

**Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History Project
Interview with Sandra Pyke**

*Interviewed by Alexandra Rutherford
York University
Toronto, Ontario
March 24th, 2005*

When citing this interview, please use the following citation:

Pyke, S. (2005, March 24). Interview by A. Rutherford [Video Recording]. Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History and Online Archive Project. Toronto, ON.

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

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

©Psychology's Feminist Voices, 2010

Psychology's Feminist Voices Oral History Project
Interview with Sandra Pyke
Interviewed by Alexandra Rutherford
York University
Toronto, Ontario
March 24th, 2005

AR: Alexandra Rutherford, Interviewer

SP: Sandra Pyke, Interview participant

AR: I'd like to get started by taking it from the beginning, the beginning being when you first arrived at York - so it wasn't truly your beginning, but I see you came to York around 1966, is that right?

SP: That's right

AR: From a PhD at McGill?

SP: Mhmm.

AR: Who did you work with at McGill?

SP: Wally Lambert, a social psychologist.

AR: Can you tell us a bit about your dissertation research with Dr. Lambert at McGill?

SP: It was on a construct called semantic satiation. The essence of that construct is that when people are overexposed to verbal material, it tends to lose meaning. That was something that Wally and his post-doc had done a bit of work on. He had moved on into bilingualism and so on, but I was interested in the satiation phenomenon. So that's what my dissertation was on.

AR: Ok, and that's what got you working with him?

SP: Uh huh. I was interested in that concept and also, I did some investigation and found out who the thesis supervisor was who got his or her students through the doctoral program the fastest, and Wally was right up there, (laughs). Very fast.

AR: I heard you got through in about three years?

SP: Two.

AR: Two years, wow, wow.

SP: Two years. And I was not the fastest.

AR: Really?

SP: Really, there was a fellow from Newfoundland who took 18 months, I think.

AR: Incredible, incredible.

SP: Mhm.

AR: Well, Sandra, I want you to explain something to me that wasn't completely obvious reading your CV and that is it looks like that in Saskatchewan you'd had a more clinical or applied-type background. Is that correct, and if not can you describe your background a bit?

SP: No, that wouldn't be correct. The University of Saskatchewan had quite a small psychology department chaired by Gordon McMurray and they had a number of faculty who had positions in the mental health system in the University Hospital and so on, but it was a very small faculty and so everybody did everything, but there wasn't a particularly clinical focus. Indeed, my Master's thesis was really experimental, reaction time, how fast people responded to shock and did they forget things when they were shocked, and we were investigating heart rate and things like that, so my work was very experimental at the Master's level.

AR: Ok. Now, after you finished your PhD, can you tell us a bit about how you came to York?

SP: Well, I went back to Saskatchewan because I had been offered a research position in a lab there, and the lab was run by Neil Agnew and I had worked there before going for my PhD. In fact Neil had been the supervisor for my Master's thesis. So I went back there, and subsequently he had an offer to come to York and asked if I would be interested.

My other options - I had a couple of other options - they weren't as appealing as coming to York. That is really what decided me, it's that he had been invited to come. And his position was chairing the Counseling and Development Centre at York. At that point I believe it was called Psychological Services. So he had been offered that position, and he had a model for how a clinical service/academic unit ought to function. The model was that everyone who was hired should be cross-appointed to the Department of Psychology so that everyone would be providing service as well as teaching and doing research. And that those academic positions would be tenure-track positions; they wouldn't be adjunct or sessional or contract, but rather tenure-track. So that was the model that he instituted and I along with Joan Stewart and any number of other people (Harvey Mandel, Igor Kuszyszyn, etc.) all held tenure-track appointments, split between the Psychology Department and the Counseling and Development Center.

AR: Ok, which was then called, as you pointed out, Psychological Services. What kinds of services were being offered?

SP: Well, I did a lot of admin (laughs), because my strengths weren't in the traditional clinical area, but I also initially ran study skills and communications skills [groups], I created a teaching development program for TAs [teaching assistants] and faculty and then laterally I set up a feminist workshop program, which had a number of different components. We offered individual feminist counseling, and that was very much a pioneering endeavour at that time. We offered a feminist library, drop-in centre, support groups, consciousness-raising groups, it was a mixed bag of clinical services of various kinds, but all with a feminist orientation.

AR: I was going to ask you all about that a little bit later, but since you've spoken about it... What made it possible at the time for there to be a feminist counseling service made available? I mean, was there a group of people with that conviction or interest, how did that all get started?

SP: I think that support from the director was key.

AR: Who was it?

SP: Neil Agnew. So he was supportive. Other staff such as Joan Stewart, while she was not involved in it, she certainly was supportive of the idea.

AR: Was she in psychology?

SP: Yes, yep. She was the real clinician (Laughs). And we had a number of people at York, women faculty, both in psychology and out of psychology, as well as graduate students in psychology who were feminist and, who thought this was a great idea. So there was no opposition. No organized opposition.

AR: And so support came top down and bottom up it seems.

SP: Well, not top top. Support came from the director, and everybody else didn't interfere. People had confidence in the director. The VP responsible for student services had confidence in the director and hence whatever we did wasn't questioned, it was assumed to be an appropriate thing to do.

AR: Were there any reactions from other members of the Psychology Department, who may not have been directly involved in the workshops?

SP: There may have been, but they didn't bring them to my attention (laughs).

AR: Ok, (Laughs). Didn't hear about it right?

SP: No, nobody, I don't recall anybody being a nuisance in that way or... you know...

AR: Questioning why or...

SP: No, I'm sure that must have happened, I mean how could it have not happened, but I can't remember. So obviously it wasn't highly salient and it didn't stay with me. So, there was no opposition that was organized or large or consistent or persistent, no.

AR: And from your CV it looks like this kind of appeared in '73 or '79.

SP: Mhm.

AR: What eventually caused the decline or cessation of the program? Do you recall?

SP: One of the things that had happened was that we had had a structure where we had a category of employees called program assistants, and I had one of those. So that person was the mainstay of the program; she looked after the day-to-day running of it. I conducted the group sessions and I provided the individual feminist counseling, but the program assistant handled the scheduling, advertising, maintaining the library, all of that kind of thing. And we lost that category of position as a consequence of some loss of funding. And so, all of us who had been blessed by having a program assistant assigned suddenly found ourselves not able to do what we had done before, because we had lost a full-time employee. I was very fortunate in having experienced, really top-notch people filling this position. These were people who had an undergraduate degree and in my case I worked with the same person for a number of years; she was just outstanding.

AR: What was her name?

SP: Cathie Stone.

AR: Ok, Ok. And how did it happen that the funding was lost?

SP: You'd be best asking Neil Agnew about that, rather than me. But it had to do with him attracting funding that we could then deploy in a variety of different ways. So it wasn't regular university-based funding that then dried up or there were constraints on it. I don't remember the details, and I'd be really out on a limb if I tried to make something up.

AR: Yeah, we can follow that up with Neil at some point.

SP: Yeah.

AR: You mentioned earlier that part of your participation in the program was to do individual feminist counseling. Can you give us a sense of the kinds of problems and situations that you as a feminist counselor dealt with?

SP: A lot of relationship problems. Often with a boyfriend. Sometimes if it was a lesbian client, it would be with a female partner. Sometimes it would be a cultural thing. Someone from an east-Asian culture who had absorbed some Canadian socialization and got into big conflicts with the family. Her family of origin. Being pulled one way by a fellow she was enamoured with, and being chastised and criticized and her freedoms limited by the family and their cultural orientation. So, those are some of the examples, I'm actually thinking of real situations now, one woman was struggling with what her sexual orientation was and so I was involved with her for quite a while. Another woman was post-divorce and that was quite recent, and so exploring that. Another person was abused, seriously abused in childhood and she was ready to deal with that as a mature adult. So those were the kinds of presenting issues that I dealt with.

AR: Wow. Where and how did you get your training as a feminist counselor?

SP: There was no training!

AR: I was going to say, that the field of feminist therapy...

SP: I trained people! (Laughs).

AR: How did you figure out what to do? What was that like for you being on the other side of that?

SP: Well I was teaching a course on women's sex roles in society, and so the material there, the people who were working on issues there, whether it was intentional or not, some of what they were saying was relevant. And in psychology, there was a gradually burgeoning body of research critiquing traditional modes of therapy, not just psychoanalytic, but all other traditional modes of therapy. And critiquing treatments such as the emphasis on prescribing drugs for women. So you could take from these critiques a sense of "well if that's not the right way to do it, what would be a better way of doing it?" So one of the things to keep always in mind was a bias or a belief that the person that you're talking to has been well socialized into traditional sex and gender roles, and so as a counselor, you're sensitive to that and pointing out when the thinking or the behaviour or both, was simply a knee-jerk reaction to the traditional socialization. So part of what would go on, in the sessions that I conducted, was an explanation of "You are who you are in part, because of this history, and this history is longstanding, it's normative, probably everyone you know reflects these patterns to greater or lesser degree, but that doesn't mean it has to be that way, that doesn't mean it's the best way, the right way, the appropriate way" and so on. And then there would be opportunities to explore "Well I could have said this" or "I could have done that", "Yes you could have" (laughs), "next time maybe you will". So, you know, that's...

AR: So you're really taking from where your teaching and academic interests and intellectual interests were, and trying to translate that into the clinical situation, the counseling situation.

SP: Exactly.

AR: Can you talk a little bit about the consciousness-raising groups you mentioned?

SP: Well, they were leaderless, because that's one of the principles of consciousness-raising groups, and so we weren't present.

AR: Oh...

SP: We were not present, because that wouldn't have been appropriate. So we provided the space, we provided the tea and coffee, and the scheduling, and anything else that they asked for. But then they ran them. People came who wanted to come and there was no monitoring of who was there... or that kind of thing.

AR: Yeah.

SP: So they were very traditional consciousness-raising groups.

AR: And were your clients, were they from just the York Community, or was the Psychological Services Department open to the wider community?

SP: They were, in the vast majority, affiliated with the York community, but if someone, somehow, found their way to us who was a member of the outside community, we tended to see them. Yes I certainly had people who were from outside York.

AR: Ok, what I'll ask you to do now is to have... kind of explain, how it was that you, coming from a very experimental training background, how did you, what events led to becoming a feminist psychologist? You mentioned some of these critiques that were being proposed and put forward in this period, and yet you came from this, you know, very quote/unquote "rigorous, traditional, experimental" psychology background and yet you find... we're hearing now about your work as a feminist counselor, and teaching alternative type courses. How did that evolve in your experience?

SP: Well, I think we have to go back to my family of origin. My mother was a feminist before anybody used that term. My grandmother was a feminist before anybody used that term, and I have had a lot of contact with both those two women, both very strong, determined, bright, competent women. My mother divorced my father when I was two years old, and I mean you just didn't do that at that time, I mean she was a source of disapprobation; she was a "bad" woman to have done that, but it was the right thing to do and she knew it was the right thing to do. And so, she essentially brought me up, she didn't remarry until I was 12, so we had a lot of time just the two of us. She was a wonderful role model, very supportive, tough because she had to be, but a very strong feminist, very determined, wouldn't let anyone tell her what to do because she usually knew what to do and she was usually right. So that was important to me and I can still remember, oh I was just young, maybe 5 or 6, "You always have to have your own money, Sandra. Always have your own bank account and don't tell anybody how much

you have... that's your business" and obviously a practice that she followed, (laughs), I assumed.

So anyway, I was a feminist too then in lots of ways, and I can remember being at the University of Saskatchewan playing basketball for the university team and being president of the women's athletic board. We were members of the student representative council, as was the president of the men's athletic board. I can remember being incensed at meetings at the difference in the budgets of the men's athletic board and the women's athletic board and arguing the case for equity. So there, you know, there was already a firm groundwork I suppose there before I ever came to Toronto. But, there was a significant event when I arrived here. When my husband and I moved to Toronto, he was still a graduate student at McGill having not yet completed his dissertation. Since Toronto was closer to Montreal than Saskatoon, he was thrilled to come here. We brought some furniture with us, but not a bedroom suite. So we went to, I think it was Simpson's to get a bedroom suite and we found one and so I wanted to buy it and I forget... I wanted to put it on a Simpson's credit card and I didn't have a Simpson's credit card, so I wanted to get one right then and charge this furniture to it.

So we went to the office that serves customers and they said "Oh fine, no problem, here are the forms, just fill these out" and I did. But at some point, somebody said "Well, your husband's name has to be on the card; it's his card so he has to sign" and I said "that doesn't make any sense, because he's unemployed, you don't want him taking responsibility". In the meantime, my husband is fading away because he doesn't want to play this game at all. So, at first I'm quite calm and reasonable and rational. You know, he's unemployed, I'm the one with the job, I can verify that I have a job, I'm the one with the salary.

Well, it didn't matter, that was irrelevant, I mean he could have been a homeless person and his name was going to go on this card. And then I got silly, I mean I got cross and silly and I did things like tell them that I was a Canadian citizen and they had no right to deny me this service, and then it went from bad to worse. "Not only am I a Canadian, but my parents and my grandparents were born in Canada, and I have been paying income tax for any number of years, and I have spent hundreds of dollars at Simpson's and I will never spend five more cents here, ever. And I will tell everyone I know not to shop here" and my voice is of course going up and this poor person behind the counter said "Can I get a supervisor?" "Why don't you? Please do!". So the supervisor came and I essentially said "Well I wouldn't touch this bedroom furniture, you know, I don't care what you do with it, but you're not sending it away with me" and the supervisor said "No, we'll put it in your name". So I won the day, but at some personal cost, and I thought, this is not right. This is not fair! I mean, yes I had the previous exposure to the difference in budgets and so on as a student at Saskatchewan, but I mean I was a student then, that wasn't quote "real life", you know. But this was real life and I was so struck by that, I've never forgotten it. I've told this story to all kinds of people, um, because it was very significant. It was, I guess, the point at which I became committed to pursuing this issue, not as a sideline, uh you know, a side interest, but as a main thrust for my personal and professional life.

AR: So it was really a turning point for you for a number of areas.

SP: Mhm, Yep, yep.

AR: And what effect did it have, in fact then as a psychologist, specifically as a scientist, as a psychological scientist?

SP: Well, before it had much of effect on my work as a psychological researcher it had an effect on extra curricular activities. We had a graduate student here, a feminist activist, who was very involved in an organization called the Toronto Women's Caucus. This was a grassroots feminist organization that met weekly downtown on Adelaide Street. And, I guess she had heard me blathering about inequities and said, "You might be interested in coming down to one of these meetings". So I went; I joined the Toronto Women's Caucus and even held office for a time. And this was a very leftist organization... I came from a very conservative background. So it was an interesting stretch, (laughs), for me. It was good, it was a good experience for me being exposed to this group and I promptly got other people involved. Mary Stewart was a faculty member here at the time and so I dragged Mary, (laughs), to several of these meetings. Frances Ricks was one of my graduate students here at the time, and I made Frances come too. And so, this extra-curricular activity was energizing and focusing. It exposed me to a myriad of issues that feminists might get involved in, including abortion. I mean, I can remember going to Ottawa as part of a march with the Toronto Women's Caucus and a number of other grassroots feminist organizations and we were protesting the government's stance on abortion; we wanted the government to decriminalize it. And I can remember one of the movers and shakers of the Toronto Women's Caucus coming up to me and saying "Oh Sandra, we've got a media person who wants to talk to a doctor" and I said "I'm not a... they want to talk to a medical doctor I think... I'm not that kind of a doctor!" "It doesn't matter" she said, well I couldn't see my way clear to misrepresent myself in that way, but it's interesting how willing people were to cut corners because it seemed... there had been so little support, so little attention paid to these important issues, like the abuse of the cosmetic companies, how they were making a killing off the skins and lips of women around the world. You know? I mean, there were just no lack of issues that this group addressed.

AR: Abortion was a big one?

SP: Abortion was a VERY big one. I can remember at Christmas-time, we had, this was a mass-action group, I mean that was what they did.

AR: That was the mandate. (inaudible)

SP: That was the mandate, that's right. And so, one Christmas-time we had an action which required protesting current legislation around abortion, all carrying candles, snow's coming down, it was very close to Christmas Eve. Can you think of a worse time to be out there arguing for abortion? I don't think so.

AR: It wasn't going to get a lot [of people] on board.

SP: I don't think so, no. But it was an interesting experience, because it introduced me to things like police escorts, the fact that the RCMP might have your name on a list of possible undesirables. I mean, that sort of thing went on at the time. We were rebels, radicals.

AR: Mhm, mhm. Well this was on the heels I assume, of the report of the Royal Commission on the Status of Women?

SP: 1970, yeah.

AR: Yeah. Do you have any... I mean, do you have any particular recollections about the impact of that report at the time? Or, what was your kind of awareness of that?

SP: It was huge for us! Just huge. I was just overwhelmed with admiration for Laura Sabia. I had the opportunity to meet her and to talk to her and that was very exciting. To know that there were those kinds of women in the world who were fearless – she was absolutely fearless – as well as being bright and articulate, she would take on anybody, anytime on any issue, that was sort of my sense. So it was just really energizing for all of the grassroots organizations that were concerned about women's issues and also for a number of women's groups that were in the mainstream. So "Voices of Women", you know there were a number of women, Teacher's Federation, I mean there were any number of women's groups that were part of the mainstream that I think benefited from that report. They had a budget and so they could collect and present data that... I mean, while our organization certainly would have the idea to do this piece of research, we didn't have the resources. So it was wonderful to have access to a database that substantiated what feminists had been claiming for years and years.

AR: Yeah, yeah. And as you were becoming more involved, politically and otherwise, with the feminist movement, with the women's movement, what, uh, were there any reactions on the part of your professional colleagues, or what was it like to be an out-feminist in psychology at York at the time?

SP: First of all, remember that I wasn't full-time in the Psychology Department. I was still cross-appointed to the Counseling and Development Center. Physically I was located on the first floor, not the second floor and those are not insignificant variables. Thirdly, I didn't teach a psychology course, I was seconded to the Division of Social Science and I taught a Social Science Course and was given free rein... I could do whatever I wanted with that course. The first year, Esther Greenglass and I co-taught it, but after that I can't remember if I co-taught it again with someone but for a number of years I taught it on my own.

AR: Is this the Women's Sex Roles in Society course?

SP: Yeah, Yeah. So I wasn't interfering in any way with what Psychology thought was right, good, (laughs), and I suppose if anyone took it for the team, it would be Esther! (laughs).

AR: (inaudible)

SP: Yeah! Well, she was more provocative. She has a style of coming out with the preposterous statement just as a way, well we'll start with the preposterous and maybe we'll work back to what should be. I usually started with what should be and then often had to fall back a little bit. So she was the lightning rod, I think, for most of the opposition. I think that I came through, not unscathed, but um, I think I had had... was the butt of less acrimony.

AR: Well I think it is important, as you mention that you were active in the Division of Social Sciences which must have been a different kind of atmosphere than here.

SP: Very different.

AR: How was it different, do you have a sense?

SP: Well, sociologists have always been light years ahead of psychologists in terms of a focus on feminist issues, always. Psychology, in my view, is a very conservative discipline, maybe deliberately so, because we've always had aspirations to be quotes "a real science" and god knows, chemistry and physics are pretty conservative disciplines. So I think Psychology has always been much more conservative than sociology, anthropology, political science, even history... even history I would say. So, in the Social Sciences, we had all of those disciplines represented and it was a freer more accepting atmosphere, they were just ahead of us.

AR: Switching gears a little bit now, but in, quite soon after you came to York, you and Neil Agnew did write your book "The Science Game" which is now in its sixth edition, working on the seventh I think?

SP: Working on the seventh, yeah.

AR: So can you tell us what was the genesis of that book? How did that book come about?

SP: Well if you ask Neil you will get one perspective...

AR: We want your perspective on this! (Laughs)

SP: ...and if you ask me you may get a very different one because it was his brain-child; it certainly wasn't mine. I took a methodology course from Neil as, I think a graduate student, yes, I must have been in the Master's program when I took that course from him... I think, maybe not, maybe I took two, might have taken two methodology courses,

one as a fourth year undergraduate and one as a Master's student. Anyway, I was a good student, I really liked the material and I did very well in his course, he really liked the assignments that I completed and so on. And then he was working with me in this research place and we had exposure to all sorts of methodologies, different topics were being investigated depending on what he could get funding for.

AR: Sort of a multi-disciplinary...?

SP: Oh well, we did a lot of things there, an awful lot of research.

AR: Where was this done?

SP: In Saskatoon. The Canadian Mental Health Association owned the building (at one time a private home), but the operational costs were entirely covered, I think, by Neil's grant-grubbing. And so there were a lot of people employed there at various times - people from commerce, people from engineering, I mean just a mixed bag, they weren't all psychologists by any means. We did a lot of things, different kinds of studies there. Anyway...

AR: What would have been an example just one that stands out, one of the research projects that you would have worked on in the Psychological Research Center?

SP: Ok, um, one of the studies had to do with peripheral versus central stimuli and what, when you watched the central stuff and when you paid attention to the peripheral stuff it was, I think we published something around the attention demand value of stimuli or something like that, that was one. One project that I worked on had to do with people remembering digits, so you would give them a set of digits, it was sort of a memory study, and then shock them - that was supposed to increase their drive level. So it involved looking at the effects of increased drive level on memory, on attention. At the same time we were measuring heart rate. So we had a physiological correlate of the assumed increase in drive level through the administration of shock. Let's see... Some of the other research was sort of parapsychological, (laughs).

AR: Interesting, interesting...

SP: ESP, telepathy... We got money from a very wealthy, gypsy-looking New York matron. Not we, Neil. And she was very interested in parapsychology and so we did twin studies, "Were twins better, or not as good as siblings who were not as good as unrelated people at telepathy". What we had was an array of slides, we'd have the sender in one room, the receiver in another room, and a piece of apparatus called ATSAM would randomly make one of these slides light up for the sender. So the sender is looking at the lit slide and trying to send that image to the receiver. The receiver has five slides in front of her or him, and they make a selection... they press a button underneath the slide they think they're receiving.

AR: Oh good, well it gives us a sense of the kind of research (inaudible)

SP: A lot of hypnosis stuff, too.

AR: Yeah, Yeah. So partly dependant on what you get money for.

SP: Yeah, we had someone from medicine who worked there who had a photographic memory and was into magic and he put on a big show at the university every year and hypnosis was a part of that. So we had him doing trials where people who were hypnotized were sending and receiving.

AR: So you had worked with Neil for a number of years.

SP: Yep.

AR: So when he decided he wanted to kind of tackle a book like “The Science Game” is that, did he kind of...

SP: He invited me to participate so I said “Sure, ok, I will”.

AR: And how did the collaboration work, partly I'm interested because I wonder what it's like to write a book with another person. How did that work?

SP: It actually worked reasonably well. We had some ground rules. We decided who was going to write which chapters. And so the primary author of a chapter was to write a draft, give it to the second author who would review it and give feedback. That would go back to the primary author and initially I think the primary author would edit and would let the second author have another kick at the can and then it would go back and that was the end of it. So you had two chances as the non-primary author to respond and I... Neil and I had a joke about some chapter that he wrote that had a naked canary in it and when it came back to me it still had the naked canary in it and I can't remember now if it survived my second edit. Anyways, it worked well even though we have very different writing styles. I don't think the end result was all that choppy or disjointed. I'm sure people who know the two of us can tell who wrote what, uh, but it's not jarring I don't think.

AR: And what was the original like, vision for the book, what did you want to accomplish? What was it intended to kind of... do?

SP: A lot of different things, some of them maybe we lost sight of along the way. Some of them we failed, but one of the goals was to write a methodology text that would be meaningful to both undergraduate and graduate students. And most books are written for graduate students, not undergraduates and we wanted something that would be useful for undergraduates. We also wanted something that would span disciplines, so we had an interdisciplinary focus, um, so we wanted people in admin studies, nursing, whatever, to look at this book and say “Oh there's something here for us, I can use this book in my course”. We also wanted to give Neil an opportunity to, how can I put this, to express his

own idiosyncratic take on science and I think the last chapter where he sort of gave free rein, I think it's called the Truth Spinners or something like that, and I think he gave free rein to his way of thinking about science. What other purposes were there? I think we wanted to get away from the narrowness of the traditional methodology of psychology, it always had to be quantitative and heavily statistical and we wanted to expose people to other ways of doing and thinking about research... maybe ways that have less internal validity but perhaps more external validity but that's something that at the time we started this project, nobody was doing that.

AR: I mean I have to admit, even looking at it now, what thirty or more years after it was first written, I think that the ideas are still fairly foreign to a lot of people, perhaps not, I don't know. What's your perspective on that? Did the book succeed in at least lets say among psychologists in widening their perspectives on possible methodologies for psychology?

SP: I don't know that I can answer that in a sort of general way, I would hesitate to generalize, but I do know that there were people in our department who used it in their courses who really liked it. Richard Goranson, for example, used it all the time, quite liked it. Dave Rennie, used it, and liked it. So there were people in the department certainly and we had adoptions all over the United States. We certainly didn't get rich on the royalties, I can tell you that. But, nevertheless, clearly Prentice-Hall was making money on it or they wouldn't have supported six editions of the book. It was a very popular book.

AR: Yeah, yeah. Yeah, I mean I think it has a lot to say for psychologists today too, I mean (inaudible), I would hope that some people would pick it up and read it again.

SP: And again and again!

AR: Ok, there's some things I want to make sure we cover, so I'm going to jump around a little bit now. You have been a very active member of the Canadian Psychological Association, so I want you to tell us a little bit about your involvement with CPA. First how did you get started as a member of CPA, what was your initial involvement with CPA?

SP: I was introduced to CPA as a graduate student, and I was very excited that there was such an entity in Canada, but I didn't play any particularly big role. I did present. I remember presenting my dissertation research at CPA. But as I came to be active in the feminist arena, and doing work on issues there, some of us began to make submissions of that feminist work. Esther Greenglass being one of them, my graduate student Frances Ricks another, Mary Stewart, another. And, for a couple of years, our individual submissions weren't accepted, and so then we decided "Ah, we're so political. We will suggest a symposium, and we'll bring together all these disparate papers into one entity." And being super-political we will get the [then-president] of CPA [whom I knew personally] Virginia Douglas, who was a faculty member at McGill, and was there when I was a student at McGill, I got along very well with Ginny. Anyway, "we'll get her to

be our discussant”, she agreed! Ok, so now we have the establishment on board, we have the president. They still turned us down! They said “No, the program committee rejected this”. Well, there were some very cross hens – I was going to say cross roosters, but it was hens in this case – and so we thought “Well, we’ll put it on anyway” and that’s where the idea for the underground symposium occurred. And I’ve written about that so you’re probably familiar with that.

AR: Esther spoke a little bit about that the other day too.

SP: Yeah. That was a lot of fun. Yeah, we got support from the Psychology Department, some of our male colleagues were out there handing out flyers in...

AR: Oh really? Do you remember who?

SP: Paul Kohn, I remember, Neil Agnew... oh there were more than that though. Um, Jim Ricks, Frances Ricks’ husband handed out flyers. Um, oh I can’t, I’m sure there were a lot more than that.

AR: And what was the effect then of the underground symposium? What impact did that have on the CPA?

SP: What impact... it certainly caught their attention! There were more people at that Underground Symposium than at any other CPA session that year, I’m almost positive. It got more press coverage than any other event at CPA that year! It was a biggie, I mean there was standing room only, there were hundreds of people in the room. It was such fun!

AR: Yeah, well how did CPA respond?

SP: Well, they were... David Belanger was Chair of the Program Committee, David was not amused, however, he got over it. But at the time, his nose was a bit out of joint, I think it’s fair to say. He may not agree with that...

AR: Did you ever find out why the program had not been accepted?

SP: Well the reason they gave why our individual submissions were unacceptable was that they could not figure out where to put them. Why the symposium was unaccepted was maybe that, I can’t remember so I’m speculating, I can’t remember if there ever was an answer. You know, they don’t have to give you a rationale, and probably they didn’t. But, sort of if I were a fly on the wall, listening to the Program Committee, they might have been saying things like “Well this isn’t going to attract anybody, I mean we can’t give up two hours of program time for an event that’s going to draw five people”, I mean maybe they thought that way.

AR: So this kind of research was not of interest...

SP: That's right, "this research will not be of interest to anybody", they might well have thought that, now mistaken judgment, but then these are conservative old boys and that could well have been their perception, but again, I don't know that's total speculation.

AR: So, that became clear that that wasn't the case, that people were interested, and when was the Section on Women and Psychology of CPA started?

SP: After the establishment of the CPA Task Force on the Status of Women.

AR: And what was the sort of...

SP: But first, I don't know if Esther Greenglass told you this, but Esther was invited the very next year, if memory serves me correctly to give one of the invited addresses at CPA. The very next year! I think that's right, you know she would probably be able to confirm that, but if it wasn't the next year it was the year after that, it was very soon, uh after. So we caught their attention all right.

AR: And you then became president, well you eventually became president in 1981-82 so a few years later now.

SP: But before that, I was on the Task Force, and then one of the recommendations was to set up a section on women in psychology and I was the first coordinator of the section of women in psychology.

AR: And what was the rationale for having a Task Force for the Status of Women in Psychology?

SP: That was Mary Wright's initiative. 1975 was International Women's Year and organizations all over the world were doing things, special things in recognition of International Women's Year, and Mary suggested to CPA that setting up a Task Force to examine the status of women in Canadian psychology would be a good initiative in recognition of International Women's Year and the Board of Directors bought that. They gave the Task Force NO money, but then in fairness, they don't often. Rarely do they do that. But our Chair, Barbara Wand was successful in getting funding from the government for the Task Force. So she put together this Task Force. I got invited to join the Task Force because I had been a presenter of feminist psychology issues at a recent Ontario Psychological Association Convention and also at CPA.

AR: And what was the mandate of the Task Force? Obviously to investigate the status of women in Canadian Psychology, but how did you do that?

SP: Well, different members of the Task Force took on different portfolios. Olga Favreau, for example, focused on research. Somebody else, Eleanor Burwell, took on education. I took on sort of the more general, you know, academic psychology, like numbers of faculty, salary differentials, conditions of work, I suppose, for women and men psychologists. And someone else took on clinical, several people were involved in

the clinical side. We prepared draft papers and generated recommendations, and then shared those among ourselves. Did some editing and produced the report with over 100 recommendations covering those four broad areas.

AR: And then, what was your impression in terms of how many of those recommendations or what impact those recommendations had?

SP: They were pretty good actually! For example, I was elected to the board of Directors in 1977 and we made our report in '76. I guess we called...

AR: Was one of the observations that not enough women were represented on the board?

SP: Oh for sure! And so I came on the board and so did Elinor Ames from Simon Fraser. Elinor had never been involved in any, she wasn't involved in any of these feminist activities. She wasn't a member of the Task Force; she wasn't known as a feminist psychologist. She was a developmental psychologist who did innovative work in the area of developmental psychology, but it wasn't feminist. It was excellent work, but it wasn't feminist. Anyway, guess who got asked to chair the status of women committee? Elinor! Not Sandra! I would have been the logical person to Chair the committee! But no, they didn't ask me, well that was fine, I didn't care, I mean I chaired the convention committee instead and that was fun. But Elinor was on pins and needles knowing that she had no credentials. Here she was confronting this group of, mostly of strident Ontario radicals – we weren't really, but she didn't know that. One person who had been on Coordinating Committee (the predecessor of the Status of Women Committee) promptly resigned over this issue. So here you are coming in and one of the committee resigns because you're not seen as an appropriate Chair, I mean not a good place to start. Elinor was superb, she was magnificent, she just had us all in the palm of her hand. No, she was really good and she did a wonderful job for the committee, a wonderful job for CPA and for women generally. She had all, each one of those recommendations on an index card and then she'd have little notes about what was happening with every one of these recommendations, I mean she really had her eye, well, her fingers on the pulse and knew what was going on, and monitored everything very closely and organized people to do research and collect data. Oh she was wonderful. So, CPA was very responsive, but this can be credited primarily to Elinor.

AR: Well let me get a broader perspective from you on CPA as an organization as somebody who has been involved in it for over thirty years. What have you seen as the major changes in CPA over the past 3 decades or major events or developments in the organization?

SP: Well I think one of the developments is it's less of an old boys' network than it used to be. I mean, it used to be, from the early days with Donald Hebb, it used to be totally experimental psychologists, very few clinicians involved and that certainly is not the case now. (To the contrary, some of the neuro-psychologists and neuro-scientists have pulled out and formed BBCS, their own group) So that's been a big change. Another change is of course the size, I mean it's grown enormously. The representation of women has

changed dramatically, we're at least 50% of the members now... at least that. The organization has responded to vested interest groups in the sense that people wanted an opportunity to meet with and talk to people who were researching topics related to their own. And so we've had this section development so now we have over 25 sections focusing on specific areas of interest. Attention to student members has increased enormously from what it was years ago. Students are seen as a much more important component of the organization than they used to be...

AR: This question comes out of my ignorance actually, does CPA perform a lobbying function?

SP: Oh indeed, yeah. Um, a lot of contact with SSHRC and NSERC and now CIHR, used to be MRC, but now CIHR. They uh, one of the things that annoys me somewhat is when people say "Oh well, no, I'm not going to join CPA because I'm a member of APA and APA gives me everything I need", well that's not the case. It isn't APA who is up lobbying SSHRC and NSERC and now CIHR and the government generally to increase grants to universities, like we even get involved in lobbies of the Ontario government asking them to increase the transfer payment to universities. It isn't APA that's doing that, none of that. And uh, CPA is a member of a number of consortia, so that when those consortium groups go to lobby, they're representing a very large constituency and politicians are sensitive to that. So yes, that's a big part of what John Service, for example, does.

AR: Yeah. Well, let me take you back to the York context now because, you've also played a variety of administrative roles in this university, so you obviously have a number of vantage points on it. You've been Dean of Graduate Studies, you've been chair of this department, among many other positions that you have held. Can you speak a bit about the period you spent as Dean of Graduate Studies and, um the perspective you gained at that level of administration at the running of the university and so on?
(inaudible)

SP: Graduate Education, not just at York, but generally, is in a somewhat peculiar position, vis à vis other Faculties. The Faculty of Graduate Studies at virtually all universities in Canada is a Faculty that operates with responsibilities but without the resources to effectively implement responsibilities. So they're charged with the responsibility of ensuring quality of graduate education, I mean that's the main reason for having a Faculty of Graduate Studies and yet the Faculty itself has really no budget to make that happen. So one of the shocks in becoming Dean of the Faculty, in spite of talking to previous Deans and so on, was how hamstrung the Dean is by virtue of not having any leverage. None of the faculty who are appointed to the Faculty of Graduate Studies owe their allegiance to the Faculty of Graduate Studies. Their allegiance is to the Faculty of Arts or Atkinson or the Faculty of Pure and Applied Science, or whatever, not to the Faculty of Graduate Studies. So when you want to lead the troops into battle, you look behind you and there's nobody there, (laughs). So it's an interesting administrative position in all universities because of that characteristic.

AR: And what are some of the particular issues that you dealt with as Dean?

SP: The budget issue, (laughs), was certainly a big one. And there was a lot of, uh, well let me say that no resource is small enough to escape the eye and covetousness of other Deans. So no matter how small the resource pie was in the Faculty of Graduate Studies, other Deans would have their eyes on it. So resource issues were a major concern. A second major concern during my tenure as Dean, and it was also true for the preceding Dean, was determining the criteria for when people should be appointed to the faculty. What credentials should you have as a faculty member in order to be given the right to supervise graduate students to teach graduate courses, I mean was it essential that you have a certain publication record? Did it have to be in peer-reviewed journals? Did they have to be first-tier journals? Did you have to be sole author of a certain number of... I mean, the number of issues around that were legion - and there were many people in the university who felt very well qualified to teach and to supervise who didn't have a strong publication record for example. And so whenever the Faculty of Graduate Studies tried to tighten up, and sort of say "Well you can't be a good supervisor or teacher in a graduate course if you're not a publisher because that suggests you're not on top of the literature, you're not familiar with current ways of getting your work published, what the hit parade issues are, what the new methodologies are, blah blah blah". So my predecessor made that a cause-célèbre and there was a lot of fallout from that at the time that I took over. So that was another major issue in my tenure.

AR: So what was your position on that? What did you want to see happen, if you're willing to state that?

SP: I think I was not a purist, I think I could see both sides of the argument, but I knew that there were people who had fantastic publication records who were appalling supervisors, absolutely appalling. Didn't know the first thing, or at least, if they knew they weren't putting it into practice, the first thing about mentoring. Also, some were appalling teachers. Then there were others who did not have a recent robust publication record who seemed to move heaven and hell to help their graduate students and worked very hard trying to keep their graduate students interested in the subject matter of the course they were teaching and so on. I mean, each of us can probably point to individuals who fit those two things and so it was very hard, I thought, to maintain an argument that said "anybody who hasn't published in these journals, in this amount over this time frame shouldn't be part of the Faculty of Graduate Studies", I just, I found that difficult, but that was the role I was supposed to play. That was clearly the expectation for the Dean, because the Dean is supposed to be the bearer of high standards, raise the bar as much as you can.

AR: Well, let me ask now, again shifting gears, you've also been heavily involved in the Women's Studies program here, could you talk a bit about that program?

SP: Yep, one of my goals as Dean was to engineer the implementation of a graduate program in Women's Studies, if I did nothing else, I would be happy if I could make that happen. So, very soon, we got going on the development of a plan for a graduate program

in Women's Studies and a fair amount of time through my tenure as Dean was focused on the development of that 'cause putting a new graduate program into place is very slow moving and time consuming, but we eventually got it and we admitted the first cohort of students in January, 1992. June 1992 was the end of my tenure as Dean.

AR: How did York compare to other universities in terms of having a Women's Studies program or not and when?

SP: There was only one other graduate program in Women's Studies at the time and that was at Simon Fraser university, and interestingly enough, a psychologist, Meredith Kimball was very active in that program and chaired the department for a number of years. But that was a Master's only program and we wanted to offer both a masters and a Ph.D. program at York so we introduced them both at once so we were the first graduate program in Canada to have a doctoral degree in Women's Studies. That's no longer true, UBC has one for example. But we were the first, and obviously the longest standing.

AR: What's interesting is, it's almost like from the very early days of your feminist activism in the early 1970s it took about 20 years off the influence of that in academia to result in undergraduate and graduate programs in the area.

SP: In the graduate program yes, but bear in mind that very early on there were undergraduate programs at York, three in fact: one at Glendon, one in Atkinson and one in Arts. And in addition at York, we had the position of Advisor to the President on the Status of Women which was not an office that existed at every university. We also had a Sexual Harassment Education and Complaint Center which didn't exist at every university, in fact we were pioneers in that area and our policies were used as guidelines for other universities setting up comparable bodies. So there was a lot going on at York, which I think made it possible to introduce a graduate program in Women's Studies. In addition, there were many, many feminist scholars at York. I think we had a concentration here that was probably unparalleled in Canada.

AR: And do you have a sense of what made York attractive to, or allowed that kind of approach to flourish, do you have any sense of that?

SP: Well, York was a new university which started in 1960 and did huge hires in the '60s. I think one year Psychology hired about fifteen people! So just that rapid growth and when you're looking for huge numbers of faculty, you can't restrict yourself to the preferred gender. Ok? I mean, you have to go to those other folks, (laughs), so a lot of women were hired. York had, also, the interdisciplinary ethos which was attractive to many women faculty members. The structure of having a Division of Social Science and a Division of Humanities I think brought people in who might otherwise have gone elsewhere. So I think, you know, there was a timeliness, I mean feminism was in the air in the '60s. You know?

AR: Yes, yes, what role did psychology play in the women's studies program?

SP: What role did psychology play? Modest... a very modest role. Right now, we have as members of the program, faculty affiliated with the program, myself, Esther Greenglass, and Erin Ross. So only three psychology faculty from a compliment of over 75, Atkinson, Glendon and... here (Arts).

AR: Are psychology courses on the roster as courses that can be taken?

SP: Esther Greenglass taught the gender course and it certainly was part of the curriculum, but she hasn't taught that for some time. So there isn't a graduate course taught by or with psychology content, that's on the curriculum, there wasn't last year, and there isn't going to be next year and there wasn't the year before that.

AR: (inaudible)

SP: Well, I'm back to psychology being a very conservative discipline. Plus it seems that we have yet to make a hire in the last, well I guess, since Esther was hired, whenever that was, I think she was the last person who was hired who really has a feminist orientation. We have tried to hire, we have had people who were short listed who certainly would have offered courses and been involved in the women's studies program, I'm thinking of June Larkin for example. But, this department didn't ever support them and sometimes we've hired somebody who had a bit of a background in the area of feminist work or work related to the psychology of women and they stopped doing that when they got here. So some of us were hopeful that that person would carry the banner, but they haven't.

AR: Ok, I want to switch now, I'm being conscious a bit of time, because we've been a bit...

SP: My answers are too long, I talk too much!

AR: No, they're not, there is just so much to ask you about. You have recently served as Chair of the department, and I might ask you some similar questions about what have been some of the, what were some of the major challenges as Chair of the department, if you feel at liberty to speak about them. Highlights? Lowlights? (laughs).

SP: One of the highlights was an effort to amalgamate the Arts department of Psychology with the Atkinson department of Psychology. That was an agenda of mine, and if not make it seamless, at least make the programs the same so that it would be seamless for the students. You know? I mean it was horrendous for students, undergraduate students who wanted to take part of their program through Arts, excuse me, and wanted to do summer courses or evening courses through Atkinson. All the different regulations, pre-requisites and other requirements made it difficult for students. Absolutely ridiculous that we would make things so problematic for students, I'm very impatient with that, very impatient with it. I will not brook any argument that anybody puts forward to substantiate it because I just don't buy it, haha, I'm very negative about this creation of individual empires. Anyways, that was one issue and we did make some progress before I stopped

being chair, but it was slow and difficult. Other things that I tried to do were mainly trying to improve the overall ambiance in the department. For example, I developed the computer lab downstairs. I was able to get more space and set up a resource center as well as the computer lab, and that was kind of nice, because we had a big naming ceremony and the Dean came over and you know, that was fun. So that was good, another thing that I tried to do was to create an openness within the department as to teaching loads and how teaching loads were determined and I tried to introduce the concept of a running record so that if one taught more than quotes "their load" their normal load in any given year, that that would be remembered and then the next year they would get a reduction and uhm, so...

AR: And that system hadn't been in place then?

SP: Well there had been a kind of, what do you call it? Common knowledge sort of system, conventional wisdom sort of system. But different people had different ideas about the particulars, so "Oh don't I get credit if I'm teaching a course of 500, well we always did before" or "if I take on coordinating the early childhood education program then I should get a full course release for doing that, what do you mean I don't get a full course release for doing that? I mean people had expectations and beliefs for sure, about how everything worked, but those expectations and beliefs were not always in sync. I wouldn't say idiosyncratic, but certainly not uniform and so we tried to develop a system that was public, that people could discuss, they could argue about, they could vote on, and that was a big job. I was constantly fighting with the Dean for more resources, so that was ongoing, particularly appointments. There was a constant pressure to hire more people and then to get the best possible package for each person who was hired without destabilizing the salary, so it's a balancing act.

AR: For you personally, what have been the biggest challenges, working at York?

SP: Hmm. The biggest challenges... I'm caught around interpreting challenge as what I liked and what I didn't like. I was Chair of the Counseling and Development Center before I did any other administration; I didn't enjoy that. There were many reasons that I didn't like it, one is I didn't have a good working relationship with the person who was next in command. So he and I had great difficulty seeing eye to eye on issues, so I didn't like that one, and didn't persist, but I got a great person to replace me who was just wonderful, I knew he'd be wonderful. My replacement was Harold Minden and he did a great job.

AR: You know what, at some point, I meant to ask you this before, some point, I know, I think I know, there was a great schism between the CDC and the Psychology Department such that as the collaboration between the two disintegrated?

SP: Disappeared, yeah.

AR: Can you tell us quickly how that happened?

SP: I'm not sure that I know how it happened, but I think it's not unrelated to budget. I think at some point, the Chair of the Counseling and Development Center realized that for the same or almost same amount of money, you could get somebody full time as a counselor as what you would pay for someone half time who was cross-appointed to Psychology. You could hire, a social worker, for example, to do clinical work 5 days a week, 9-5 for the same money as you get someone who has a tenure track appointment in Psychology. So that was one of the issues, it was budget related and the increased demand for service. So as Chair of the unit, you're sort of worried about "how can I provide quality service to all of these people who are needful of the service and still maintain the cross-appointment model that Neil Agnew originally developed?" So gradually, that model disappeared and when it started to be eroded, CDC people started to rethink whether they wanted to maintain the CDC portion of their appointment. So for example, I think Harvey Mandel made up his mind after he was chair of CDC that he wanted to come full time Psychology, so did Igor Kusyszyn and at the time that I became Dean, I had still an appointment in the Counseling and Development Center, but after being Dean, I knew that I didn't want to go back to CDC so I became full time Psychology.

AR: So it was a gradual then, kind of (inaudible)

SP: Mhm.

AR: Ok, so I disrupted you from your challenges... do you need to change?

Technician: Yes, to change tape.

PAUSE

AR: Ok, sorry. I'm going to switch now to asking you a bit about teaching and mentoring. Having been here for the past, I'm sure you don't need me to remind you, having been here for over 30 years!

SP: Forever, having been here forever!

AR: You've been teaching for over thirty years, and mentored graduates and many graduate students over the years, have you noticed, what is your impression of changes in, have there been changes in the kinds of students you've taught, or in your approach to mentoring the students?

Tape cuts off

SP: ... to finish off one thing about the challenges.

AR: Ok, sure.

SP: Of all the administrative positions, of all of them that I've held - and I've held more than the ones we've talked about - the one I liked the very best was chairing psychology.

AR: Really.

SP: I really enjoyed that.

AR: Ok, why?

SP: Well, I know enough about other Psychology departments in Canada and I know enough about other academic departments at York to know that this is the best department.

AR: Best in what way?

SP: It's the best in terms of representation of content areas, although under-represented in Psychology of women, but that aside it's got a good representation of various content areas, I think the best is teaching here as compared with almost all other departments, I think it's the most prestigious department in terms of the quality of the faculty. I think it's the most congenial department in terms of how well people get along with each other and respect each other. I mean, everybody isn't bosom buddy, that's for sure, there are some people who really don't like each other, but that aside, they treat each other respectfully and can work together. Furthermore, I like it because there was still room to do things, so an administrator still had an opportunity to be a bit creative. There was support for the Chair in the department. If the Chair said, you know, "can everybody please come out to the next council meeting because we need your vote to put sociology in it's place" (laughs), or whatever, people would come and they would speak up and they would vote. If I asked people if they would take on a job, not every time, but in the vast majority of cases, people would say yes. Everyone was so cooperative and helpful, it was a really good experience, I just loved being a part of the department and being involved in the administration of it.

AR: What do you see as some of the future challenges, things, issues that are really going to be on the horizon for the department?

SP: For the department?

AR: Yeah.

SP: I think we're getting complacent, and I think we need some shaking up and I think joining the new Health Faculty might do that. It might reenergize, I think we're in a rut.

AR: A rut in terms of?

SP: Well, nothing different is happening now, (laughs).

AR: In terms of research, teaching, programs?

SP: Everything, yeah, we do things the same way. You know, I mean the undergraduate office runs the way it ran 20 years ago and you know, so I think we need a major shake up and I think there is an opportunity with the Health Faculty to do that. So it will get everybody reenergized and thinking again about well “where do I fit in, in all of this?” and “how do I fit in?” and “what can I teach that’s appropriate?” and you know? That’ll be all to the good. I think every so often everybody needs a shark in the bathtub. (Laughs).

AR: Ok, well let’s finish off by having you speak a little bit now about some of your recent research actually. You’ve done some work...

SP: Well, you were asking about students before, now you’re moving...

AR: Well I was, now I’m trying to tie it back. I’m going to tie it back.

SP: Ok, ok.

AR: Because you’ve done some work on the chilly climate which has had to do with the experience of students, women students in higher education. Specifically postsecondary education and you’ve also been someone who has of course been a mentor of many women graduate students. So you’ve done this work on the chilly climate and how, basically, well would you summarize your findings from that work and then I’ll ask you another question?

SP: Ok, I think the principle finding that came out of that body of research, was that while women might and do complete their degrees in roughly the same time as men, and while women do not drop out of graduate programs at higher rates than men, they nevertheless are significantly more dissatisfied with the quality of their educational experience. So the environment in which they’re working is a much more benign environment if you’re a male than it is if you’re a female. If you’re a male, you get better quality supervision, your supervisor sees you more frequently, invites you to participate on papers and so on, to a greater extent than is the experience of at least my sample of women graduate students. So there are real differences in supervisory experience and just in general, women are operating in an environment that was designed by men, for men to fit their needs and their lifestyle and is not a good fit necessarily for women’s needs and women’s lifestyle.

AR: And how have you tried to mitigate that in your own mentoring relationships with women in Graduate School here at York?

SP: I've tried to be accessible, and so when people need to see me, they can usually see me without a very long delay. I've also tried to be someone who gives prompt feedback, so if someone gives me something to read, I try to read it quickly and give them feedback. I've also been someone who tries to give full feedback not just "well this reads fine" which is sometimes the case for some of my colleagues. So in those ways, I've tried to be a good mentor, or good supervisor, I've also tried to be supportive to students, not just on academic issues, but on personal issues as well, so if someone is experiencing personal difficulties, I haven't ignored that, I haven't tried to extinguish discussion of personal things. I've also tried to support my students, to be on their side. If I'm the principal supervisor, part of my role as I interpret it is to be on the side of my student and so that may mean taking on the external examiner, it may mean taking on other members of the supervisory committee and saying "well I think you're asking too much" or "we made that proposal two months ago, and you didn't like it then, but now you do?" you know, I mean that's never happened. I've never actually said that to anybody, but that would be an example. I certainly have had experiences where I have supported the student in the face of external examiners being precious or other members of the committee deciding they had new insights to offer, late in the day, (laughs).

AR: Right, right. So how do you connect up, I mean this work that you've done and your own experience being a graduate supervisor, how do you connect up the fact that we have more and more women in positions where they can mentor other women and yet the chilly climate seems to somehow remain. Is there an explanation for that?

SP: Well, we still don't have the kind of situation where any woman graduate student who wants to be supervised by a woman can be, that's not the case. So maybe until that is the case, we're going to run into examples of the chilly climate. The worst expression of chilly climate is sexual harassment and it's usually men faculty that are responsible for that. So as long as there are men faculty in the (inaudible) there's some risk for a graduate student experiencing some form of harassment.

AR: Ok, and so, one of my questions from before was, have you noticed changes in the kinds of students at York overall and/or their research interests, have they shifted or changed over the years?

SP: Sure, uh, one of the shifts has been a methodological shift. Many of the graduate students who I supervise now are into qualitative research methods and a grounded theory analysis is quite popular or discourse analysis. I mean, that wasn't the case years back, although, even then, some of my students did do interviews, but mostly questionnaires, surveys and things like that. Not the in-depth kind of interviews with a

grounded theory analysis that's much more common among my students now.

AR: Is there anything I haven't asked you about, in terms of your career at York that you think would be important in establishing a history of this department and your students in general?

SP: Well, you haven't asked me specifically, but I would have to say that I have been the beneficiary of extraordinarily good mentoring. I think that was something that was extremely helpful to me in my own career development that I had exposure to people who were interested in my career and who gave me support and feedback that was very helpful. Donald Hebb would be one of those, Neil Agnew would be another and I'm not mentioning my thesis supervisor you'll notice, (Laughs).

AR: Right, right.

SP: Who was not helpful, (laughs).

AR: No, you got through fast but not...

SP: I got through fast, and in that sense he was good.

AR: And in terms of the good mentoring that you've had, the supportive mentoring, can you think of any specific examples of the kinds of things that for you indicated that this was a good mentoring relationship?

SP: People treating me with respect, people treating me as if I really wasn't an idiot, I mean I knew I was an idiot, but here were people that I respected and they were treating me with respect, which was reassuring. It helped to deal with the imposter syndrome. So I think that's important, and also, people who listened. They listened carefully and understood what I was talking about. People who gave latitude who gave free rein who they didn't say "why on earth would you do that? That's not going to work, that's not a good idea", instead, "well, sure if this is something you want to pursue, you go ahead and pursue that". So those were the kinds of things, some of the things anyways, that I remember that I think worked well for me that I appreciated.

AR: Anything else that we haven't kind of talked about?

SP: Oh gosh, I think you've milked me dry, (laughs).

AR: Ok, well, let's stop there.