Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History Project

Interview with Jean Pettifor

Interviewed by Alexandra Rutherford
Halifax, NS
June 13, 2008

When citing this interview, please use the following citation:

Pettifor, J. (2008, June 13). Interview by A. Rutherford [Video Recording]. Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History and Online Archive Project. Halifax, NS.

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 Jean Pettifor
Interviewed by Alexandra Rutherford
Halifax, NS
June 13, 2008

JP: Jean Pettifor, Interview Participant
AR: Alexandra Rutherford, Interviewer
TB: Tera Beaulieu, Interviewer

AR – If I could ask you, for purposes of identifying the tape in 50 years from now, when it's been mislabelled – could you say your full name and place and date of birth for the record?

JP – Jean Linse Pettifor. I was born on October 14, 1922 in Saskatchewan, Canada. I now live in Calgary, Alberta.

AR – And where in Saskatchewan where you born?

JP – The hospital was in Scott, which you may not have heard of! My father had taken up land when it was free in the early part of the century, so they were just still opening up the country, and of course 1922 is now getting to be a while back! So conditions were a bit different then than now.

AR – Why don't we start by having you tell us a little bit about your upbringing and how it may have influenced your values, and the values that you bring to psychology now? So, tell us a bit about your upbringing!

JP – Ok! I grew up on a farm. My mother had come to this country as the eldest child of eventually eight children from an immigrant family from Denmark – primarily for economic reasons, in terms of the family making a living. So, she was eleven years-old, was immediately thrown out of childhood into doing domestic work – trying to bring money in for the family survival. And, she did extremely well in school, was in teacher's training and so forth. But what I found interesting was that in those first years her main concern seemed to be the survival of the family and her responsibilities as the eldest child who helped taking care of things. My father had been [inaudible] (03:08) the land – he was eighteen years older – but he had not been fitting with the community too well. He was having a lot of very liberal, progressive kind of literature in! But, what happened then was that, for the two of them getting together, is that, instead of focusing only on the individual's survival, she felt that there was a need in terms of society, policies, and government. So, she got into much more of the social, political advocacy. And, I certainly grew up in that atmosphere on the farm – that we have got to solve problems with regard to war and peace, with regard to the economic distribution of goods, with regard to health care, with regard to education, and all of these things.

The word "feminism" never came up. The words "social justice" never came up. Although, I think these days they would be much related. But, one of the big things that I think, in retrospect, probably affected my life and what course I have took was partly her shift then to the, basically,

social justice kinds of issues, but still living with rather primitive conditions in terms of the farm life. But, the other fascinating aspect is that, I think, a few days before they were married they voted in a federal election that elected a number of progressive people from western Canada in terms of the farm [inaudible] (04:49). It also had elected Agnes Macphail, who was the first woman in the House of Commons. And she happened to be from the home constituency [where] my father had grown up! So, he kept taking local newspapers and she kept writing weekly reports on what was going on politically and in Ottawa.

Well, I think then Mother was following her development and feeling: "We got to get into the political changes"! So, 1927, there was actually a big farmers' meeting in Regina and Mother managed to get enough coverage for her four kids to attend and set up personal friendship with Agnes Macphail. Agnes never married because she said she has got to pave the way for women to get into the public life. But there was a need for more mothers to be involved. It was giving my mother an awful lot of encouragement to get out politically, which she started doing and was actually women's president for… I think it was the "Farmers'Union" – I'm not sure if I've got the right name on that. And in the early thirties, of course, that brought you right into the Great Depression that I'm sure young people are tired of hearing about. She stays with that for about a year, but she still kept working in terms of writing and getting herself into the newspaper and so forth. I was the oldest of four children and I would listen to all these conversations. And when I go back through her papers I find it interesting because if I see the names, even the last names of somebody, the first name pops into my mind as well, even though if you would just ask me if I could give you some names, I wouldn't remember!

But, I think growing up in that background has probably had a great deal of influence in terms of my concerns for other people, maybe disadvantaged, and so forth. Mother, in the early thirties, wrote an essay predicting the war if they did not stop Nazism and fascism in Europe. And the insight there is just amazing! But it seems to me that in 1939, when my siblings and I were growing up – you know, finishing high school and so forth – that war breaks out in 39, I think that was a terrible disillusionment to Mother, to Agnes, and, of course, to other people. So, her emphasis seemed to be then very strong on having to get the kids educated. Because, if you have educated people, there is going to be more sense of bringing about a bunch more social justice, equality, and all of the fine things we talk about in feminism except we don't limit it to feminism.

And, of course, we started leaving home and going in different directions. I took the accelerated teacher's training program in the early forties. And the mission there was that we've got so many teachers, male teachers, overseas in the military that we've got to speed things up and [get] people out into the schools. Now, in terms of occupational choices, it seemed to me that there weren't many choices for women. You could be a teacher, you could be a nurse, you could be a stenographer. Anyway, the teaching appealed to me much more because it seemed to me that it was helping people, or helping children, or helping people to have a better life. So, I took the teaching route and then went back to university and became interested in the psychology side – again, I think very much in terms of helping people. When I went back I had already taught school for three years and, it's sort of interesting because I sort of thought, "Am I going back to teaching or look at something else?" I was interviewed for teaching and told that I didn't get the job because "I was too interested in the children!"

AR – Like that was a bad thing!

JP – "Yes, you should be interested in the instruction and the discipline!" So, I thought, "Isn't that interesting!" Anyway, at that time, I got a job with the Alberta Guidance Clinic which was part of the mental health system. The focus when I was there was primarily children and families.

{10:02}

So again, I think, there was the theme of trying to help people that may have problems or disadvantages and so forth. I think a lot of it came from the much earlier experience that was never identified as feminism, or social justice, or things like that. But certainly, Mother was making a point that, you know, girls should have the same opportunities as boys, until we found that it wasn't ok for us to go on a softball team in another town for competitions because girls might get taken advantage of! I said, "Oh! Maybe we aren't really the same! Maybe we aren't really equal!" But certainly, she was promoting that.

Now, I always sort of wondered a little bit about the Persons' Case. Now, my mother was the first group of women that were actually granted the [inaudible] (11:07) award in 1979.

AR – Can you speak a bit about that award? That wasn't something that I was familiar with.

JP – What was the basis of that?

AR – Yes!

JP – There were women that were wanting to get, I think, Emily Murphy appointed to the Senate. Now, she had been appointed a judge in 1917 and apparently there were lawyers that were saying it was invalid because women weren't entitled to have these kinds of positions. But the very specific issue seemed to be whether women could be appointed to the Senate. Ok … the interpretation of the legislation – I was just trying to think what the act was, but it was still out of London, England – was that women were not persons in terms of certain rights and so forth. And the famous five women appealed that decision to the higher court in London and got it reversed so that women really were persons that could be appointed to the Senate. But the Prime Minister was in no hurry to do so and I don't think he wanted Emily Murphy there. The thing that I found fascinating – and I cannot find out if there is any paper record of it or not – is that Agnes Macphail in the mid-twenties told Mother that she was offered a seat in the Senate, and the reason being that there was a minority government and she would likely vote against them if they didn't get her to move somehow. So, I always wonder if there was any political interference in terms of the Canadian higher court saying that women were really not persons that could be appointed. It's a question that I may never know the answer to, but I thought, "This is interesting – the earlier Prime Minister had no problem if it served his interests!"

AR – It's politics!

JP – Oh, yes!

AR – Well, tell us a little bit more about your entry into psychology – your entry into sort of formal psychology, in terms of your training!

JP – Well, I took my Master's of Education degree [and] I was focusing as much as possible on educational psychology. The other areas, English and history were supposed to be my speciality

areas in terms of teaching. I found the psychology quite fascinating and then they were looking for two psychologists to be hired into the government's mental health services. The minister of the day did not believe in psychologists! In fact, I'm not sure that he believed in social workers {14:08} either because if you had social workers there would be social problems; or if you had psychologists they would be psychological problems! And we didn't need these problems; nurses were far better people for everything. So, the first two psychologists hired within the community mental health services were called social workers. And then at some point, they were able to get the name changed to psychologists.

AR – Tell us a little bit, this would have been in the late forties, early fifties, that you are speaking of now, with the community mental health centres?

JP – Yes!

AR – Tell me about the atmosphere then. This was post-war. I know a little bit about the history of the development of post-war applied psychology in the States, so what was it like in Canada and your region? The community mental health centre, was that a new kind of entity that was established with government funding or not?

JP – What they called the guidance clinic, they had actually started in a part-time way about 1929-1930 because there was a mental hygiene movement, I think, that was quite strong in the twenties. They were setting up travelling clinics, but prior to World War II, they were on a part-time basis, borrowing some staff from the mental health hospitals, borrowing some staff from the Institution for the Mental Handicapped, and so forth. So, in 1948, they established full-time guidance clinics … no, in 1947 the first guidance clinic [was established] in Calgary and in 1948 in Edmonton. And, it was in 1948 that I was hired as a psychologist for the Edmonton Clinic. And the staff was, you know, very limited in terms of psychiatrists in charge – psychiatrists, psychologists, social workers. And, this triumvirate has been described as the "holy trinity!" In terms of, "we are going to look after the morals of the community" Those who are immoral were more likely to be considered with mental health problems! I may be exaggerating slightly, but there were certainly that degree.

AR – Tell us exactly what you were doing at that time. What did your work look like?

JP – I did Stanford-Binets! I did a great deal of intelligence testing. In the very beginning, it was as if we weren't capable of counselling or [doing] psychotherapy – that was the psychiatrist's job! After a while, they sort of thought, "Oh! [inaudible] (17:10). They called it, I think for a little while, "pre-treatment." Psychiatrists were getting bogged down trying to keep up with everything and so we were then allowed to do "pre-treatment." It wasn't "real treatment" because real treatment had to be psychiatric. After a while we were allowed to do counselling, or therapy, or whatever – and [everything has] changed in terms of systems, of the delivery of services. But, I have given thousands, I think, of Stanford-Binets.

AR – Tell us a little about what your work environment was like in the fifties, in terms of being a woman, being a psychologist providing services – obviously there were relationships with other types of professions – what was it like being a woman in psychology providing psychological services at that time?

{18:01}

JP – I didn't see too many really visible issues as long as you were single. If you were married, you were not really expected to work, certainly not after the war ended. And if you were pregnant, you had to resign. Now, they did have a clause that you could be reinstated at the pleasure of the minister, but you need not be if it was not his pleasure. And your pension that you paid into as a single person was returned to you so fast – you have never seen the government act that quickly before! Because you weren't allowed to pay into the pension fund unless you had a medical certificate that your husband was incapable of supporting you. Now that seems to be a little hard to believe these days! I got married in 1961 and that was still the case then. A little later in the sixties, this was never announced to us, they changed the rules so that married women could. Well, they were going to say I couldn't because I had interrupted my service – I had gone back to university, actually on a government partial grant and so forth. So, I had quite a long struggle with the pension department to get my past services reinstated.

AR – The government gives it and then takes it away!

JP – Yes! And then, years later when I was up in the more management levels and had readier access to the personnel's file, I sort of thought, "I think I should take a look at my own. I have the right to do so!" So here is the letter from the provincial head of the mental health division saying with regard to me, "She may think she wants to come back after the maternity, but she won't want to and let's hurry up and hire a man in her position while she is away!" Apparently, the man did not take the job and I got my position back. But, you know, sometimes you sort of think that it's not that long ago. I'm still alive! I was there! So, you can ask so, "how did you manage?" It wasn't that somebody said that you are not eligible and so forth, but certainly there was some discrimination there, but it wasn't always blatant and upfront.

AR – Things were happening that you may not have known about if you didn't have that access!

JP – Yes!

AR – Well, tell us now a little about you – you did your M.A. and M.Ed. in the late forties, I believe, and then worked?

JP – In 1948, I got both an M.A. and M.Ed. degree.

AR – Then you worked and then went back in the sixties to get your PhD?

JP – It would be actually in 1959 to 1961. And, what I found out later, the reason they gave me partial salary to go back was that I was now too old to get married!

AR – Well, you surprised them!

JP – Well, the things is, when you surprised them, you also betrayed them!

AR – Right!

{21:33}

JP – Because married women do not have to work! But if I was single, I would have to work for the rest of my life in order to support myself! So, getting married was a betrayal. Having children

was a betrayal. I had one, then later I had another one and, you know, no wonder they were looking for a man!

AR – Tell us about your doctoral training. I know that you have mentioned in one of your articles that part of the impetus was that they were looking for the most highly trained professionals they could get, so they thought it was a good idea for you to go and get a PhD.

JP – And that I was too old to get married!

AR – And you were too old to get married! So, you were a good bet!

JP – Otherwise, I was a pretty good bet! You are talking about actually doing the program?

AR – Yes, who did you study with? What directions did you take in terms of research and that kind of things?

JP – Well, I was in Wayne State in Detroit. One part of the department that would seem to be the dominant one [had] a very strong behavioural approach. It seemed to be prior to bringing in the cognitive aspect, as well. And then, my own adviser was Frank [inaudible] (22:58) whose background had been psychodynamic and one of the things I think I mentioned in the article was that when he was talking with a student, he could talk in psychodynamic terms. If he was talking with his colleagues, he could shift those same kinds of things into behavioural terms. And I thought these were two different languages! But I think it is trying to deal with some of the same phenomena. So, I feel I got a lot more of the practical things from the more psychodynamic approach. Another aspect of why it was valuable was that prior to that, I was always supervised by a psychiatrist who did not tell why to think, what to think – why you might do this or that, what kind of options there might be. It was much more, "Do this! Do that"! And when I got training, it was as though, "Oh! I'm allowed to think now!" I could try to say, "Well, what would be the best thing to do?" Or if there were options, "How do we sort of weigh them out as to which would be the way to go?" But, you were capable of thinking, which also meant you might be capable of supervising. Suddenly, the way the psychiatrists were supervising, I didn't think it was that smart! Other than that it kept them in full control and in full knowledge of things.

AR – Right! So, how then did your work change after you got your PhD?

JP – Oh! I was not much more credible than the day before! And, I sort of said, "This is uncomfortable. This is unfair. This is not right. I haven't changed much!" But, certainly, it was worth having the title! It was worth having the title in the community! And then, our psychiatrist, he determined how we should call each other. So, he was Doctor so-and-so, full name, his wife, who was a psychiatrist, was Doctor first-initial, and I was allowed to be Doctor Jean! And the rest of the staff could go by their first name with no titles! And I thought, "This is pretty class oriented!"

AR – Hierarchical!

{25:29}

JP – Hierarchical for sure! So, I had reason: I could now put "Dr." in front of my name!

AR – But you were still Dr. Jean!

JP – Yes! I'm still a couple of rungs below him! His wife is one rung below him and I'm two rungs below him!

AR – Tell us where in all of this – we started off asking … and feel free to jump in whenever if you have things you want to follow up on – but we started off talking about your upbringing, which was very, although this term wouldn't have been used, but it was very social justice oriented; and that what attracted you to psychology was that it was a helping profession. Tell me, through this period then of your training and really entering into the profession, how did you kind of see your activism, your concerns for social justice and so on, how did that interact with your life as a psychologist? How did that play out?

JP – Well, it's sort of like what kinds of activities you get yourself in and how you define social activism. But certainly, when I was working with the guidance clinics, I was very soon doing volunteering things in the community, talking to homeless school groups, organizing "buzz sessions" – I think that was term that was used. For a while, mental health had little plays with mental health themes. We would go present those and then lead discussion. So, you were trying to do a lot more in terms of the mental health and the health developmental – parenting, family stuff – awareness. I got very much involved with the Canadian Mental Health Association, even to the point where I got called on the carpet because they were criticizing the government and I shouldn't be associated or I would never advance in the profession!

AR – Ok! So, one of your first kind of conflicts in terms of what you should do for the profession versus what you should do ethically as a person practising – that kind of thing!

JP – Well, ethics wasn't ever mentioned or named. You know, if you are an employee, you are obedient! I went to a workshop one year – I am not sure when that was, it was in the seventies – it was supposed to be ethics for managers! And I sort of thought, "Oh! I'm going to see what they have to say!" It was within the government. I must say, I was a little disappointed. Although, it was interesting. They had three presenters who apparently had never talked to each other before! So, the lawyer gets up and says, "It's a master and servant relationship. You shall obey!" End of the discussion, essentially! The clergyman gets up and says, "You know, you have got to respect the inner sanctum of virtue and all of the rest of it and we know things are tough out there, but, you know, the greatest martyrs of all time stood up for their beliefs!" And I thought, "Oh, really! I don't know if I want to be the greatest martyr of all time!" But the psychologist got up and said that he knew it was tough out there and so forth, but when you got totally stressed out, here was his office number and address and you could come and see him!

So you are not supposed to, in government or other larger organizations, be critical of anything that may be considered the line of authority. But you may have a little more freedom if you go outside the line of authority and find some other channel! So, I went to my official boss and said, "You know, I would like to write a critique and some suggestions on how {29:26} they could do better on this topic!" He said, "Fine, go ahead and let me see it!" So, I sort of thought it would be protection if I let him see it and he didn't get blind sided! So, I wrote it up, not just critical, but, you know, I thought it would be much more effective if they had organized this way or that way, or whatever. I got a nice reply, "Thank you very much. We don't know if we will ever do it again. The person who did it this time is no longer with us, but thank you very much anyway. Fine, good bye, hope we never hear from you again!" However, I thought it was a nice story to remember!

AR – Tell us, then, about the evolution of your work on and interest in ethics because that's been one of the major, major, themes in your career!

JP – The ethics has become very much so. Early, I was involved very much in the founding of the Psychologists' Association of Alberta. And at one point, this would be – oh my Gosh! – it must have really started by 1958, but it must not have been until the seventies that we started setting up an ethics committee. And then people started saying, "What's that?" and, "We are not sure of what is considered ethical or unethical behaviour and you are setting up a committee that might be policing us and we would like to know more." And the answer came, "It's all confidential; we cannot tell you!" This I couldn't buy! I was editor of the newsletter for several years, so I wrote up a whole bunch of little vignettes and published them. And, one of the psychologists came and said, "You should never do anything like that! All of you have done is inform the public about all the bad things we could do!"

AR – Oh! Bad public relations!

JP – So, I've been doing it ever since! I've been refining it! Certainly when I look back at the first ones… what we are doing – we've gotten a lot more in depth and concerns matter to them and options available and so forth. But it is almost [as though] when you start off on some of these things that you start feeling that you have to prove there is a problem before you can really get on and deal with things in more depth. And if we wanted to jump over to feminist stuff in the mid-seventies and the work that actually got out about 1980, in terms of guidelines for women…

When you look at that now and you look at the task forces, reports, and different things, there was such a strong need in the mid-seventies to prove that there was a problem – so that your vignettes tended to be examples of problems, whereas, today, we are far more apt to talk about diversity and that feminism must be a part of the diversity. And we are for more apt to talk about dilemmas when maybe there are some conflicts or differences in what is "respecting the individual" – what somebody else thinks is in their best interest or the different parties say, "This is what needs to be done!" "No, that needs to be done!" And you have some obligations to both. And so, when you have a real dilemma, it is a dilemma where there is not always a clear cut answer. So, I think there has been a real development there, in terms of whether you have to prove there are problems, or whether you can start talking about what kinds of dilemmas, what kinds of situations come up that we hope we'll manage more ethically than unethically and some kinds of guidelines there.

AR – Can we talk more – and I know Tera, you might have some questions here...

{33:22}

TB – I was just hoping you can speak to the process of developing the guidelines for counselling and therapy with women. I know they were revised more recently and what were the differences between those two processes, developing the initial set and the more contemporary? Maybe, what were some of the barriers or obstacles that you have encountered initially as well, if you did?

JP – Well, earlier on, when we were working in the late seventies and they were adopted in 1980, all of this was based on the United Nations' – I think 1975 – the year of women's something... And the APA got in; there was a survey and guidelines, and the counselling division did… and the Canadian CPA said, "Oh gosh! I guess we should get on the bandwagon too!" And so, they

actually had Barbara Wand heading a study looking at different areas and also making recommendations. Then we started saying, "Well, what are we going to do about this?" Some of us thought that the board was not fully supportive – whether we were right or wrong is another question – but they seemed to be dragging their heels a bit. And then there were some complaints that got some shifting us as to who was responsible on the board and so forth. One of the issues was the language: the "he, she" thing, gender terms, and how to get non-gender terms. And I didn't think I could personally get deeply involved in that. Certainly, other areas were in terms of employment, how women are there – professors, heads of departments. That was a little out of my range as well.

I was interested in the therapy and counselling with women. So, I got more personally involved in how do you develop guidelines there. And of course, even before the guidelines coming out, you are doing presentations at CPA, whether that is a workshop, symposium, or what have you. So, we were working on that, but when I look at the documents now it seems to me, still very clear, that we were going to present vignettes to prove there were problems. We were going to give rules that said, "You don't do these things!" And now, we are more apt to go back to the current code and say, "What is respectful? What is in best interest type of thing?"

AR – This is an intriguing point you bring up, that in the late seventies you still felt that it was a matter of proving that a problem existed – and you are speaking specifically, I guess, about sexism in therapy, sexual contact in therapy, and whether that was right or wrong. Can you talk a little about then the method that you used to kind of prove that there was a problem because you allude to it in one of the articles that you wrote? I am curious about that!

JP – I'm just trying to remember exactly how we did, but I know we tried to make it known that we were looking for examples from people in the field. I think we got quite a few of them. I'm just a little vague on what mechanism we used.

AR – I think you mentioned something, you put announcements in newsletters and community areas. But were these reports you were getting from clients, from women in therapy that said, "This is what I have experienced at the hands of ...?"

JP – Yes! And then of course you try to write them up and don't use a lot of identifying information. But, they were real life stories!

AR – That is powerful!

{37:25}

JP – And we're still in the business of looking for real life stories on project that we are working on today, or even on the workshop that I did this morning. But, there has been an evolution in the approach in terms of whether we believe we should be accepting of diversity. Now, I've still found that the sexism type of thing – what there still is, is a little more underground, is a little more subtle. It used to be quite overt! And, of course, we always try to pull out a few interesting stories like [how] one member of the board kept referring to "broad issues of the feminist [inaudible] (38:09)"! And said, "What? You can take a joke, can't you?"

AR – Right! "You don't have a sense of humour!"

JP – You know, I try to remember a few specifics that can be interesting. But even into the nineties, on the board there was some opposition to something was proposed and it was [like],"that's more of this feminist/sex rhetoric with no empirical support" type of thing.

AR – "There's really no problem, it is just feminists who are getting wrapped up about..."

JP – Yes! Some of that I definitely saw in the nineties! Now, anybody that spoke up strongly there, you know, they weren't going to get everybody screaming. They were sort of well ... but it was there! And, you're sort of thinking, "yes, so one individual who seems to be under attack for feminist writing got an award the other day, yesterday I think, isn't that nice!" I asked her if she had been rehabilitated! So, I think you were asking something [else] and I may have gotten sidetracked.

TB – Oh well, you sort of described it! But, I was curious, what was the initial reaction when it was proposed that you were going to bring forward these guidelines as well? Were people supportive of it?

JP – [Inaudible] (39:49) was a very strong proponent of these things. I think she did probably the spearheading as far as the board was concerned and some people can get intimidated by her – I'm not sure if everybody does, but...

AR – I was so sad she wasn't able to be here at this time, but I have a little note to read from her tomorrow.

JP – She was a major force in CPA in, what...the seventies and eighties. And I think if anyone was responsible for a lot of these position papers, I think that she was. What was it like? Well, I wasn't on the board during some of those years, and I'm not quite sure what went on but, what I did find later on – I forgot the very specific there – but there was some proposal, and certainly I was supporting it. Somebody wanted to know if this was more of that feminist rhetoric that hadn't any empirical support and so forth.

Oh! It must have been when we were doing guidelines for non-discriminatory practice! Yes, that was it, because we sort of said, "Well, if we are talking about diversity and guidelines for non-discriminatory, you know, that includes ethnicity, it includes disabilities, yes, it includes women, but, you know… there is a whole range of things here in terms of discrimination – you wouldn't be opposed to all of these others would you?" "Well no, no, that's ok!" And it almost seemed to me that if you put the feminist – what is seen as some of the feminist – proposals in the bigger context you got a better response!

{41:52}

Because, I think there was a backlash in some areas in terms of what seemed to be too overtly or aggressive, pushy feminist. And, you know, even my son, who I think is a pretty reasonable guy, he's got that feeling about even the word 'feminist,' as if that's not something you want to be in contact with. And at the same time, I think in terms of the basic values, I don't think he's got any problem with it.

AR – Right! You have now, as you've written, been in psychology for over sixty years. And certainly in the last, at least, twenty years – maybe more – you've supervised clinical students, students doing applied work, so you are in touch, obviously, with sort of a generation of people

who are going through their training in the nineties into the two thousands, how do you see their attitudes or their values vis-à-vis feminism – if we weren't going to use the "F" word – women's issues? What is the feeling now? Are these things problems that have been solved and we are just going to go out and be psychologists? What is your experience mentoring students, seeing the way that training has evolved?

JP – In my own experience it does not seem to come up! We try to attend to whatever business should be attended to. I don't find them raising the issue; I don't specifically raise the issue, certainly if it came up I'll try to deal with it. You know, I had a student from the Middle East – I may have pulled it out of him – sort of saying that women in North America really deserve some of the domestic violence because they don't know their proper places! And there is no problem in his country about that because they know their place, they follow the men around and take second place and the men, in return, protect them and look after them. And this comes up in a class and you sort of think, "Oh, shall I go and behead him on the spot? No, no, no!" But what I tend to do with somebody that comes up with something that I think is really off, "Oh! What does the rest of you think about that?" No, I don't feel I'm just escaping for my own comfort and I may summarize some comments later, but I try to get them talking. Can you understand where he is coming from? Can you understand that this may not be that acceptable? Or it may not be that valid in terms of his own country. But try to get them talking and hope that you get more understanding and more coming together, rather than setting up something confrontational and, you know, we've got to take sides and this win/lose situation, you try to turn it into a win/win.

AR – Right! You have written also on international ethics code and how to achieve this tricky balance of establishing universal principle while at the same time respecting diversity and dealing with cultural relativism. Can you speak a bit about how – first of all, how did you get involved at a more international level in the issue of ethics and then go from there?

JP – Well, let's see... In the early nineties I think I was asked to contribute something to ASPPB – you know what that is? The Association of State and Provincial Psychology Boards, all North American regulatory bodies belong to it. They wanted me to talk about something on ethics. I was proud that they had recognized Canada and then I got Carole St-Clair with me on the presentation. What we did was the approach on the Canadian code of ethics, which of course is somewhat different from the American one. We got a tremendous response, even though we did not have too much time, but it was new to a lot of them and appealing to a lot of them. So, then, I think, it was shortly after that, the ASPPB was organizing an international congress that was to deal with certification, regulation – it had three words in there.

{46:53}

And so I thought, "Ok! Let us see if we can submit something here that is going to be a little more international, at least between Canada and the States." Well, then you see, we start meeting some other people, and then there is the European Federation of Psychologists at this meeting! I think the next year was in Greece, so we started recruiting some people there and just talking about ethics from different countries, different cultures. We had seen a couple of studies that had been done and, there was one that had been in the States, another one similar in the United Kingdom, where they were looking at surveys of psychologists: "what kind of dilemmas have you run into in the past year?" and trying to see what seemed to be the big issues. So then we started organizing every year for an international conference, a symposium where you brought in people from different countries, different continents, [to] talk about ethics from their own point of view. Now, most people, if they submit, it's for themselves or their immediate colleagues,

whereas we had made a special point of trying to get people from different parts of the world. And, this was fascinating; sometimes we had a workshop format, sometimes more of a symposium format.

So we kept working on that – we are still working on that basis – but in 2002 this was sort of a big moment. We didn't know it was going to be, but we were in Singapore at the International Congress of Applied Psychology or it may have been at the International Union of Psychological Science. I get mixed up sometimes! Anyway, what I had organized there, we had presentations from Norway, from South Africa, from New Zealand, from Canada… I think we had the States in there, but the thing that triggered things off was Janel Gauthier making a comparison between the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the Psychology Code of Ethics. This is Asia; human rights is a sensitive topic. We were on the first day, fortunately! But it meant that people were talking immediately or being afraid to talk immediately. And, of course, these other international associations sort of have these little business meetings when they have the opportunity at another congress. So, I think he reported – or I shouldn't try to speculate if this is totally accurate – but, anyway, he had contact with other international associations and they set up a task force in the committee, "working committee," they called it, to draft a universal declaration of ethical principles. Now, of course, there were several things we learned: Don't mention the words 'human rights!' That would cut off some people; either they wouldn't be allowed... Because I started getting the idea that some people had to have permission to leave their countries to attend some of these conferences and certainly seemed to be quite nervous about it. So, there were a lot of things there. But, he set up a committee, working committee, with somebody heading up psychology in China, and somebody in New Zealand, somebody in Zimbabwe, somebody in South Africa, somebody representing the European Federation, and so forth ... we even got Iran in there, then trying to work on a universal declaration. Now, it's had a lot of... there has been a lot of input, there has been a lot of discussion in different parts of the world. He's gone to an awful lot of different countries in terms of their conferences and one of the things one learns is the importance of language, the meaning of words that we may think we take for granted, but they may mean something else in another culture.

AR – Even 'psychologist,' the word psychologist, what does that mean somewhere else?

JP – Even psychologist! And, Janel actually gave a paper this morning on the importance of language, of the meanings; they are almost lessons for trying to work with this idea of the universal. But you do, if you see the draft document, there is certainly a similarity in terms of the Canadian code because what we are saying is: we emphasize ethical principles as values and we do not tell you how you shall behave in your own country, in your own culture.

{52:12}

So that one is constantly careful that you don't sound as if you are giving orders, as if you are colonizing the rest of the world, the rest of the world must do as you do to be recognized. That can be fairly sensitive in terms of the words you use. Do you endorse, do you adopt, do you uphold, do you only think about it? Do you entertain? What kind of word do you use that does not mean that you are telling them what to do. So, what you say then, well, how this is interpreted or used in any given country or culture has to be culturally appropriate. Now, what they consider culturally appropriate we may not! But, that's not our business at this point in time! Now, what we think may happen, and I think it's already beginning to happen, is that, particularly from countries that don't really have a code of ethics is, "Hey! Could we use this as a model for developing a code of ethics?" And maybe even, "Might you be helpful to us?" But

you have to keep it on a higher level of the respect, the caring, the well being, because you know there aren't very many people that are not interested in maintaining the welfare, at least, of their own people. And even the question of respect for the dignity of persons and peoples – and we got that very strongly from New Zealand, from the Maori people; you have got to respect peoples as a group as well. It isn't just the individuals and the persons.

AR – Anybody want to jump in? I have tons of questions. Tell us about what you feel is the unique contribution of the Canadian code of ethics in all of this – because it is unique in the way it was developed, as you said, these four kinds of pillars of the code. Can you speak a little bit to that? It's obviously had, it seems, like an international influence at this point.

JP – It has moved into international influence. The Europeans resonated with it very, very quickly once we got into the international. And we seem to be much more on the same page with the Europeans than what we have been in terms of the Americans and the APA. And this is primarily because we put a stronger focus on being educating, supportive, being helpful, rather than going out and finding the bad guys. Now, I don't want to say that everything in the States is that. I certainly have a tremendous admiration for Stephen Behnke who heads up the present APA's ethics office. So, I don't want to be denigrating at all there because I think they are moving and I think he is doing a tremendous job. But, we have really resonated very, very much with the Europeans. Now, even the coming up – in July – conference in Berlin, the Europeans have organized a symposium around ethics for European psychologists. And, they have asked Carole St-Clair from here to be a discussant and they have asked me to present a paper on the Canadian perspective, and all the rest is European. We've got a copy of the book that they want to be promoted – it isn't published yet, but we got an early copy. I read that and I sort of think, "This could be Canadian just as easily!" Whereas I don't think I feel quite that way in terms of the APA code.

AR – Well, I have to ask you because it is so timely, and because you are an ethicist, what is your take on what has been happening in terms of the APA's response to the allegations of psychologists' involvement in interrogations at Abu Ghraib and Guantanamo Bay? What is your take on that whole situation?

JP – Well, I suppose it is self-protective that it is not up to us to be unduly criticizing another country! And we have refrained from doing so! I think sometimes it is very hard to get facts. I think it has caused a great deal of disturbance, you know? I suspect that there may be enough reasons for a great deal of disturbance.

{57:10}

I think it is unfortunate, in some ways, that, I think, the APA's ethic offices have had to spend an awful lot of time and energy on, basically, damage control. I think they could have handled things much more positively and constructively from the beginning. I think they put out some messages that would provoke more than otherwise, like, "We can't tell you. It has to be secret who is on this committee or this task force! And we did have some disagreements, but we can't tell you what they were!" You know, those are just waving red flags! It also delayed them getting around to doing a handbook that might be supportive of people because they didn't give any guidance, really, on what do you do if you are working for the military and you are in a position where there may be certain expectations.

AR – And I think the military psychologists were looking for that. It was like, "Help us out here. How can we act ethically in these situations?" But instead...

JP – Yes! So, on the surface, you can't help feeling that there are some serious problems. And you can't help feeling that they had good intentions, but I'm not sure that the APA has handled it as well as they might have. I said, from the beginning, that they needed to get this handbook or manual together that was really supportive and helpful. And, at one point, I was told, "Well, we can't do that until all this other furor settles down!" I said it would never settle down, unless you got something out that was helpful. Now, they have asked for people to submit case studies and vignettes and so forth. I don't know what they are getting, but again, I think I have a lot of admiration for Stephen Behnke in terms of the ethics office and I think he is in an unenviable position, in some ways, of trying to support, you know – I don't know if he 100% supports everything that they have done but he certainly does a tremendous job in trying to turn things positively around.

AR – Well, that was fairly diplomatic!

JP – Well, I think if there is something one should be, or should be, it is fairly diplomatic. And whether I go edit that again or not, I might take an [inaudible] (59:30) out. No must, and should, [inaudible] (59:36) or we'll get you!

AR – Jean, can you tell us, you were CPA president in 1995, were you the last… most recent woman president?

JP – There is a new one, Catherine Lee, I think she is coming in on the meeting on Sunday.

AR – Ok! Going back to 1995, what were your kinds of hopes, aims, or goals for your presidency?

JP – Keep the [inaudible] (1:00:09) working cooperatively together. They had had some bad times in the years prior to that.

AR – Ok, and how did that work out in terms of goals?

JP – I think it worked quite well! Now, certainly, on occasion, you know, it wasn't that you didn't have some responsibilities, but, on occasions, somebody would come to me and say, "So-and-so blah, blah, blah, you better intervene!" And I'm sort of saying, "Well, have you tried some better discussions, negotiations? Maybe you should discuss some of the following kinds of things – if you are still having problems come to me!" One person at one time was afraid that the predecessor would be out to get him! I said, "Well, he may not! But I made the decision as to what I wanted, the portfolio that I wanted you to take, and if there is any problem get him right back to me; I'll deal with him!" It wasn't, you know, "It's your problem, go flounder!" So, in a way, I had the feeling that you needed some sense of responsibility and some sense of leadership, but I didn't mean that you took over everything and controlled everything! If you could support others in resolving problems, then that's fine! I think it did work better. I'm told that relations are just excellent at the present time. But there is certainly history in the past that wasn't pleasant.

AR – Jean, I wanted to ask you now a little bit about your perspectives on the Section of Women and Psychology in CPA. You've been involved in the section in various roles, also, of course,

involved on the Committee on the Status of Women in Canadian Psychology, which lasted for how long – the Committee on the Status of Women with CPA?

JP – I don't know! Was that in the mid-seventies?

AR – It started in '75, but I think it was disbanded in the early nineties or there were some discussions about whether it was needed and it got kind of disbanded.

JP – I don't honestly remember. It sounds similar to the Task Force Report, like the United Nations Report, certainly then the CPA report that Barbara Wand put together, and it is quite possible that we set up a Status of Women Committee at that time that didn't survive in that form. Now, I don't recall when SWAP… but I think the section was [around] '79.

AR – Yes, I think SWAP was around '76, I believe. So, what has been your relationship with SWAP?

JP – Most of the time on the periphery. If there were particular projects and things I certainly have been interested in, such as the therapy and counselling with women and more recent psychological services with women, and certainly I was involved in the non-discriminatory practice, at the time, when some of the women were concerned that we had no guidelines because the 1980 ones had gathered so much dust, they couldn't find them! And so, my involvement has usually been on something specific that I was interested in. Also the "recovered memory" – I don't whether you recall that – but I was responsible for getting that organized.

AR – What was the context there? I mean, can you speak to that issue – the "recovered memory" debate – and how it was that you came to that work?

JP – It seems to me that the recovered memory and the non-discriminatory practice were relatively around the same time. I don't know if I remember all the details there, but certainly when I was president, we were getting requests – the movement in terms of criticism and each of the professional associations should stop their members from creating these things. And, I know we ... Oh! I remember now how we got into that! Well, we referred it to the ethics committee that was chaired by somebody else and, I think, when I was president I was supposed not to be on it– conflict of interests etc.

{03:15}

Anyway, the committee decided that they would wait for the Americans and adopt theirs! Well, the American situation seemed to break down in conflicts with people resigning. They never quite came out with their promised guidelines. So, "Oh well, maybe we can adopt the Australian ones!" I took a look at that and I sort of thought, "No way!" Then you were hearing stories about it being adopted in the United Kingdom and I sort of thought that there was no way because those guidelines seemed to be: "Beware! Don't get involved with anything if there isn't enough research done!" But essentially, it seemed to me: "Don't try to be helpful because you had better protect your own backside!" So, I think at that point I said, "Ok," and another couple of colleagues in Calgary, "we are not going to adopt some things that I don't think are ethical. Maybe it's time we develop something ourselves!"

AR – And what did you develop then? How did it differ from the things you had read?

JP – Well, I'd have to look at it again, but I think we would go back to the ethical principles again in terms of what disrespect means, in terms of dealing with this topic. What does responsible caring mean? [We were] really trying to get across the message that you don't ignore this, but neither do you push agendas. You try to be respectful, your job is the counselling job of helping that individual cope with things. Your job is not bringing somebody to justice and the courts. And in terms of vignettes, we were also saying that you might be in this situation where they want this or they expect that or your concerns and anger maybe influencing it, just keep things in hand and balanced. A few things were undoubtedly more specific than that, but for heaven's sake, be sensible and balanced! Don't forget that you have a counsellor or therapeutic role here and that is your main role!" A lot of the other things may be a matter of choices, but don't get dragged in a way that is inappropriate!

AR – Jean, in the service of gathering some final thoughts – I certainly have a question – but does anyone want to jump in on something more specific that we talked about, or maybe haven't talked about?

TB – My last question was about the recovered memory and we spoke about that, so I'm good!

AR – I realized there are a number of things on my list that I sent you that we haven't covered, but I would like to ask about, given that you have been heavily involved in the development of Canadian psychology, especially applied psychology in terms of your involvement with ethics, guidelines for practice and so on. What do you see now, in 2008, as the most pressing issues for Canadian psychology and especially applied psychology? What are the challenges that practitioners face now? And I'm thinking specifically of the Canadian context because I think it has characteristics that make it different from other contexts. What do you see as the most pressing issues for practice in Canadian psychology?

JP – I haven't a clue! People will have different views depending on where they are coming from.

AR – What are your views?

{07:22}

JP – I don't even think about it. I will try to be involved where I can, which at this point is likely to be far more on ethics and standards. I'm not going to get into the details of clinical because I'm not up-to-date!

AR – Ok! And, when I look at your CV, a lot of your work seems to have been more community-based as opposed to sort of hospital, clinical. Can you tell me then about what you see as the development of community psychology, community-based applied psychology in Canada? And partly I ask out of complete ignorance. I was trained in a clinical program and you would think that was the only kind of psychology there was.

JP – And my doctorate is in a clinical program.

AR – Yes! And yet there is this whole other world, right? Of community, prevention, and so on, and I wonder what your take is on the relationship between the two?

JP – My interests have been far more on community-based. And certainly, my activities, even from very early days and working with different organizations on mental issues and so forth, are part of being, I think, community-based. The training in clinical tended to be overly psychiatric diagnosis and psychiatric-oriented treatment, not 100 percent, but much more in that way. And it seemed to me that I fit in better in terms of what is your environmental context, what is the community base, how do you strengthened communities, because it seems to me that is more health promoting than how do you treat illness! I was on Canada's Mental Health Board for a period of time – editorial board – and I remember one time, you know, sitting around the table, like they do in committees and not always responsive, and they were talking, "Oh! What about some ads, advertisements that would go in the papers? Well, here is a wonderful one and it says 'If you are feeling this way, get this medication or get to see this psychiatrist!'" So, I objected to that being the only approach. There should be far more community… they should be far more health oriented. Well, that caused a bit of a stir, especially among the couple of psychiatrists present. I sat back and grinned while the rest of the group went at it! I have no objections to having the psychiatric and the hospital services, so help me, if you don't develop the community stuff, you do not have the health promotion, you do not have the prevention aspects.

And even recently, where they have set up the – what is it? – the Commission on Mental Health, John's services moved over to. I think John is wonderful, but I sort of keep wondering, is it going to be community oriented or is it, "gosh, we need some more prescription drugs! And we need more psychiatrists because we haven't got enough to go around!" I am hoping very much that it is promoting health, promoting community! And it may well be. I think John is a tremendous person in so many, many ways. But the community has always appealed more and I sort of think, too, when we talk about the socialization of psychologists, I sort of think that I did not get properly socialized. I don't think I conform properly!

AR – Thank goodness!

JP – And I'm saying, "thank goodness"! And I think much of what I have done that might be a little more creative, I might not have done if I was properly socialized within the clinical training. Now, there may have been an advantage – I'm sure there was an advantage – in going back for the doctoral work after I had several years of experience in the field.

{11:44}

Because, if you just take your career path the way you are supposed to, one sequence after another, you may be pretty well brainwashed by the time you get through it.

AR – Would you have any advice to psychology students now who want to kind of pursue that path – a community oriented path?

JP – Well, I don't know enough about what kind of courses are available or whether there are options that you don't have time for, but certainly I would try to look over the academic programs and what they have to offer. I think I would look toward what kind of practicum placement or internships – are they all hospital-based or are there any available that are more community oriented? Are there any even residential that are not hospitals? And sort of, where would you like to focus your efforts and your energy in terms of making a contribution? Now, you could be making a big contribution in serving people who have some very severe disturbances, pretty big problems, but I can't help thinking that maybe you are making a bigger contribution if you get much more into the community. And, when you are talking about

community, you can talk about other layers in terms of social justice and working for the betterment. And I always feel as if it is nice if you can feel you are working toward something positive more than putting band-aids on it! But you may have to figure out what do you believe, where do you think you can best fit in, and everybody doesn't have to fit in the same place – and then how do you develop that? And you can change paths and sometimes people that are most effective have worked in different kinds of settings and they've got a pretty broad kind of background. And then, whatever they are focusing on, they call on an awful lot of their past experiences.

AR – Jean is there anything I haven't or we haven't asked about – either about your personal life or your professional life that you would like to contribute to the interview?

JP – Well, I don't know what you want! I think some of your questions were relating to mentors and who were great examples for you. I sort of think, "mentors – did I have any?" Or was I always trying to charge ahead, a little beyond? And, when it comes to that, I can't think of people within psychology itself that I would consider mentors or models and so forth. And it is probably one of the reasons I went back to talk to, as I mentioned, Agnes Macphail and my mother. I don't think they were mentors in a sense, but I think they influenced, undoubtedly, where I have gone since. I don't have empirical evidence, you know, sitting upstairs, supposed to be in bed, with the trapdoor open to let some heat from the stove up so we didn't freeze to death and listening to them talking – I don't remember all the talking, but I know that I did that! I also know that in looking over all of my mother's papers – and she kept an awful lot – I resonate with it far more than my brother and sisters do. And I sort of think, "Oh, what's going on here?" There is stuff that has gone in, but that is not fully conscious. And even when I say, you know, I recognize names, even though if you asked me to bring them out of the blue, I wouldn't! So, there are some things that go on that one is not fully, fully conscious and aware of. And I think it goes way, way back.

AR – Well, I guess we should stop there!