about. I hadn't done publishing as a graduate student. I mean it was the days when you could do that. So I started there in psychology. I don't know, do you want to go on to other questions? [17:15]

LB: No it's okay. This is actually a good story and you're actually hitting some of the questions that I was going…

MK: Well, I will keep going. So I am pre-tenure, in tenure track position in psychology. Tenure decision is made in year 5 and then you have an extra year if you are denied for looking for a job. I immediately found the feminist group on campus and joined it, 'cause there was a women's lib group on campus, and then participated in a small study group that was focused around social sciences. A group of us, not all faculty by any means, but a group of people who were interested in sociology, psychology, anthropology formed a small study group. There were other small study groups and then there was also a small consciousness-raising group that I joined and that met for 2 or 3 years. Not all the same women, but some of the same women who were in the social studies group. And that immediately became quite important to me, and I kept my mouth shut about that in the psych department, but anyway. I did do some publishing, but immediately got more interested in shifting my research over to feminist stuff.

LB: Actually, I was going to ask you about that, your first publication was very straightforward, developmental and then all of a sudden…

MK: It changes.

LB: It switches and it's like you don't go back.

MK: I did try some research. I got a small president's grant and a start-up grant and I tried some research on infant perception. I was doing…

LB: I think you had some stuff about television.

MK: That's a bit later. That's older kids. This was infant stuff. I don't know, I met with Elinor Ames, who was at Simon Fraser, who had done infant perception work and she gave me the design for her infant looking box. And I had one built by the psych department and I tried some babies, and they all looked left. I don't know what was wrong, but they all looked left. That soon became a non-… I didn't even have data from that project. But at that point I also got interested in, the first work I did in the feminist work was fear of success. And I did that study with grade 8, I'm pretty sure grade 8, it was published, so you can find out if it wasn't grade 8, but I think grade 8 girls at a private school in Vancouver. So that was the beginning of …part of getting interested in feminism meant I wanted to take my research that way. And, at the same time, the second year I think I was there, '71-'72 there was a noncredit Women's Studies course. A bunch of us got together from the university and from outside and put together a noncredit course. I think I gave one lecture in that course and was involved in a small discussion group. The lecture may or may not have been on Freud, but anyway later

lectures were. [20:31] So we ran that non-credit course and at the same time, a group of us in the faculty, and that was primarily Dorothy Smith, and Hilga Jacobson, who was an anthropologist, and Annette Kolodny, who was in the English department at UBC at that time, and myself put together a program for a credit Women's Studies program and took it through the various committees in, I think, '72-'73. And that was a learning experience, 'cause that was kind of the first time I really ran up against, "they don't want you to do this," right. So particularly the faculty. The programs went through the departments and I think psychology probably decided they were going to get rid of me anyway, but anyway it was okay in psychology. But at the Faculty of Arts, the curriculum committee or the major faculty of arts meeting that had to pass it before it could go forward, we got all sorts of crap. So that was where one of the groups of people said… we were compared to the Nazis, because we weren't going to let men take the course. And "why isn't there men's studies?" which is a kind of a very common one that comes up. But we got a lot of that. I was scared witless. Fortunately Hilga Jacobson, who was a really battler from way back, knew how to handle this. And, Dorothy Smith too. I think Annette and I were younger, and a bit… Annette went on to fight many, many battles after she left UBC and academia. But Dorothy and Hilga were more experienced and more used to the boys being unreasonable and standing up to that. So we got it through. Basically the opposition, all those comments came from a few people and the majority voted for it. And that's a very typical pattern with Women's Studies, I found both there and at Simon Fraser. They would go on, and on, and on, and on with all these ridiculous comments and they would vote against it, but most of the silent people would vote for it. At least enough that we would usually get a majority, so that was an interesting lesson. And then in I think '74-'75. Either '73-'74 or '74-'75. Some of this you can find because it's been published, about the development of Women's Studies at UBC, so checking dates for anybody whose using this tape, there are references out there. Annette Kolodny published an article about that and the *Minds of Their Own* book I mentioned yesterday also has my description of the UBC experience and I would have the dates in that article. So we offered the first course and it was wonderful. It was absolutely one of the best experiences of my life, because what we had set up an interdisciplinary course in Women's Studies called 222, and then each student took one of 4 seminars offered by us. So I offered a psychology seminar, to about 25 people and we had about 100 or 150 people in the course. And Dorothy did a sociology seminar, and Hilga did an anthropology seminar and Annette did one in English literature. And there were no sources, there was no textbook, it was a lark. We actually assigned things like, you know, the work by Erickson on various kinds of womb stuff and then critiqued it. Okay. Or, there were a few things that were out. I used Vidal's article on discrimination and hiring. That was a very early one where she very simply sent out CVs with male names or female names to the heads of departments. There was the Broverman work on what is a healthy man, a healthy woman. You rate a healthy man, a healthy woman, a healthy person and the male and the person were the same, the woman was different. Used some of those kinds of things. And a lot of our own work. I mean, we just flew with it, but it was so exciting because we were discovering it, the students were discovering it, everybody felt like a pioneer. You know, everybody, students I have run into since, remember that class in a really positive way. And at that point of course, I was beginning to approach the tenure process, which came up in my fifth year. I was

denied tenure by the department for not publishing enough. Now this was debatable. I certainly had not published. I think my article with Phil Dale was the only sort of standard, peer reviewed, psych, mainstream journal and that was in *Child Development*. And everything else had been in, mostly in edited books. [25:38] Because people were trying to get texts together. Marylee Stepenenson did the *Women in Canada* book. I put an article about the fear of success in there. Dorothy and Sara David, who was a clinical psychologist, did a book on women and mental health and I had an article in there. So I had, and the edited books had certainly been reviewed, although not peer reviewed in the way that the department thought they were important to be. So I was denied tenure. I appealed and there was a fair amount of support, but it didn't go anywhere. The appeal didn't go anywhere. It was basically going to be a goner. So then I was in my last year when a former colleague from the psych department, male, sent me the ad for the joint position in Psychology and Women's Studies at Simon Fraser. I had decided by that point, if this was academics, I probably didn't want to be a part of it. And I would stay in Vancouver. I became a Canadian citizen at that point, and I would basically change careers. I didn't want to go anywhere else in Canada. I definitely didn't want to go back to the States. I didn't look at job ads or anything. I probably would have missed this ad at Simon Fraser if he hadn't sent it to me. And it was in the same town, so I thought okay I'll give them a chance. I interviewed for that job and I had to do a psych interview and I had to do a Women's Studies interview. It was a two-day interview. I had to give a talk in both departments. Women Studies was new there, this was their first… they hired a historian and me that year and those were their first permanent hires. And I had actually met, I knew about the program, partly because we had one meeting, joint meeting, with the UBC Women's Studies people and the SFU [Simon Fraser University] people when they were developing their program. But then I kind of lost contact. So I went for the interviews. I was offered the job. It was quite interesting. The psychologists all, male and female, there weren't many women in the department, but they all asked basically some version of are you a *real* psychologist or have you really gone over to Women's Studies? So, I mean, of course I made the talk for psychology the most research, that was the TV, which I had also gotten involved in. That's where you get the TV study. That was at UBC and Tannis Williams, Tannis MacBeth now, was the person who organized that and I was involved in two parts of that. One was the aggression study and one was a sexual thing. To look at, would kids would more aggressive if they had the TV. We had three different towns. One had no TV, one had one channel CBC [Canadian Broadcasting Corporation], and one had three channels. At the time three channels was the most you could have, that was all you could have. So they had American as well as CBC television. And those articles were published as part of a book on that study and that was my most definite, although it wasn't strictly developmental in following, it was with kids. So I emphasized that. Whenever they said are you real psychologist, I talked about that the TV study. That was my main thing. And with Women's Studies, it's just very interesting. Two of the women, people in Women's Syudies who interviewed me, Maggie Benston and Andrea Lebowitz, I did my talk and Andrea said, "we'll go up to my office." And they pulled me into Andrea's office and they shut the door and they said, "are you sure you really want this job? Thank God you applied! You should see the other candidates!" Well, I mean, nobody had much experience in Women's Studies in those days. The women who would apply, there were three people who were interviewed for

the job, were clearly not asked by the psych department it they were really psychologists because that was all they were doing, but were very suspect by the Women's Studies people. And it sort of, I think that was because joint appointments are that way. [29:55] You always kind of lean a little bit more one way than the other, and I clearly learned, I mean I started Women's Studies at UBC. I clearly had those credentials, I was clearly committed to Women's Studies. They said, one of the comments they said is, "well, were about to start a…after the first two candidates we wanted to start a rat liberation project." So I guess there were animal researchers, who probably did brain stuff you know, sex and brain stuff and all of that. I don't know who they were. I never did find out, but I could say I was Canadian by that point, which was a plus because Simon Fraser was narrowing down. Pauline Jewett was president at that point and she pretty much had a policy that unless you can prove there's no Canadian who can do the job, you know. And I think she thought I was a bit suspect because I came from the States, but I had Canadian citizenship. I wasn't running around as a landed immigrant trying to get jobs away from Canadians. I did in the end get the job and I think I had a lot of support from women in the psych department, actually, in that process. Negotiating with Women's Studies and that kind of thing. So I took the joint appointment and it was like landing on my feet. I had finished at UBC in July and started in September at Simon Fraser and I wasn't sure I would like it. I wasn't sure I liked academics. The other thing when I was interviewing, that I didn't do what people did later, was I had this two months I was not getting paid, which to me seems like nothing. I could live on my savings or whatever and I later found out I should have negotiated for those two months salary and I didn't think of that. We had colleagues later who came in Women's Studies who clearly negotiated that their salary be ongoing and that there not be a break in it. I was also teaching that summer because I was so sure I was not going to get a job. I had signed up to do some extra sessional teaching at a community college in Vancouver, so I had some money in the summer from that and no break, cause I taught all summer and then started in September. It took me about two months to realize Simon Fraser was a lot better. The psych department was better, Women's Studies was great and we were sort of cobbling things together at that point. The history position was only… Pauline Jewett cut it. It was an American women, so Pauline cut it back to a one year instead of tenure track. And then the next year a Canadian applied, when we reapplied for the job, which was hard on the woman who was one year, but she ended up staying and teaching at a community college and having a good life in Canada and becoming Canadian. And the following year we hired, well… Mary Lynn Stewart was hired for the joint appointment in History and Sue Wendell was hired in a joint appointment in Philosophy and Women's Studies. So we began to build a bit and then there were other people, but that history is elsewhere. And I was quite sure by October, that… I had this kind of experience, how would you call it? Sort of a moment of, not enlightenment, but kind of a peak experience thing. I was still wondering in October, whether this was going to be okay or not. Colleagues were a little suspicious, but I'm pretty easy to get along with, so people started to kind of like me and that helped a lot. And in October we had one of those foggy days in Vancouver. The whole lower mainland is covered in fog, but Simon Fraser, of course, is on a mountain. And, I was driving up to school, driving up to school and I had The Eagles on my tape. They were playing along and I was kind of singing along and I was driving up the mountain and I drove out of the fog. Just like this. And it

was sunny, it was brilliant, it was beautiful. And I thought "okay, I'm here." That was a nice experience. [34:09] So I just said okay settle down, do this job, and I did and tenure went easily. Tenure was on your fourth year and your sixth year, there were two tries at tenure. Cause this was right after all the political kafuffle in the sixties. And the CAUT [Canadian Association of University Teachers] censure I think was still on when I applied for that job, cause Dorothy had to think twice about whether she was going to write me a letter or not. But she did. Because Sociology was one of the departments, in fact the Canadian Sociological Association left the censure for years at Simon Fraser because some of the people who were the worst, most brutally treated in all of that. When faculty were just fired, tenure track faculty were just fired in Anthropology, Sociology, and Political Science. One person committed suicide. A couple other people could never develop an academic career after that. The CAUT censured Simon Fraser. Pauline took the job and part of her goal was to remove the CAUT censure, which she did by putting in the tenure and promotion policies, which had not existed prior to that. It was decided by the dean or something like that. And that included, you had two tries. Your fourth year and your sixth year. Tenure committees had to consist, and this was very unusual, they've backslid a bit from this at Simon Fraser, but at that time: two associate, two full, and two assistant untenured faculty had to be on the tenure committee. And to have untenured faculty on the committee, cause it was tenure and promotion committee, they decided promotion to full professor in the department, was pretty amazing. And, in the psych department anyway, people were elected from a wide-open slate. Other departments had a nominating committee and then you voted on that slate. We had it so everybody who was willing to run, you could take your name off, but everybody who was willing to run was on the slate and elected. And even before I got tenure I was on the tenure committee, in psych. So that was a good sign. This wouldn't have been possible later, but at that time it was. I was on the committee the year I went up for tenure. You had to sit down while they made your decision, but you were on the committee. And as one of the women in the department said to me "that's really good cause if you're on the committee they won't turn you down." And I did, I got tenure and promotion at that time to associate. You had to do that, then full professor you could decide on your own. You weren't required to go at any point for full professor. I think that's a mistake. The universities that I know of that had unions and required that you go for full professor, women often did not want to go but were successful. I wasn't promoted, I was promoted to associate in 1980 and I kind of continued to do my own stuff, which was publishing but more in, not in psych peer reviewed journals. So I waited until the mid-90s to go for full and there was no problem with it. I might have gotten it sooner, but I waited until… in 1989 I published a *Psych Bulletin* [*Psychological Bulletin*] article on women and math, which would clearly carry the clout in psychology and then in '94 or '95, I went for full professor when my book was almost out.

LB: Actually I did want to ask you about that, while we're there.

MK: Why don't you go for questions now, instead of me going, doing a further monologue? (laughs)

[37:59]

LB: Well, I was wondering if you could tell me about how the *Feminist Visions* (*of Gender Similarities and Differences*) book developed, came about, and what it was like winning the distinguished publication award?

MK: Yeah, that was great. That book started when I was on sabbatical in 1988 at the University of New Brunswick. And I had started out, I started out in one direction for that book and it changed throughout that year. And I can't even tell you right now exactly how I had started out. I could probably find that and I might find it cause I probably kept my sabbatical report for that year, and I can add it in when I get your tape or something. Cause it was interesting. I spent the whole year reading, just reading all sorts of stuff, and by the end of the year I'd come up with the model for the book, which was three similarities chapters and three differences chapters. I had the history and then the research, which was math and moral development, and then the applications which was care giving and women in science. Then the history chapters were [Leta Setter] Hollingworth for similarities and [Karen] Horney for differences. The end of my sabbatical was the, I produced the outline of that book. I knew at that point where I was going. And then I wrote, I didn't publish much, I published some and I did a lot of conference papers. I'd work up a conference paper, usually for AWP [Association for Women in Psychology] and I would do it and then I would work on the next chapter and then I would work on the next chapter. And then in '94, '93-'94, I had a, one of the really good things was that you got some administrative leave for chairing departments. And I chaired Women's Studies from '90 to '93, so I got two semesters of administrative leave, which was wonderful policy because it was full pay. And I added a research term to that, or a short sabbatical to that or something to make it a year and in that year I wrote the book. I had two months per chapter. And one month I wrote… And I also had my own, I was, I had a contract from Haworth Press, but they clearly were, they said "okay send us your manuscript," and it was clear they'd probably just take it. And I, by this time, was impressed with the peer review process. I'd actually had pretty good luck with it, particularly that *Psych Bulletin* (*Psychological Bulletin*) article was wonderful. I am sure the reviewer was a feminist, the editor was a feminist, I forgot, Nancy… I've forgotten her name, but it can be found. Anyway, and I think she sent it to feminist reviewers. I am sure she did. I got tough reviews. I had to do a lot but no one argued with my basic point, which I wanted to talk about achievement, not ability. And that was critical for the argument I was making, which is math achievement not some innate ability and nobody, neither of the reviewers challenged me on that. And I thought okay. And they were very supportive reviews. I mean, they were pages long and I had to do, I had to do probably 3 months work to do the revisions on that, but you can tell, they may be tough, but they're supportive. And that was a wonderful moment in which feminist, kind of by accident, I mean the importance of having women in editorial positions. And having feminists as editors of journals, really came through to me on that. So I really liked peer review. So I set up my own little peer review for the book and I just had about 30 people. People like Olga [Favreau] and Sandra [Pyke]**,** Rhoda Unger. Anybody who was interested, I'd add to the list and I'd send them a chapter. And, you know, 5 or 6 of them would respond to me and make suggestions, and make very good suggestions. Then I would do the revisions on that chapter based on those suggestions and most of the

things they would ignore and the chapters they were interested in they'd do. [42:31] That's sort of how that came about. And the AWP [Association for Women in Psychology] award was a total surprise. I got a, Carla Golden I think called me. I got a message from her on the phone and I had to play it 4 times. I could hardly believe this was true. I later found out Hilary Lips nominated me. Which was really nice. Hilary and I were friends and had contact. Hilary was one of the people who did the peer reviewing for me, so she'd read the book before it even came out. Yeah, that was lovely. That was great.

LB: Well it sounds like, well I had this other question about the gender differences versus similarities debate and what it was like to be involved in that, especially around achievement and math because that's been one of those areas where there's been women on both sides of that debate. What were your experiences like in…

MK: What led to the structure of the book, and the basic underlining argument, that both gender similarities and gender differences can be useful politically for feminists, and that both similarities and differences are constructed, and you can look at it one way or the other. That basic argument came out of the experience of teaching women and achievement type stuff in Psychology and to some extent in Women's Studies. So if you're into women and achievement it is pretty clear similarities is the good political argument, right. I mean, and that's what I'd done in that math article. And women are slightly better at getting grades, men at the achievement tests etcetera. But on the other hand, in Women's Studies for a number of years I taught feminist psychoanalytic theories and I had used [Nancy] Chodorow's book in that course for a number of years, in which she talks differences. I mean there is no question, the basis is women have a different experience in socialization, girls do than boys do. And the relationship with the mother is very different, and we need to value the girl's relationship with her mother and that results in different kinds of things. I had also read a lot of Carol Gilligan and knew how, you know, even though the psychologists were like, including feminist psychologists, were pretty down on Gilligan, by and large, I saw some, there were feminist possibilities in that. And certainly feminists outside of psychology were very positive about the difference argument. And I had taught Gilligan also in the feminist [course] because she comes out of that same psychoanalytic tradition. And basically, I think I say it in the introduction of the book, I was unwilling to give up either of those things. People argued either/or, but for me intellectually it didn't make sense. And I also did, it comes out in the care giving chapter, but a lot of reading of maternal feminisms, both historically vis-à-vis Horney and contemporarily in terms of non-North American societies. The mothers of Plaza de Mayo, the bread riots, other, these women may not call themselves feminist. In fact, they usually didn't because they thought feminists didn't believed in the family, but they were doing resistance activity. And they were doing resistance against really heavy duty political systems, particularly in South America and in other places. So it seemed to me feminism, and as I later then pluralized it feminism(s), ought to include these kinds of political resistance and fighting against oppressions and that we did ourselves a disservice to say you have to call yourself a feminist to be doing interesting feminist action. I mean, I wouldn't label somebody else against their will either. I wasn't like I wanted to call them feminist. But I wanted to include their politics, and the

peace movement was another place that emphasized differences, and used the maternal feminisms argument. [46:50] Mostly in psychology we pooh-poohed maternal feminisms. But of course I was also in Women's Studies where there was more of a tradition of that. And it wasn't that I thought maternal feminisms were the answer, but then of course the other part is you have to say there is no perfect strategy, there is no single strategy that feminists can adopt that will get us where we want to get. You need to analyze the situation, come up with a strategy that will work in that situation, recognize its positive and negative aspects, and do the best you can with it. So I would never go in front of a senate committee at the university and argue for more women in engineering by talking about how they're going to bring maternal values into engineering. I mean, forget. You just wouldn't take that argument there. At the same place, if you're working with a group of women who have organized as women around issues of poverty, who are concerned about their kids, there's a place. It's a different problem and you can use a different strategy for that. So that's how the book kind of came about, but probably I wouldn't have written that book without a joint appointment. Without teaching Women's Studies and teaching Psychology.

LB: Why would that be?

MK: Well, cause I never would have taught feminist psychoanalytic theories in psych, for starters. And, because the emphasis on interdisciplinary in Women's Studies means I was looking more to history, I was looking more to other kinds of things, I was talking to feminist colleagues, who had some respect for maternal feminisms.

LB: I was wondering. You mentioned how much you really enjoy Vancouver and you never really wanted to leave there. So do you think that working within a Canadian context might have helped develop your work in a certain way or given you a new perspective on things?

MK: I think in a, I am not sure, I think the Women's Studies was more critical than the Canadian context in developing my thinking, but I think I thrived more in a Canadian context than I would have in a US context. I think I am more typically Canadian than typically American. Personality. Okay. If you talk about national images. I get along with people, I am always saying I'm sorry, I will negotiate anything, you know, I am worse at standing up and fighting for something than I am at working out some kind of solution for stuff. And also I just felt much more comfortable in a smaller pond. And, it was interesting, because I didn't realize how chauvinistic I was. It was an unconscious chauvinism about being from the States, until I came to Canada. And it is, what it is, is I didn't realize how much I had the view that whatever is really important, is happening here, i.e. the States. So in terms of feminism and in terms anti-war activity. I was a leftist in terms of politics all along, but what's happening in the way of "what's happening that's important for the whole world is happening here" and I really realized when I got to Canada that things where happening here and we didn't approach it with the same point of view. What's happening here is really important, maybe for the rest world, certainly is for us, but I was more comfortable being a bigger fish in a smaller pond. And, it is less competitive I think, just because there are fewer of us. I mean,

certainly academics compete with each other in Canada, but somehow you can't be the really big cheese if you are Canadian. I mean some Canadians are, but that's an attitude, that's a feeling. So CPA [Canadian Psychological Association] is always ignoring, the section 35 is kind of, you know, Sandra [Pyke] sets up the thing and then division 35 kind of ignores it, so we kind of fall off again. [51:31] And that has its problems, but it really provided me a nourishing environment. SWAP [Section on Women and Psychology], CPA was smaller. I was there at the start in terms of Feminist Psychology and Women's Studies, I could sort of know everybody. So I don't know if, I think I fit better in Canada. And I think I thrived more in Canada than I would have in the States. It is harder to say what is distinctively Canadian, but I think that's something that is kind of distinctively Canadian. You immediate, you know if you live and work in Canada, this is not "where it's at." Where it's at, is in the States. And I don't mean that in a negative way at all, but you know that in a way you do not know it if you are American. Its like the oppressor doesn't understand. The person in power doesn't understand what the subordinate is feeling cause you don't have to look at it. It's, you know, [Pierre] Trudeau's thing about the elephant. You are very aware, if you're little and you're next to the elephant.

LB: All right. Well I am going to take a quick pause just to switch the tape over, if that's okay? (talking while flipping tape) We're on again.

[53:03]

MK: Okay.

LB: I was wondering if you could tell me a bit about your involvement with SWAP and with AWP (Association for Women in Psychology)?

MK: Okay, well SWAP, I was not at the underground symposium. I didn't go to CPA that year. I really started…

LB: Terrible year to miss out on.

MK: Oh, terrible to miss out on, but I wasn't, that was the time I was at UBC and I was not committing myself to the profession a lot. I did go, the first CPA I attended, I think was in Vancouver and we presented the TV study results. That would have been '75 I think, when we did a symposium on the TV results. So that was the first time I was at CPA. I think at that point when I joined CPA I also jointed IGWAP [Interest Group on Women and Psychology], as it was known then. So I was in IGWAP before it became SWAP. And then went to, and later in a later Vancouver conference which I think was '80, I mean I was a member or SWAP and I believe I was on the Status of Women Committee at some point. I was not, actually I was asked to join the committee that, oh who was the chair, did the Status of Women in Canadian Psychology Committee. That wasn't Mary Wright who chaired it, she wrote, did she chair it or did she write it? Anyway, the one that comes out in '76, the Status of Women in Canadian Psychology. At the time, I was asked to join that committee, so I had been in SWAP and active

enough that somebody knew my name. I think Tannis, Williams at that point, asked me. But that was one of my more, I was in the middle of one of my more unfortunate political experiences, which was I had the year before, the year I was getting tenure I had run for the faculty association executive at UBC, because we were planning to unionize and this seemed like a really good idea to a untenured, junior faculty member. [55:27] Plus, I very pro-union. I ran for vice-president and was elected. I think it was a slight, but two days after the election, the president decided, who was from economics, decided unions scared him so he quit. That was a bad moment. I was 30. I was very young and very inexperienced. And I looked up the faculty association constitution and the critical phrase was, if the president is unable to serve the vice-president becomes president, period. So I ended up president of the faculty association the year we tried to unionize. And my plate was more than full, we lost the battle to unionize, we never made it. And then Tannis [Williams] calls me and I said I'm not taking on one more thing. I am going to go nuts with this union stuff. I am just not doing it. So I wasn't on that committee. I knew some of the people who were on the committee. And then, so I remained active with SWAP. I think the next major thing, first major thing, I did for SWAP was with a graduate student, Olivia Scalzo**,** who was a PhD student of mine. We ran an institute, a SWAP institute in 1987 when CPA was in Vancouver again. And that was very successful, and that was very exciting. We did the thing where you get papers and that kind of thing. We had, we were at the Hotel Vancouver, which was like this hotel in Vancouver, right. We were at the Hotel Vancouver and we had, it was opened to people, there was no problem with CPA, it was much more informal then, so people from SWAP were signing up, but we also had advertised in the community and opened it up for registrations and we got 250 people. First, we were so upset because they had put us in all these huge rooms, but it was a lifesaver in the end. Because there weren't that many sessions. If we'd gotten small rooms we wanted, we would have had people unable to even get in. Oh, phew, you know. So that was very successful and we made a lot of money for SWAP and all of that. So I did that. And continued on the Status of Women Committee. It would be on my CV, the years I was on that committee. I didn't, I actually got the Distinguished Member Award before I coordinated. So that was in, I got it the second year, whatever year that was, early '90s. And then Joanne Gallivan, when she was coordinator, got me at the right moment. She called up and said, "how would you like to be coordinator of SWAP" and I was already feeling guilty for having the Distinguished Member Award and not coordinating. So I said "yes." And that was I think '95-'96 I was coordinator. That was the same year I set up the SWAPnet listserve because that seemed, I don't know, seemed easy to do and it was a fairly easy thing. So I continued with that until this year. It was basically just giving it a home. I think there was one other attempt for CPA to set up a list for us, well that's when they set up their list, we said no thank you, we will just stay outside. And now then there's this second thing that's happened, that they're excited about. The only exciting thing we had on the whole SWAPnet list was, the only thing people got outraged in a sense was when they started getting spam. That produced many exciting memos and we solved it by making it so only members could send messages. And so I've done that since then and always been a member of SWAP. I did one other pre-convention institute with E. B. I think. Did E. B. and I do that? It was more recent than my memory goes, but in the history of the pre-convention institute. So it was another time it was in Vancouver, it was out at UBC and

we did it slightly, we experimented with something slightly different. We didn't solicit papers, we had two or three people giving workshops from the community. Mostly, but not exclusively clinically focused, and a keynote speaker and we had more, it wasn't parallel sessions, or we only had a couple parallel sessions. [1:00:21] And that drew some negative feedback, especially from people who felt quite strongly it ought to only be submitted papers. We were more in an experimental mood and wanted to try it out, and I don't think SWAP's done it since for a pre-convention workshop and I don't think I would do it again. But it seemed worth a try, so there was one other pre-convention workshop. And I am pretty sure **E. B.** worked on that.

LB: You mentioned early on in your narrative about your undergraduate career that you wanted to be a famous psychologist, so I was wondering what it was like to be added to so many of the who's who lists?

MK: Well to tell you the truth, not much. Those are not my biggest joys in life. Partly because it's a bit of a scam, those who's who lists. I mean,they want to sell you their book, so they put you on the who's who list. I mean it's not like I did nothing to get on, that's true, but you're kind of invited to apply and it's kind of like a conference paper. I think they accept most who apply and then they try to sell you their book. So that is not, I mean I put it on my CV, I thought they ought to be on there, but I tell you the award I valued most was the SWAP Distinguished Member Award. That was the one that touched me the most, because this is where I live. Right, and this is where I, this is my home where I can bring psychology and feminism together in an uncontested way, kind of thing. So that was probably, that, the award this year, and the AWP publication award was very, very important to me. That was a biggie.

LB: So, the stuff from within your own community?

MK: Yeah. Those were the more important ones.

LB: And there was another theme that, it seems to be popping up fairly often throughout your narrative, is the histories. And more recently, it seems that you've been even making a historical shift and starting to look at the history of psychology, specifically some of the history of psychology within Canada, and then also psychoanalysis, the Anna O. and Bertha Pappenhiem…

MK: Probably, we're not talking present tense, because since I've retired I haven't really done research. But at the end of my career in the '90s yes, I got fascinated by history. I think if I had to start all over again, I might do my work in history instead of psychology. It just, it really intrigued me. Especially the Pappenhiem work, but also with Karen Horney and [Leta Stetter] Hollingworth. The kind of little mysteries and then sometimes finding an answer to that mystery or finding a source that told you something about these people probably knew each other. You know. And it was just, I really liked it. I really like it. And I enjoy doing it. I would have liked to pursue the Pappenhiem stuff more, but there were two problems. One is one could not do that without German and although it could be a fantasy to learn German, I knew I wouldn't do it. The other was that her

papers were largely destroyed in World War II, actually by the Allied Forces, not by the Nazis surprisingly enough. She died in 1936, so she died before World War II, but when people clearly saw it coming and so they took her papers and they were given to somebody in Dresden for safe keeping. And they were given to a Christian, because they didn't, they knew Jewish places would be endangered. [1:04:30] And he kept them, but then they were destroyed in the bombing of Dresden. So there isn't much. I mean I have read some biographies of Pappenhiem that have been written by somebody who knew German, and I have forgotten her name, but it mostly looks at, mostly is an analysis of her writings. And she destroyed some of her papers. When she went back in the early 1930s to Vienna to visit her brother, she destroyed a lot of letters and stuff from the Anna O. period. She did not want, she basically did not want people to know she was Anna O. and people in Frankfurt basically didn't know. Once she moved to Frankfurt she told a couple of people and that was it. She was "outed" by [Ernest] Jones in his biography of Freud. He put a footnote in and said "oh by the way Anna O. is Bertha Pappenhiem," without checking with anybody about anything, which didn't please her either. So she was quite a private person, and particularly about that. And it is hard to know. People have argued that, you know [Joesef] Breuer was a, that was an abusive situation. I think that would be overstating it, but I still came up with the idea that a lot of, she, sheer determination or force pulled herself out of that, kind of thing. And there is a fair amount of evidence that she may have had a particular kind of epilepsy that would have, could have explained the symptoms, as well as anything psychological. So she really cut that part of her life off. Anyway, it was interesting. I loved doing that paper. I think that's my best work.

LB: Wow.

MK: I would say that's my best work. It was the most fun to do, because I read all these psychoanalytic things that did the Anna O. hysteria routine and then I read the feminist historians work about her work in Germany, later in Frankfurt when she moved there. And I read whatever had been translated about her or by her and there were a lot of interesting contradictions and my goal was to try and pull some of that together and nobody else had done that. I actually, to tell you the truth I submitted that paper for a couple prizes and it didn't get anything. Yeah. It was interesting, I just thought okay, you try. But, yeah I felt good about it enough to submit it.

LB: So now that this is sort of a retrospective sort of thing, now that you have come to the end of your career what do you think the future for feminist psychology will be and what do you think it's accomplished and where do you think it's going to be going?

MK: Well in terms of accomplishments, there clearly have been, there are more women in psych departments than there were, not as many as need to be. You know all the things within CPA like blind review, which we've managed to hold onto. The boys didn't like blind review, which isn't always blind because people cite their own stuff. But none-the-less that is important. You know, gender-neutral language. That has stayed and that has become more of a mainstay in academics. Women's Studies programs, yes and no, I mean some of them are under threat now and that's always been kind of been

true. But there are also more feminists in other departments. You don't have to be in Women's Studies to do feminist work or be a feminist and I think that is really an accomplishment of Women's Studies, that there are more ways to do that. We clearly have literature we didn't have at all when we started. There is research. There is theory. There is history. [1:08:44] There is a lot of writing in the area, so there are sources that will be there for the next generations. And there are, all the kind of post-feminist this and that that goes around, for all of that, there are lots of young women like you who will call themselves feminists and do and go that direction. I think the future is feminisms. The future is plural. The future is fragmented. The future is understanding that a group of immigrant, Asian, women working together to improve their plight are going to have a very different outlook than a group of young academics and they both are doing feminist work. And I think, I think it is important for feminisms to not get too stuck on the label. The, "I am a feminist, but…" Well listen to the "but" part. They always come out with some feminist statement, when people say "I am a feminist, but…" "I believe in equal rights" or "I think women deserve a better break" that kind of thing. So I think we need a wide, we need a big tool-box and we need to be not afraid to use it in research or political ways. Different strategies, different concepts. I do think feminism is here to stay, I really do. We can't go back to before we, well say even before first wave feminism which we sort of forgot before second wave. I like somebody said they thought they were fourth wave. I like that. You know there is some young faculty in Women's Studies who clearly consider themselves third wave and that is great. I like a lot of debates within a lot of communities. And the whole, in the lesbian community the whole femme/butch debate and then kind of, well I became lesbian in the situation in which you were androgynous and that was the only way to do it. And it took me a long time to come around to acknowledging femme, which as you can probably tell I wouldn't identify as, but I'm not sure I identify as butch either. I stick with the kind of androgynous thing. But I have had some students in Women's Studies classes who were really into the femme power. And it was great. It really opened my eyes to it. I thought, okay. Teetering around in high heels is about the most powerless thing I can imagine, for me, but it was not powerless for them. And I could hear them. I could hear them, I could hear that. They were in my last class, that last class I talked about yesterday and there were some great women in that class. You know, I don't know. I've gotten more into pink. I like pink, it is okay! The main thing people said about my book was, your cover's pink and I said well, let me tell you what they wanted to put on the cover and how awful that was! They wanted to put this terrible picture on the cover, which had a woman playing a piano or no, a woman standing up and talking and a man behind a newspaper. I mean it was just awful, god-awful. So I wrote back and said you got to use this reversing illusion thing or I'm withdrawing the book. That was the worst I was in the most of it. And the woman was fine. They had just thrown it out. They weren't saying we're going to do this for sure, so I over reacted to what I need to, but I got the reversing figure on the cover of the book. Which was the main thing. I didn't care what the hell colour they made it. But that was the comment I got a lot. So there is that kind of thing. So I really, you know, I've had my eyes open in some that kind of way. Third wave feminists have opened my eyes to a lot of the power of the bitch and also wearing the clothes you want. Because when we started in the '70s we dressed to deemphasize femininity. I mean I think we had to do that in that context, but one of my, one of the young women, in fact

both of the young women, from time to time, we've hired in Women's Studies now wear short skirts and they're great. I mean they like it. Something like the *Vagina Monologues*, which really opened my eyes too, to a whole different way in which you could reach. [1:13:34] I mean we did, some of the Women's Studies graduate students did the *Vagina Monologues* one year for Valentine's day at Simon Fraser, and I went of course because I was chair of the department at that point and introduced them. They put it on, I mean they recruited students, graduate and undergraduate students who played the parts. They designed the costumes. They did the whole thing. And we had a mixed audience for that. We had as many men as women at that. And almost no, I said okay pay attention to this, because we don't get mixed audiences at Women's Studies events, when we decide what we think is traditionally feminist. But here were men, liking this stuff. We have always, we have an endowed chair in Women's Studies, which we got the million dollars for from partly, well partly the federal government when the Liberals were disappearing in 1993 and disappear they did. Right before they did, they set up 5 different $500,000 grants for different sections of the country. And Simon Fraser, I wrote the grant that Simon Fraser got, the $500,000. And then we had, another thing it just happened, it's so important. There was a woman who was a feminist, who was director of development at Simon Fraser at that point. And she went out and found the Woodward sisters, whose brother had been honored, or whose father had been honoured at UBC by a building or something, and they wanted to do something for their mother. So they gave $ 400,000 for the Ruth Wynn Woodward endowed professorship. And we've hired different people in that and the last person. We've tended to do that as a one or two year position so we can get a lot of different people in and emphasize community activities and stuff. And the last one was Afua Cooper from Montréal and she is a Black feminist who does Black women's history and Black history. And, she did a project in which she interviewed Black people in Vancouver, which there are relatively few, but she interviewed the older people about the early days of Black resistance and stuff in Vancouver, men and women, and then she gave a presentation of her work at the downtown centre. And I was amazed. I thought I don't have to go early, this is a Women's Studies event. I go in, it's standing room standing room only. I am standing for the whole thing. There are old people. There are young people. There are more Black people than I had seen in any one place in Vancouver, ever. Because, of course, all the people she interviewed and their families, all came to this event. And it was a wonderful success. And it's like, that's where feminism, that's… to reach out to other communities, to bring them into

LB: doing feminism…

MK: Doing feminism. And she certainly talked to as many men as she talked to women, we can do feminist history of men. That's so, that's where I see that kind of fracturing, reaching out, branching off, coming back together, working together on this project, but not that project. That's where feminism's going to go and then you infiltrate.

LB: I want to touch on something that, actually seemed fairly notably absent in your narrative thus far. Have you ever experienced, or felt that you experienced, any

discrimination based on your gender or feminist identity, or any other aspect of your identity…

MK: Well, there was the little league! (laughter) But sports were important to me and I'm very… I was regretful I didn't grow up post-Title IX in the States. [1:17:21] I think at UBC not getting tenure was clearly, I mean that I had started Women's Studies and that I had been president of the faculty association, because none of the senior faculty in psychology approved of unions, that was two major strikes against me. They didn't say that. They never put that in writing, nobody ever said that to me. They said I hadn't published enough peer reviewed journal articles, okay. And they were very well known at UBC for getting rid of junior faculty at that point. I don't know if they still are or not, but they would hire junior faculty and keep 1 out of 5 who had really become more star-like in their view. I had friends, men and women, two good friends, who are still my good friends, one man and one woman, who were fired from UBC around the same time I was. Who were not outwardly feminist, although they were very sympathetic, but were different, you know. Didn't do psychology in the right way, and that clearly influenced not getting tenure. I also had felt, I mean psych department meetings at UBC were very sadistic affairs. And that, I was scared to say almost anything in those department meetings. Now, they were equally sadistic to men and woman, but I think there is a kind of masculine model in that sort of academic, competitive, sadism, put down. And I am sure that, there weren't many women in the psych department. Some of them, one was a woman Reva Potashin, who was a developmental psychologist, an excellent teacher, did everything for the department, didn't publish and was kept as an assistant professor forever. So there was that kind of thing that happened. Certainly, since then things probably have changed. I think there is still the high research focus at UBC, but there are more women there. There are women like Janet Worker who play that game very well and do very good work. But I was very uncomfortable in the psych department at UBC, and it was very clear they didn't want me. And part of why they didn't want me was I was a women, and to boot I was a feminist, and I was involved with Women's Studies. And, that was, probably that was my most butch phase, because I would wear jeans, gumboots and this red wool jacket to teach in. My students didn't mind, and in fact my students in my introductory psych class said you aren't getting tenure because you wear gumboots. Maybe they knew. They probably had a point. But, so I think in that way, yes. I mean, it wasn't we are getting rid of you because you are a woman. I had very good support from faculty. I never had faculty say, "you shouldn't be getting a degree cause you are a woman, it is useless to give degrees to women," both in the undergraduate experience and the graduate experience. I really was lucky, fortunate. Not a hint of that from any of my undergraduate professors, all encouraged me to go to graduate students, etcetera. And John Hagen was very good. He was very, I mean he wasn't a feminist, but he was very even handed with all of his students, he supported you in what you wanted to do. He wrote letters for everybody and, as I said, he was everybody's supervisor in those years. Now I couldn't have had woman supervisor and the one woman mentor I had, as I said, on my committee was kind of like Reva Potashin in the Michigan department. She was, you know, she wasn't ever going to be anymore than a kind of assistant professor or, she did sessional teaching. I wasn't even aware as a graduate student how… I liked her and she was able to be on my committee and that's all

that kind of mattered to me, but I am sure if we could have talked to her she would have a story of a lot of… So I saw some of that. At Simon Fraser I had committee meetings in which really ugly things were said about Women's Studies or something like that. We had that kind of endless thing. At the same time, usually at the critical moments there was support from the senior administrators. I still remember one senate meeting that Pauline Jewett chaired when we were bringing forward a women and health course and Maggie Benston and I were at senate as information people. [1:22:33] And it was exactly what I described earlier. About three or four people in senate, "oh, this is no good" "what about men's studies" "this is da, da, da" "this is discriminatory" "da, da, da, da, da." So Maggie and I were sitting there, and sitting there, and sitting there and this was going on and on. The advantage of being W was you were at the bottom of the list and the agenda, so they were kind of tired. Everyone else was being kind of quiet. Finally Pauline Jewett brings her hammer down (makes noise of bang). She says "I am making a ruling that is allowed to me as chair," one of those rules, " that from now on out the only people who can speak on this particular motion, are those people who have not spoken before." Because the debate had gone on, these people had said three or four things. Well one or two people got up and said, "this seems like a reasonable idea to me." That was it. The vote was taken, 75% voted for it. And I had deans all the way along who were supportive of Women's Studies. Not always. Things have been worse since 2000, just that there has been a lot of budget cuts, so they are always looking towards, there's this little program over here in Women's Studies. We haven't been able to replace everybody who's left in terms of faculty. So there have been some vulnerable moments, more since I retired, that have been pretty hard. And I have heard stories about, we had one of our faculty, when she went for promotion and tenure, another colleague of mine was on the university tenure committee and she said it was amazing. This was a minority women, who did her work in Asia and Mary Lynn [Stewart], who was on the committee, the university tenure committee, basically said they really treated her, her case looked very identical to another young woman who was white and was doing regular sort of research, and both of them got through. But it was the hassle on one and not on the other that she really noticed. That's racism, not sexism, but that's what was going on. I have been particularly fortunate at Simon Fraser. There are sexist men around, they have not disappeared, they don't keep quiet. But in some ways they are easier to deal with than people who keep quiet that are sexist. You know what you are up against. And personally, I would say probably my own hesitation about going for full professor. I probably should have gone a few years before I did. There may have been subtle things that held me back, that were partly me, but also partly coming from the environment. But UBC was my prime experience of sexism and I am sure that is part of why I didn't get tenure there and I am happy enough I didn't, in the end. But at the time it was pretty devastating, but I was lucky in my school experience.

LB: Well I have one last question. More of a positive question. What advice, if any, would you have for a young feminist coming into psychology?

MK: Go for it. (laughs) Well, certainly to seek out faculty who are sympathetic to feminisms or to more liberal points of views within psychology. They may be women or they may be men. They are more likely to be women, but they won't be exclusively

women. And some women won't qualify. Form groups with other feminist students. Read feminist research. Read lots of feminist psychology research. Read it from all the decades. Ignore the whole thing about, you only read the most recent article. The most important thing is the most recent article. Historians know it's not. But anyway, read some of the early feminist work. You know, read in an area and go back. Find the women. Find the women that way. Find the feminist research that way, because that will support you in what you do. [1:27:21] You don't have to make, your feminism doesn't have to match what their feminism was. You can take feminism to a different place, feminism in psychology to a different place. You will. You are a different generation, you live in a different world. Contextually, it is going to be very different than when I started, or even 10 years ago. So that would be my advice.

LB: Great. Well, before we wrap up, I am going to turn it over to you. If there is anything that you think that we should have touched on, anything you want to add in, that occurred to you during all of this.

MK: There is nothing now. I will look over the transcript carefully and I'll annotate stuff…

[1:28:06]