

## **A Social History of Female Faculty in Psychology at UC Berkeley (1888-2021)**

Rhona S. Weinstein, Ozlem Ayduk, and Sheri L. Johnson  
University of California, Berkeley

Correspondence concerning this essay can be addressed to Rhona Weinstein, Department of Psychology, 2121 Berkeley Way, UC Berkeley, CA 94704; email can be forwarded to rhona\_weinstein@berkeley.edu.

October 3, 2020 marked the 150th anniversary of the University of California Regents' unanimous approval of a resolution in 1870 by Regent Samuel F. Butterworth: "That young ladies be admitted into the University on equal terms in all respects with young men." The first women were admitted as students to Berkeley in 1872, four years after the university's opening in 1868. In celebration of *150 Years of Women at Berkeley*, a website was created to showcase essays, interviews, and talks from across the campus, demonstrating the breadth and depth of women's contributions to Berkeley, their fields, and to the larger world.

The Psychology Department at Berkeley joined this campus tribute to women with a three-part series. **Part I** (Weinstein, 2020) highlighted 10 trailblazing women from psychology who attained notable "firsts." **Part II** (Weinstein, Ayduk, & Johnson, 2020) celebrated our female Ph.D. graduates in psychology (as of 2019 numbering approximately 650 women, 47% of the doctorates awarded) and captured the diverse and exceptional careers of a sample of 10 of our alumnae. Accompanying these essays, two symposia were held to honor this history. The Psychology Department hosted two Ph.D. alumnae, Laura Helmuth, Editor-in-Chief, *Scientific American*, and Sybil Madison, Deputy Mayor for Health and Human Services in Chicago, in a virtual colloquium to share their careers as changemakers on the frontlines (Helmuth & Madison, 2021). In addition, the Women's Faculty Club featured an online session about the lives of two pioneers who fought for gender equity at Berkeley, Professors Susan Ervin-Tripp of Psychology and Elizabeth Scott of Statistics (Golbeck & Weinstein, 2021).

This essay, **Part III** of the series, (here revised), examines the social history of the female faculty in psychology at Berkeley—exploring who they were, how they fared, and what they contributed during four different eras. Our primary focus is on the women who became tenure-track faculty in the professor series. These women were hired for their research, shaped the direction of the department through their votes on hiring and tenure, and were granted membership in the Academic Senate, the university governing body. Senate faculty positions also enabled greater job security through tenure, salary, and benefits. Nonetheless, as we will cover below, during the period from 1924 through 1971, no *new* female tenure-track faculty joined the department. Accordingly, we also discuss some of the incredibly productive women who were appointed without these senate faculty privileges—in roles as lecturers or instructors in the department and as researchers in institutes—during this long period. It should be noted that women's history in our department has been largely one of white female scholars until fairly recently. As examples, the first Black female (Diane Howell) awarded a Ph.D. in psychology was in 1978 and our first woman of color faculty appointment (Serena Chen) occurred in 2000, the latter almost 80 years after the department was formally created.

In this essay, our emphasis is fueled by the early underrepresentation of woman faculty, until recent times. We frame their story around major turning points and contextual factors—examining women's accomplishments, obstacles faced, and policies in place. Given the broad span of years and that less is known about the periods in which women faculty were at their lowest levels, we focus in greater depth on the earlier years.

In four sections, we cover (1) the first-generation women faculty, (2) the 47 dry years of no *new* female faculty hires, yet with women psychologists in the shadows, (3) the academic pioneers of the 1970's, and (4) the late 20th and early 21st century women faculty. This essay is just a beginning. More work is needed to fully capture the intellectual contributions of these women, the earliest trailblazers and the remarkable female faculty hired once affirmative action was put in place, and beyond.

It is well known that women have been largely omitted from the history of psychology, as was also common in so many fields. Vigorous efforts have been made to retrieve their untold lives and to chart their role in shaping psychological science and its discoveries (e.g., O'Connell & Russo, 1990, Scarborough & Furumoto, 1987). We stand on the shoulders of those who came before us. By excavating women's history within their time periods and institutional contexts, we can see how far we have come. Through this work, we hope to stimulate dialogue about an unfinished agenda—despite advances made—that would promote greater equity and a more powerful voice for women in shaping the university as well as our discipline.

## **THE FIRST GENERATION OF FEMALE FACULTY IN PSYCHOLOGY**

Psychology at Berkeley had its roots in the late 19th century, first within a

Psychology Club and later, primarily within the Philosophy Department. Edward Rowland Sill, an early chairman of the Department of English (at Berkeley from 1874-1882) encouraged the formation of this Psychology Club. It was held in his home and included four Berkeley undergraduates (Josiah Royce, Edmund Sanford, Milicent Shinn, and George Stratton)—three of whom, the men, later became presidents of the American Psychological Association within its first 20 years (Mayer, 1972).

**Milicent Washburn Shinn** became Berkeley's first female Ph.D. (**1898**), based on a dissertation entitled "Notes on the Development of a Child" and earned in the Department of Pedagogy, the precursor to the Graduate School of Education. Although Shinn's career was brief due to family obligations, her dissertation (based on empirical observations of her niece and later published as a book), became recognized as a classic in the field of child development and led to her listing in *American Men of Science*, 1906, as among the first-generation American women psychologists (Scarborough & Furumoto, 1987).

The first course on psychology ("Propaedeutic to Philosophy," covering empirical psychology and formal logic), was taught in **1888** by philosopher George Howison and Berkeley's Psychological Laboratory, with George Malcolm Stratton as its director, was established in **1896**—both within the Philosophy Department (Groll, 1961). The first four doctorates in the emerging field of psychology were awarded to women.



**In 1915, Olga Louise Bridgman** (1886-1974) became the first female faculty member in psychology, housed within the Philosophy Department. In that year (1915), she had also earned psychology's first Ph.D. under the direction of Howison's former student, George Malcolm Stratton. With an M.D. from the University of Michigan and her Berkeley doctorate, Bridgman was immediately appointed as an instructor in abnormal psychology and pediatrics, dividing her time between the UC Medical School in San Francisco (where she started a psychiatric clinic) and the Berkeley campus. Ultimately appointed to the professor series, she rose through the faculty ranks, achieved tenure, and after four decades of service, became Professor Emerita in 1956.

Bridgman (by then an associate professor) was one of four faculty, along with George Malcolm Stratton [appointed Chair], Warner Brown, and Edward Chace Tolman, to establish an independent Department of Psychology at Berkeley in **1922**. This ended a 34-year embryonic period which Jean Walker Macfarlane noted in her history essay (Macfarlane, 1968), was accomplished only after "severe labor pains." As she noted "The rats that he (Tolman) used in his experiments in learning saturated the wall-to-wall carpets of the dignified old Philosophy Department with such smells that parturition clearly was imminent." Psychology was leaving its roots

in philosophy behind.

Alongside research contributions to mental deficiency and child psychiatry— informed by clinical cases and the scientific method—Professor Bridgman’s achievements were among the earliest examples of clinical psychology in an American university, importantly, providing students simultaneous exposure to academic work and clinical experience. Bridgman was also known as a gifted teacher, as a consultant to clinics, well-baby centers, and juvenile courts, and as a member of numerous state and national boards, including the Orthopsychiatric Association (see the Bridgman In-Memoriam statement written by Tuddenham, Macfarlane, & Simon, 1977).

By the time Bridgman had joined the faculty in 1915, California had become the sixth state in which women could vote equally with men, nine years before the 19th Amendment was passed in 1920. During this first-wave of feminism, women fought for equality in voting rights and for broader educational opportunities, beyond those that prepared them for homemaking or teaching positions. Among many obstacles that these early female scientists faced was the choice of marriage or career, not both.



**In 1924, Jean Walker Macfarlane (1894-1989)** became the second female faculty appointment in psychology. Having received her undergraduate degree at Berkeley in 1917, she earned the second psychology doctorate in 1922, also under Stratton. After postdoctoral training in clinical psychology in Boston and an appointment at the UC Medical School in San Francisco, Macfarlane returned to Berkeley’s Psychology Department, first as an instructor in 1924, then as an assistant professor in 1929. After advancing through the faculty ranks and earning tenure, she became Professor Emerita in 1961, after almost four decades of service. She also held an appointment as a Research Associate in the newly established Institute of Child Welfare (now the Institute of Human Development).

Macfarlane was known for her initiation of the famous Guidance Study, a longitudinal and empirical investigation of the development from birth to maturity of 250 normal infants born in 1928-29 in Berkeley, through which she empirically charted varied developmental histories. She also created the first *formal* clinical psychology program at Berkeley, recognized as one of the best in the country, and in 1950, wrote a prescient paper in the *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, calling for psychologists to train in the delivery of community mental health services.

Professor Macfarlane assumed the presidency of many psychological associations and was honored with two awards for scientific contributions from the American Psychological Association: in clinical psychology (1963, as the first woman) and in

developmental psychology (1972, G. Stanley Hall Award). See the Jean Walker Macfarlane In-Memorial statement written by Mussen, Honzik, & Tuddenham (1991). Macfarlane also had a lane on campus named after her, adjacent to Tolman Hall (which housed Psychology and Education from 1963-2018). With the demolition of Tolman Hall due to its poor earthquake safety, the building and Macfarlane Lane remain only in our memory.

In 1930, the Psychology Department moved to the new Life Sciences Building. By 1940, Psychology had grown to 11 members, of whom two (18%) were women.

Jean Macfarlane wrote two brief histories of her time at Berkeley. The first, a 4-page document entitled "Preliminary Notes on the History of the Psychological Department, University of California, 1896-1951" was written on the occasion of Warner Brown's seventieth birthday (February 9, 1952) for an "Anthology of Appreciation" (Macfarlane, 1952). Macfarlane also wrote a brief history "Psychology" (Macfarlane, 1968), which traces the field's presence at Berkeley from 1888-1961. She also supervised an extensive honors thesis written by Joan D. Groid about this same time period entitled "A History of the University of California Psychology Department at Berkeley" (Groid, 1961).

The narratives of Macfarlane or Groid made no mention of the scarce representation of women during this historical period. Also, it should be underscored that no departmental history has been written beyond 1961—now 60 years ago.

As Berkeley's first psychology Ph.D.'s and first female faculty members in our department, Bridgman and Macfarlane left an important legacy. They championed the evolution of clinical and developmental psychology (then considered female topics), heralding naturalistic, descriptive, and longitudinal methods in the empirical and rigorous study of both normal and abnormal development. These naturalistic methods stood in contrast to the experimental influence of Wilhelm Wundt, with whom their mentor George Malcolm Stratton had studied in Leipzig. The valuing of the experimental method over naturalistic studies continued to be an underlying tension in the department's history.

## **A HIRING GAP AND A COHORT OF FEMALE PSYCHOLOGISTS IN THE SHADOWS**

No *new* female faculty hires came on board between **1924 and 1971**—a dry period of 47 years after the appointments of Bridgman and Macfarlane. Beyond the seven departments that had never hired a female faculty member, the Psychology Department was identified on the campus as having the most long-lasting hiring gap for women (Blumer, Newman, Ervin-Tripp, Colson, & Scott, 1970).

Yet within this long hiring gap in Psychology, women were visible as lecturers who taught essential courses. And less well known, as we describe below, one of these lecturers was belatedly offered a faculty position in Psychology, which sadly did not

come to pass. And another lecturer ultimately joined Psychology in the faculty ranks for two years, as a transfer professorial appointment from another department.



**On December 4, 1957, Else Frenkl-Brunswik** (1908-1958) was unanimously voted by the faculty for a professorship, due to take effect on July 1, 1958 (see her accomplishments noted later in this essay). As the wife of psychology faculty member Egon Brunswik (hired in 1937), she had been denied an appointment because of nepotism rules within departments or fields. This practice emerged in many states in the 1930's to preclude bias and prevent states from funding two salaries to the same family. At Berkeley, it was applied only to faculty membership. Frenkl-Brunswik served as a research psychologist and was hired as a lecturer in 1944. Her subsequent appointment to the professor ranks was made possible only because of Brunswik's

tragic death by suicide in 1955, in response to an illness. This noted psychologist, a Viennese refugee who had fled the Nazis, also took her own life in her fiftieth year on March 31, 1958, just months before the appointment was to take place. It was written that Frenkl-Brunswik suffered despair over the death of her husband and the role of gender in hampering her career. See "Else Frenkel-Brunswik," 2021.



**In 1962, Catherine Landreth** (1899-1995) became the third female faculty in Psychology through a transfer appointment. Like Bridgman and Macfarlane, Landreth was a Berkeley Ph.D. (1936) with her dissertation in developmental psychology directed by Harold E. Jones. She was first appointed in 1938 to a faculty position in the all-women Department of Home Economics and as of 1946, also served as a lecturer in Psychology. Home Economics, established to train women to become better wives and mothers, ultimately faced its demise in 1962. Given course records (which lists academic titles), Landreth's transfer from Home Economics to the professorial series in Psychology most likely occurred in 1962 (rather than in 1950 as noted in other sources)

and she soon retired as Professor Emerita in 1964. Landreth also served as a Director of the Nursery School of the Institute of Child Welfare (a precursor to the Child Study Center). With architect Joseph Esherick, she was pivotal in the design of the landmark Harold E. Jones Child Study Center at Berkeley (opened in 1964) to create a model play and learning environment for children that enabled both quality education and research on child development (see Landreth, 1983 for the oral history of the Nursery School). Landreth was a pioneer who shaped the emerging field of early childhood education.

During this 47-year dry period, however, a cohort of female psychologists of great

renown was hard at work as researchers at two campus organized research units (ORU's): The Institute for Child Welfare (1927, later the Institute for Human Development [IHD]) and the Institute for Personality Assessment Research (1949, later the Institute for Personality and Social Research [IPSR]). Many of these women also served as instructors or lecturers in Psychology but were overlooked for senate faculty appointments. Given university rules, they were, in large part, treated as second class citizens, although they were pivotal in building the international reputation of these institutes. Faculty appointments were out of reach, due to nepotism rules, bias, and perhaps, hiring goals. Further, their research appointments did not allow them to serve as principal investigators on their own grants or to chair the dissertations of graduate students.

Among many exceptional scholars at these institutes, we acknowledge eight of these women psychologists (identified as leaders in their fields) as representing an important part of psychology's history at Berkeley during this era (1924-71). Five of them appeared on a list that Professor Stephen Glickman (former chair and teacher of the history of psychology course) passed on to Weinstein, as evidence of honored female psychologists that our department had overlooked for professorial positions. We list them by year of appointment at IHD or IPSR.

**1927: Mary Cover Jones** (1896-1987), IHD, was recognized as “the mother of behavior therapy” for her early work on the desensitization of the fear response in young children (as in the famous case of Peter) and also for her research on the Oakland Growth Study (in collaboration with her husband, psychology faculty member Harold E. Jones, and her IHD colleague, Nancy Bayley) which contributed rich understandings of the development of personality across the life span. See “Mary Cover Jones” (2017) and Rutherford (2006).

**1928: Nancy Bayley** (1899-1994), IHD, was recognized for pioneering contributions as an initiator of the famous Berkeley Growth Study and the creator of the Bayley Scales of Mental and Motor Development, used worldwide as standardized measures of infant development. See Alic (2021), and Lipsitt and Eichorn (1990).

**1936: Marjorie Pyles Honzik** (1908-2003), IHD, was known for ground-breaking studies of intellectual and behavioral development over the life span, among the first to demonstrate gender differences in the environmental factors associated with mental growth over time. See “Marjorie Pyles Honzik,” 2021.

**1939: Else Frenkel-Brunswik** (1908-1958), IHD, was best known for her contributions to the classic book *The Authoritarian Personality* co-authored with, among others, the critical theorist Theodor W. Adorno (Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, & Sanford, 1950), and for the first study of anti-semitism and out-group prejudice to find a link between childrearing practices, character structure, and personality. See Brewster Smith (1990).

**1952: Dorothy Eichorn** (1924-2018), IHD, was a noted developmental

psychologist and an esteemed organizational leader, evident in her two-decade leadership of the Society for Research in Child Development, which grew enormously in size, international scope, and intellectual contributions under her watch. See Eichorn In-Memorial statement by Society for Research in Child Development (2018) and Hagen (2019).

**1957: Ravenna Helson** (1925-2020), IPSR, has been described as a “pioneer in the study of women’s lives” for the Mills Longitudinal Study, in which she tracked women’s development from young adulthood to old age, and in other work where she explored gender and creativity, at a time when most of psychology treated men as the only scientifically interesting subject matter. See Chung (2016) and Institute for Personality and Social Research (2020).

**1960: Diana Baumrind** (1927-2018), IHD, was a pioneer in research on the effects of parenting styles on children’s development—internationally known for delineating between authoritarian, permissive, and authoritative patterns of child socialization. See the Baumrind In-Memorial statement written by Cowan, Cowan, Weinstein, & Owens (2020) and Vande Kemp (2010).

**1965: Jeanne Humphrey Block** (1923-1981), IHD, was internationally known for contributions to the understanding of sex role development in cross-cultural context and the role of ego-control and ego-resiliency in the organization of behavior, the latter work in collaboration with her husband psychology faculty member Jack Block. See the Jeanne Block In-Memorial statement written by Mussen, Eichorn, & Hardyck (1985) and J. Block (1990).

Working as shadow faculty, these female psychologists (three of whom were our own graduates: Honzik, Helson, and Baumrind) were widely recognized and won major awards.

Nancy Bayley was the first woman to receive the Distinguished Scientific Contribution Award from the American Psychological Association in 1966, its highest honor, and went on to receive the Gold Medal Award for lifetime contributions in 1982. The biographies of Bayley, Block, Frenkl-Brunswik, and Helson were included in O’Connell and Russo’s (1990) book *“Women in Psychology”* as leading historical contributors to the advancement of psychological science (Block, 1990; Brewster Smith, 1990; Gough, 1990; Lipsitt & Eichorn, 1990). Five of these women, along with Jean Macfarlane, were recognized by G. Stanley Hall Awards for Distinguished Contributions to Developmental Psychology from the American Psychological Association (Division 7): Mary Cover Jones (1968); Nancy Bayley (1971); Jean Macfarlane (1972); Marjorie Honzik (1983); Diana Baumrind (1988); and Jean Humphrey Block (1990). Among many honors, Ravenna Helson was named the 2017 Society for Personality and Social Research Legacy Honoree for lifetime contributions to the field.

Some were disheartened by how nepotism and bias (for example, the automatic assumption that men deserve more credit than women in any collaborative work)

had limited their careers whereas others welcomed the freedom that came with a non-tenure track research appointment. Mary Cover Jones, for whom strict nepotism rules had precluded appointment in Psychology, was finally appointed Assistant Professor of Education in 1952, at the age of 56. Diana Baumrind was quoted as saying that the research pathway offered her the flexible hours that as a divorced mother she needed in order to raise her three daughters (Cowan et al, 2020). In the early 1970's, when the federal Office of Civil Rights investigated UC for discrimination against women and identified Marjorie Honzik as a case example, it was said that Honzik chose to keep her name out of public view to shield her privacy.

Years later, the Psychology Department, with Stephen Glickman as Chair, voted to appoint Jean Block (1979) and Ravenna Helson (1980) as the first Adjunct Professors of Psychology—in the words of her husband, Professor Jack Block, “a belated recognition” of significant research contributions. While not used before in Psychology and not accompanied by tenure, salary, benefits, or the right to vote on new appointments, this academic title mirrors the academic standards of the tenure-track professorial series—an important honor and opportunity for greater inclusion. Collectively, the research programs of these eight women influenced generations of our students. Had they had secured tenure-track faculty appointments, the Psychology Department might have looked very different then and perhaps even today.

## **ACADEMIC PIONEERS OF THE 1970'S: A SECOND WAVE OF FEMINISM**

The title for this section is drawn from “The Academic Pioneers” oral history project, conducted by Emeriti Professors Christina Maslach (Psychology) and Paula Fass (History). The project, currently underway, was designed to understand the experience of a wide range of women faculty who came to Berkeley in the 1970's, the first period where women joined the faculty in significant numbers after this historic low point in the 1960's, and its results will appear in forthcoming articles and a book.

In 1963, Psychology moved into the new Tolman Hall, a building shared with the Graduate School of Education. By the mid-1960's, the psychology faculty numbered 42 members. With the retirements of Bridgman (1956), Macfarlane (1961), and Landreth (1964), there were no women represented in its faculty ranks.

This pattern mirrored a similar decline in tenure-track female faculty in the university at large: In 1930, women were 10% of the faculty, but by 1968, their numbers had dwindled to 3.6%. In a talk given at the Women's Faculty Club in October 2020, campus historian for the 150 Years of Women celebration, Professor Catherine Gallagher (2020) called this the “rise and decline of the first wave of women faculty,” suggesting that the shrinkage was due both to a “de-gendering” of the fields that women had established and also to “the failure to hire women in the more traditional academic fields” between 1939 and 1969 (Gallagher, 2021).

The two factors identified by Gallagher as pivotal in this decline can also be seen in the history of the Psychology Department. The more applied programs in clinical and developmental psychology (first established by women, such as Olga Bridgman and Jean Macfarlane) went on to add males to the faculty ranks. Females, though, were less likely to be hired in the more mainstream subfields of psychology. Other factors played a role, such as nepotism rules (which prioritized the males in the marriage) and a mismatch between perceptions of women's interests (seen as the softer sciences) and the intellectual priorities of the discipline at the time, which were oriented around experiments and basic psychological processes. Biases were also at play, as recalled by Professor Emeritus Donald A. Riley (personal communication, November 2020): the belief that the few women hired were sufficient, that "qualified women could not be found," and that women would not be as dedicated. Ironically, despite these beliefs, the department continued to train a substantial number of female Ph.D.'s.

Hired in 1964, Professor Emeritus Dan Slobin reflected in a brief essay (see Appendix) on attitudes toward women in the Psychology Department during this period of the mid- to late-1960's, culminating in the breaking of the glass ceiling. He remembers being told that although a woman may be qualified, she could not be relied on to follow a lifetime commitment, given the need to raise a family. That is, the Department couldn't afford to invest in someone who might not run the course.

Reflecting a second-wave of feminism, it took the activism of the late 1960's and 1970's—civil rights legislation that outlawed sex discrimination, the recognition of unfair nepotism rules and gender bias, and affirmative action—to secure six female faculty appointments in Psychology (five new and one transfer positions) during the 1970's.

**Susan Ervin-Tripp** (1927-2018) was a pivotal campus activist on behalf of women. She first served as a visiting professor in Psychology in 1958-1959, was then hired (as ladder-rank faculty) in the Department of Speech (now Rhetoric), and ultimately, after 16 years, returned to Psychology in 1975 as a full professor— thanks to the efforts of fellow psycholinguist and psychology professor Dan Slobin, among others. In her paper, *Women Activists of the Seventies: Multiple Routes to Affirmative Action* (Ervin-Tripp, 1995), given at the History of UC Women Conference and sponsored by the Center for Studies in Higher Education, Ervin-Tripp wrote: "*Women on the faculty were a vanishing species ... then we decided to try to do something about it!*"

Ervin-Tripp described the three strategic and simultaneous pathways that they used. First, a newly organized Women's Faculty Group (later the Association for Academic Women) took the "Inside Route," working through Senate committees, departments, and the administration. This led to the infamous 1970 Academic Senate Subcommittee Report on the Status of Women on the Berkeley Campus, which documented the drop in female faculty hires, gender disparities in salary, and the absence of women in administration (Blumer, Newman, Ervin-Tripp, Colson, & Scott, 1970). Second, a subset of these female faculty formed the League of

Academic Women. Third, these female faculty pursued the legal and government route by filing a civil rights complaint to the Department of Justice and a class action suit under federal and state anti-discrimination laws.

The data-driven advocacy of these women forced dramatic and sustained change at Berkeley. It paved the way for 1) affirmative action in hiring; 2) a permanent Academic Senate committee called SWEM [Status of Women and Ethnic Minorities] formed in 1971; and 3) two new positions, Academic Assistant for Affirmative Action and Academic Assistant for the Status of Women, both reporting to the Vice Chancellor. For more about this period of activism, see also Amanda Golbeck's (2017) book, *Equivalence: Elizabeth L. Scott at Berkeley*.

With the advent of affirmative action, faculty hiring shifted from recruitment via male-dominated personal networks to the open advertising of positions (inviting women and minorities to apply) and to the monitoring of availability statistics, hiring targets, and hiring progress. The recruitment letter of Sept 5, 1972 for the clinical program search in Psychology read: "*We have a clear interest in candidates who are women or who are members of ethnic minorities.*"

In Psychology, the six female faculty of the 1970's presented below—hired/transferred on the cusp of the 1970 Academic Senate report and the beginnings of affirmative action—spanned the fields of social, cognitive, developmental, and clinical/community psychology. The first four of these hires entered as the sole female faculty in their subdisciplines in the department. Emerita professors as of this writing, they went on to illustrious careers, achieving significant honors and impact, despite the obstacles of that time. Listed alphabetically by year of hire, they include:



**1971: Christina Maslach** is best known for her pioneering research on job burnout, including creating the standard assessment tool for job burnout (the Maslach Burnout Inventory, MBI), as well as for her books and award-winning articles. The impact of her work is reflected by the official recognition of burnout, as an occupational phenomenon with health consequences, in the 11th Revision of the International Classification of Diseases (ICD-11; World Health Organization, 2018). See Maslach, UC-Berkeley Psychology website.



**1971: Eleanor Rosch** is known for her visionary work on how the mind organizes and structures information about the world (mental categorization and prototypes)—fueling research across a wide range of academic fields, such as cognitive science, anthropology, philosophy, logic, computer science, theoretical biology, and critical theory. Her work in Eastern thought, reflected in the classic book, *The Embodied Mind* (1991), as among the first to explore the connection between science and Buddhist practices (Varela, Thompson, & Rosch, 1991, 2017 revised edition). See Rosch, UC-Berkeley Psychology website.



**1973: Mary Main** is an internationally known leader in the field of attachment. She is noted for the introduction of the "disorganized" attachment classification, the creation of the Adult Attachment Interview (AAI), and for major contributions to the understanding of intergenerational factors in attachment—with her papers to be housed at the Wellcome Trust in London. See Duschinsky, 2020.



**1973: Rhona S. Weinstein** is recognized for award-winning research on self-fulfilling prophecies—illuminating the perceptions of children (as mediators of the strength of teacher expectancy effects) and the contextual features of classrooms and schools that promote positive prophecies. Captured in two books, *Reaching Higher: The Power of Expectations in Schooling* (Weinstein, 2002) and *Achieving College Dreams* (Weinstein & Worrell, 2016) are evidence-based visions for educational equity, actualized in the partnered-creation of CAL Prep, an early college

secondary school for “first generation college youth” which opened in 2005. See Weinstein, UC-Berkeley Psychology website.



**1975: Susan Ervin-Tripp** (1927-2018) was a founding leader in the emerging fields of psycholinguistics and sociolinguistics. She was engaged in path-breaking research in child language, bilingualism, and the application of new technology (computer analysis of tape and video recordings) to the study of everyday communication, especially multi-party discourse within social contexts and gender roles. See Kyratzis, 2020; see Ervin-Tripp In-Memorial statement written by Slobin, Maslach & Weinstein, 2019.



**1977: Charlan Nemeth** is recognized for her research on influence processes in small group decision making. Her focus has been on how minority positions persuade and how exposure to dissenting opinions, even when wrong, stimulates more divergent thought, better decisions, and more creative problem solving. This new approach, exemplified in her 2018 book, *In Defense of Troublemakers*, has shaped research on the dynamics of influence, with the results widely acclaimed and utilized in business, law—and life. See Nemeth, UC-Berkeley Psychology website.

During this time (the early 1970's), Psychology was a highly divisive department. Faculty were members of one of three groups (Group 1: clinical, personality, developmental; Group 2: experimental; and Group 3: general), in part reflecting friendship patterns rather than subfield, and each with its own graduate student admissions procedure and independent determination of faculty recruitment and hiring. Also contributing to the divisiveness was a string of six faculty terminations (five tenure rejections and one resignation) that wiped out industrial and organizational psychology as a program, with only Sheldon Zedeck remaining. Fortunately, by 1974, Department Chair Geoffrey Keppel (1972-1977) proved successful in forging a more coherent and cohesive department, by eliminating the three-group structure and re-organizing around substantive program areas.

The integration of this new cohort of female faculty into the department was not always smooth sailing. The list of obstacles that women faced included biased beliefs (about women's intelligence and commitment), the collision between the

biological clock and mid-career/tenure decisions, the absence of child-bearing leaves, limited access to information about the tenure process, and lack of transparency in faculty review.

To learn more about the early experiences of our academic pioneers in the Psychology Department (Maslach, Rosch, Main, Weinstein, and Nemeth), we asked them to contribute brief essays, available in the Appendix to this essay. To learn more about the late Susan Ervin-Tripp's experiences at Berkeley, see her oral history (Ervin-Tripp, 2017). We also note that an extensive archive of her activism (letters and reports) is housed in the Bancroft Library, ripe for analysis.

A number of these women joined Susan Ervin-Tripp in activism. Weinstein, the first faculty pregnancy in the department (with no maternity leave at the time), was accorded the first "stop the tenure clock (two years for twins)" as an exception to the rule in 1977, when she went over the heads of both department chair and dean to successfully appeal for extra time to Vice Chancellor Michael Heyman. Over the years, Ervin-Tripp and Maslach were to serve as chair of SWEM and Weinstein and Nemeth as members of this important Senate committee. Among the policies forged were accommodations for children (parental leave for childbearing, modified duties, and stop the clock), salary equity studies and remedies (including career reviews), and greater transparency in reviews (through access to content of redacted letters and the opportunity for candidate rebuttal).

A critical factor in Berkeley's development of accommodative and more equitable practices was the decision to offer these opportunities to men as well as to women, embrace a talent development approach, and hold all accountable for what had been viewed as "gender work." Maslach later held an appointment as Faculty Assistant for Women (now called Vice Provost for the Faculty, in the Office of Faculty Equity and Welfare) and Ervin-Tripp became a campus ombudsperson.

Maslach's activism helped open membership on the important Budget Committee (where appointments, advancements, and tenure decisions are made) and enabled greater fairness in the reviews of female faculty.

Under the auspices of SWEM, Weinstein and Ervin-Tripp collaborated in revising a 1978 document (first penned by Ervin-Tripp) called "Advancement and Promotion at UC Berkeley." Issued anonymously in 1983 and updated many times, it made explicit the professional development tasks critical to tenure preparation and the resources available. This implicit curriculum was typically shared by the largely male faculty in the men's room, the poker games, and over beer—a world to which female faculty had no access. Weinstein was chastised in a meeting with the then all-male Budget Committee, whose members argued that the document cheapened the meaning of tenure, unfairly advantaged women, and must be destroyed. Ultimately, this document was used to prepare all junior faculty for tenure and was even posted on the web until recently (see "Academic Senate, Berkeley Division Committee on the Status of Women and Ethnic Minorities (SWEM) Guide to Faculty Advancement and Promotion at U.C. Berkeley 2011). Of interest, early on, one

section entitled “The Need for Further Change,” which argued that we must work actively to change the career constraints for women, was deleted. Years later, Weinstein was appointed to a more gender-diverse Budget Committee (1995-1997).

Many men also played an important role in furthering the success of women in the department and on campus. As one example, Department Chair Stephen Glickman (1977-1982) was exceptionally supportive in the tenure cases of a number of these pioneer women and spearheaded the successful effort to grant the first adjunct professor appointments in Psychology to Jeanne Block (1979) and Ravenna Helson (1980), noted earlier. As a second example, Psychology Professor Sheldon Zedeck, as Chair of the Senate Privilege and Tenure Committee (1986-1989), led deliberations on the fairness of tenure decisions. In one infamous case, this resulted in an outside comparative review and an overturned denial—a model process used as an exemplar.

Susan Ervin-Tripp remained a steadfast leader and “nudge” around issues of gender equity in the department and campus until her death in 2018. She concluded her infamous 1995 paper with this statement: “How can we tell when the job is done? When the Academic Senate and the top administrators look similar to a sixth-grade class, we can know we have arrived.” This target goal was ultimately to be achieved with regard to gender in Psychology during her lifetime, but less so in some other fields on campus, especially the STEM disciplines.

## **LATE 20th AND EARLY 21ST CENTURY FEMALE PSYCHOLOGISTS**

Across the five decades from **1970 to 2020**, as a result of sustained activism of women and some men, and new policies in place, the percentage of female faculty rose from 0% to 47% (17/36) of the Psychology Department, with their presence and enormous accomplishments evident in every subfield. Women’s representation in typically male-dominated subfields of psychology also witnessed a large boost, with substantial hiring of women in the cognition, cognitive neuroscience, and behavioral neuroscience areas. In considering this era, we describe the greater representation of women among the faculty, the shifting approaches to dual career couples, the first female department chairs, and the Women’s Faculty Forum.

With one glass ceiling broken (the hire of the 1970’s women), a total of 28 women were subsequently appointed in the Psychology Department—25 as senate faculty and 3 as adjunct faculty. The department grew its use of adjunct faculty appointments (both female and male), in two cases enabling a spouse (female and male) who met the academic standards in psychology to be recognized more appropriately for research and teaching contributions. Given the number of female hires, our discussion focuses not on their scholarship but on some firsts reflected in their appointments and the obstacles in diversity that remain.

The 1980’s welcomed four female appointments: Professors Barbara Mellers (1981- 1995), Karen DeValois (1982-2008), Anne Treisman (1986-1993), and

Alison Gopnik (1988-present).

The 1990's added three female appointments: Professors Lucia Jacobs (1993-present), Lisa Capps (1997-2000), and Ann Kring (1999-present). Also, with a greater receptivity to the use of the adjunct professor series, the department was enriched with the appointment of Lynn Robertson (1998-2013) and Carolyn Cowan (1999- 2005) as Adjunct Professors.

Since 2000, the department grew with the addition of 18 female Senate faculty, including Serena Chen (2000), Ozlem Ayduk (2002), Lori Markson (2002), Allison Harvey (2004), Joni Wallis (2003), Carla Hudson Cam (2004), Darlene Francis (2005), Tania Lombrozo (2006), Qing Zhou (2006), Silvia Bunge (2006), Sheri Johnson (2008), Sonia Bishop (2008), Fei Xu (2009), Iris Mauss (2011), Linda Wilbrecht (2013), Anne Collins (2016), Celeste Kidd (2018), and Arianne Eason (2019). Nina Dronkers also joined the department as an Adjunct Professor in 2020.

While affirmative action in higher education—dismantled by the UC Regents in 1995 and by the state of California in 1996 with the passage of Proposition 209—had helped the hiring of female faculty, it did not do as much for faculty of color. This was true in Psychology, especially for women of color, despite their presence as graduate students and despite the earlier appointment of Professor Enrico Jones in 1974, which led the way for greater ethnic diversity in male faculty appointments. The early 2000's were noteworthy for women's history in psychology because the department finally welcomed its first Asian-American female faculty member, **Serena Chen** (2001), its first First Nations-African female faculty member **Darlene Francis** (2005, now at the School of Public Health), followed 14 years later by hiring of African-American female faculty member, **Arianne Eason** (2019). Even with this progress, minority representation among psychology faculty remains profoundly low.

One persistent stumbling block up until the 2000's had been the mismatch of the research interests and methods of underrepresented minority scholars with the hiring priorities of traditional departments—a mismatch that had also been a historical concern regarding female scholars. Administrative efforts to shift the academic culture included the 2005 UC systemwide addition to the faculty evaluation criteria (APM-210) to recognize contributions to equity and diversity in research, teaching, and service, and the celebration of such accomplishments with annual awards, such as those established by Chancellor Birgeneau (2004-13) on the Berkeley campus. Also, the UC Berkeley Initiative for Equity, Inclusion, and Diversity (supported by the Evelyn and Walter Haas, Jr. Fund in 2010), created the Othering & Belonging Research Institute with eight endowed professorial chairs at its core—importantly, hired outside of traditional department searches and focused on topics of disparities, equity, and inclusion.

Beyond the gaps in diversity, controversy continued to divide the department around how to handle the problem of psychologist couples, even with nepotism rules no longer in play. Until the late 1990's, being in a dual-career relationship in

academia was treated as a woman's problem. As we have seen, it was almost always the female member of a couple who was positioned in the "spouse" role and often delegated to research appointments within the campus ORU's and/or offered instructor or lecturer opportunities within the department. While bias may have interfered with how women's contributions were evaluated relative to men, there were also fierce debates about the future direction of the department at that time, favoring breadth over depth of coverage, which worked against couples who collaborated within the same subfield.

A number of these appointments in the late 20th century illustrate the tensions raised by dual career couples. After a decade spent as an independent principal investigator in the laboratory of her husband and sometimes collaborator Professor Russell DeValois, **Karen DeValois** became an Associate Professor in **1982**—an appointment achieved only with the offer of an additional FTE from Optometry. Thus, Russ and Karen De Valois became the first couple in Psychology to share one tenured faculty position, each appointed halftime in Psychology and Optometry. The second couple, Professors Barbara Mellers and Philip Tetlock, married while members of the department—each holding their own faculty slot. The policy mechanism of a "target of opportunity" appointment helped bring a third couple (two senior appointments) to Psychology in **1986**, **Anne Treisman** and Daniel Kahneman. In **1999**, **Carolyn Cowan** (spouse and research collaborator of Professor Philip Cowan) was appointed as adjunct faculty to recognize her contributions. However, a number of other proposed spousal/partner appointments failed to be approved during these years; two male faculty members left over these denials whereas several male faculty members chose to remain.

As the number of female faculty on campus grew, the campus, with leadership of key administrators including Mary Ann Mason (the first female Dean of the Graduate Division), Sheldon Zedeck (Vice Provost for Academic Affairs and Faculty Welfare), and Angelica Stacy (Associate Vice Provost for the Faculty), developed family-friendly policies (for childcare and housing) and generated a partner policy and institutional mechanisms for hiring couples. These structural changes reflected and reinforced shifts in faculty norms and culture already underway. For both men and women, the Psychology Department looked very different during this era—with marriage/partnership and children in full view, better work-family balance was achieved for females as well as males.

With more women being interviewed and offered positions in the department in the 2000s, it was not uncommon for them to have partners who were also in academia, such that dual-career couples became an even more pervasive issue that involved both men and women as spouses. The department welcomed its fourth dual-career couple, **Ozlem Ayduk** and Rodolfo Mendoza-Denton, in **2002**. This was the first couple appointment at the tenure-track assistant professor level. Two more junior dual-career couple hires followed, **Tania Lombrozo** and Tom Griffiths (**2006**), and **Celeste Kidd** and Steven Piantidosi (**2018**), all with two FTE appointments.

Despite the remarkable growth in female faculty, there were many unfortunate

losses of women from the department. Some of these losses were due to spousal hire issues, where a second position could not be found (Markson, Hudson Cam). Other losses were due to better offers from other universities (Mellers, Treisman, Lombrozo), and one who moved to the School of Public Health at Berkeley (Francis).

A poignant loss was the premature death of a gifted and much-loved young female faculty member **Lisa Margarit Capps**, at age 35, after three years in our department (1997-2000). Hired to span clinical and developmental psychology, Capps conducted pioneering research in psychopathology—marrying linguistics, discourse analysis, and narrative—to illuminate strengths that had been hidden in children with autism and to study the intergenerational transmission of anxiety disorders, among many other topics. Her In-Memorial statement noted that “her blend of creativity and caring will not pass this way again soon.” See the Lisa Margarit Capps In Memoriam statement written by Hinshaw, Keltner, & Main (2000).

The glass ceiling in administrative leadership was finally broken with the appointment of the Department’s first female chair, to be followed by two more female chairs. It took 76 years after the birth of the Psychology Department at Berkeley to appoint the first female department chair, **Karen DeValois (1998-2003)**. Her chair role was ironic given the hard battle to win her faculty appointment. K. DeValois, internationally known for the development of an advanced and highly influential multi-stage model of color information-processing in the visual system, also became chair of the campus Budget Committee (1995-96). As Psychology Chair, she proactively supported the work of all faculty and importantly, women, and led with wisdom, calm, and generosity. Her campus and professional service was legendary, and she was known by her motto that “If I am needed, I will happily serve.”

Second female Chair **Ann Kring (2015-2020)**, internationally respected for her ground-breaking work on emotion and schizophrenia, handled a department external review, supported women vigorously, took a major role in the design of a new building, showed her organizational prowess with the move from Tolman Hall to Berkeley Way West, and provided a calm and steady voice during the first months of the COVID pandemic.

**Serena Chen** became the third female chair (2020-present). Chen, with her widely recognized work on self, identity and power in a cultural context, provided optimism and persevered as we faced the chronicity of the pandemic and remote work, and again showed consistent commitment to ethnic diversity and to women.



Back row left to right: Serena Chen, Iris Mauss, Sheri Johnson, Allison Harvey, Ann Kring, Silvia Bunge, Ozlem Ayduk, Fei Xu, Lucia Jacobs, Qing Zhu, Tania Lombrozo, Sonia Bishop.

Front row left to right: Carolyn Cowan, Lynn Robertson, Rhona Weinstein, Susan Ervin-Tripp, Alison Gopnik, Mary Main.

Several members of the WFF not present.

During this era, progress was made beyond female department chairs. In 2013, in response to unmet needs around gender equity, the **Women's Faculty Forum (WFF)** in Psychology was formed, consisting of active and emerita faculty and initiated by faculty member **Silvia Bunge**. This effort built a community of women scientists—creating the room where it happens, to borrow the phrase from the musical *Hamilton*. With rotating leadership, including the now Chair Serena Chen and Vice Chair Ayduk, and among many accomplishments, this committee succeeded in lobbying for a faster timeline for a new psychology building. The **WFF** took on activities such as meeting with structural engineer and seismic experts to review the poor earthquake safety of Tolman Hall, presenting these results to the department, organizing a signature drive to provide a state appropriation for building replacement, and meeting with the Chancellor and other key officials. Their actions hastened the construction of the new Berkeley Way West building for Psychology, Education, and Public Health, which opened in 2018.

In 2014, the **WFF** also successfully lobbied the Chair to clarify the departmental policy on ASMD (Active Service Modified Duties, APM 760-28) for birth mothers as vagueness in the former policy could disadvantage those who were not adept negotiators. The new leave policy more concretely defined a standard for 2-semester leave and clear expectations for work and relief from responsibilities for birth mothers and 1-semester leave for adopted mothers and fathers. The committee also became aware that women tended to ask for fewer perks than did

men, and so requested then Chair Rich Ivry to share publicly the types of resources available—creating a more transparent and equitable system for their distribution. Additionally, the committee sponsored a series of faculty-graduate student events around work life balance/parenting in academia and explored issues of sexual harassment and bullying.

Mirroring national trends, gender equity in salaries continued to be a point of contention. 45 years after the 1970 Academic Senate Report on the Status of Women had exposed the problem, the university released a 2015 Faculty Salary Equity report, of special concern to us (Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty, 2015, January). The report showed that gender disparity in the Psychology Department was among the worst on campus and more than twice the disparity shown across most other departments, with a 9.7% disparity between the logarithmic mean of men and women’s salaries in psychology that was not accounted for by area of study (neuroscience), years since degree, or citations (p. 43). On average, the mean 9-month salary was lower for women by \$27,607 among Full professors, and \$13,358 for Associate Professors. Led by then Chair Ann Kring as a true advocate, the **WFF** lobbied successfully for **Targeted Decoupling Initiative** (TDI) awards to be dispensed to be targeted toward departments with the most egregious disparities.

As the **WFF** engaged the department in discussion of these issues, there was growing recognition that many of the community-oriented issues should be spearheaded across genders, which led to the formation of the departmental Climate and Equity committee. In 2020, this committee divided so as to support the formation of a separate Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion committee (currently co-chaired by Professors Arianne Eason and Mahesh Srinivasan) and a Community Building and Cohesion committee (currently co-chaired by Professors Sheri Johnson and Anne Collins).

Looking across this history, we see remarkable progress, albeit with some serious zigzags: the first appointments of women on both sides of the 1920’s, the absence of a single new female tenure-track faculty appointment for the 47 years from 1924 through 1971, to a place where 47% of the faculty in the department are women. Beyond the head counts, the activism of the pioneers paid off, as women won a vote and a seat at the table and emerged as leaders in the department and the university. Along the way, the culture of the department shifted, from a place where women felt compelled to choose between family and career, to one with policy and goals of allowing men and women to balance career with relationships and family. Not only did the department benefit from the ground-breaking science of the women faculty members, but those women also shaped the field of psychology, introducing new topics, goals, and techniques to the science.

## THE FUTURE

Berkeley has made great strides in gender equity of the faculty. Nonetheless, a recent review paper spearheaded by a UC Berkeley Psychology Ph.D. program

alumna (June Gruber, a 2009 Ph.D. alum) with collaboration from multiple female faculty members at Berkeley highlights the disparities in the academic opportunities for men and women (Gruber et al., 2020).

Some issues are pernicious across disciplines. Across academic disciplines, women's work is cited at 76% the rate of men's work, they hold only one-third of the grants from the National Institute of Health, and women tenured professors earn about 90% of what men do (NSF, National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics, 2018). Disparities appear to emerge early in training. Gruber and colleagues note, for example, that women are less likely, relative to men, to get a response to email requests for future meetings with professors (Milkman, Akinola, & Chugh, 2012, 2015), and 61.9% of women undergraduate students report receiving inappropriate, sexual, or insulting comments. Academia also has struggled with how to promote opportunities that are sensitive to family planning. Across academia, married women are less likely than married men to enter a tenure-track job (Wolfinger, Mason, & Goulden, 2008), and married women with young children are less likely than men with young children to obtain a tenure-track job within six years after receiving a Ph.D. (Ginther & Kahn, 2014). Sadly, COVID has only increased gender disparities, as women academics have faced more burdens in childcare with school closures than have men.

Psychology is not immune to these problems. Within psychology, although women are much more likely to complete Ph.D.'s, they remain underrepresented in the ranks of full professors, receive less than one-third of the APA or APS senior-investigator awards, and are less likely to be invited to give keynote addresses (Gruber et al., 2020). Other barriers to women's career development are well-documented in psychology. As one example, the Society for Personality and Social Psychology (SPSP) reported that 28% of women, as compared to 5% of men, reported experiencing sexual harassment at an SPSP event during their careers (SPSP, 2019).

We hardly need note that issues of diversity in psychology remain of deep concern. Adding to the title of the Guthrie book (2004), it is clear that "Even the rat was white *and male*." A truly diverse psychological science would represent a diversity in its researchers, its subject population, its questions, and its methods. A core goal for the future of psychology will be to allow for a more enriched focus on how meaningful variation across individuals and across social settings can be integrated into our science. This work will require the engagement of scientists who represent the full diversity of our society.

We see enormous potential for Berkeley to be an ongoing leader in recognizing and addressing these systemic barriers and issues that continue to hinder women's careers. With three recent female chairs in a history of 21 chairs (14%), Berkeley's Psychology Department is fortunate to have equal numbers of male and female professors (even at the full professor level), to lead the nation in family-friendly leave policies, and to have many examples of mothers who are thriving in their careers. Many of our women faculty members have received prestigious awards,

high levels of citations, and frequent invitations for keynote presentations. Recent chairs have provided full support for addressing each and every example of bullying or harassment brought to their attention. With this type of progress, we hope to see Berkeley continue to be a leader in awareness of gender gaps and in the design of solutions for addressing them, striving also for greater diversity.

### Acknowledgements

*With thanks to Emeriti Professors Dan Slobin and Sheldon Zedeck, Chair Serena Chen, for their helpful comments on a previous version; Academic Personnel Coordinator Jitka Horavova for her help with research, and Software Engineer Morteza Faraji for his help with website programming.*

### Photo Credits

Photographs of Bridgman, Macfarlane, Landreth, Maslach, Rosch, Main, Weinstein, Ervin-Tripp, and Nemeth, Courtesy of the Department of Psychology, UC Berkeley.

Photograph of Frenkl-Brunswik drawn from <https://jwa.org/media/else-frenkel-brunswik>.

Photograph of the Women's Faculty Forum by Frances Katsuura, 2013, with permission.

### References

- Academic Senate, Berkeley division committee on the status of women and ethnic minorities (SWEM) guide to faculty advancement and promotion at UC Berkeley* (2011). University of California, Berkeley. [https://academic-senate.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/swem\\_tenure\\_guide\\_final\\_2-2012.pdf](https://academic-senate.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/swem_tenure_guide_final_2-2012.pdf)
- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, N. R. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York, NY: Harper and Brothers.
- Alic, M. (2021). *Nancy Bayley*. In Psychology encyclopedia. <https://psychology.jrank.org/pages/65/Nancy-Bayley.html>
- Block, Jack. (1990). Jeanne Humphrey Block. In A. N. O'Connell & N. F. Russo (Eds.), *Women in psychology: A bio-bibliographic sourcebook* (pp 40-48). Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood Publishers.
- Blumer, H., Newman, F., Ervin-Tripp, S., Colson, E., & Scott, E. (1970). *Report of the subcommittee on the status of academic women on the Berkeley Campus*. University of California, Berkeley. [https://psychology.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/department/senate\\_report\\_on\\_status\\_of\\_women.pdf](https://psychology.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/department/senate_report_on_status_of_women.pdf)
- Brewster Smith, M. (1990). Else Frenkl-Brunswik. In A. N. O'Connell & N. F. Russo (Eds.), *Women in psychology: A bio-bibliographic sourcebook* (pp 88-95).

- Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood Publishers
- Chung, J. (2016, November). An interview with 2017 SPSP convention legacy honoree Ravenna Helson. *P: The Online Newsletter for Personality Science*, Issue 11. [http://www.personality-arp.org/html/newsletter11/interview\\_Helson.html](http://www.personality-arp.org/html/newsletter11/interview_Helson.html)
- Cowan, P.A., Cowan, C. P., Weinstein, R., & Owens, E. (2020). *In Memoriam: Diana B Baumrind*. University of California Academic Senate. <https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/in-memoriam/files/diana-baumrind.html>
- Duschinsky, R. (2020). *Cornerstones of attachment research*. London, England: Oxford University Press.
- Else Frenkel-Brunswik. (2021, October 5). In Wikipedia. [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Else\\_Frenkel-Brunswik&oldid=1048271853](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Else_Frenkel-Brunswik&oldid=1048271853)
- Ervin-Tripp, S. (1995). *Women activists of the seventies: Multiple routes to affirmative action*. University of California, Berkeley, Department of Psychology. [https://psychology.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/department/ervin-tripp\\_womenactivists.pdf](https://psychology.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/department/ervin-tripp_womenactivists.pdf)
- Ervin-Tripp, S. (2017). *Susan Ervin-Tripp: A life of research in psycholinguistics and work for the equity of women*. Oral interview conducted by Shanna Farrell in 2016, Oral History Center, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley. [https://digitalassets.lib.berkeley.edu/roho/ucb/text/ervin-tripp\\_susan\\_2017.pdf](https://digitalassets.lib.berkeley.edu/roho/ucb/text/ervin-tripp_susan_2017.pdf)
- Gallagher, C. (2021, May 28). 1915 – 1968: *The rise and decline of Berkeley women faculty* [Video]. Talk presented at the Women’s Faculty Club, University of California, Berkeley. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=rQ55JGTad7c>
- Ginther, D., Kahn, S. (2014). Academic women’s careers in the social sciences. In A. Lanteri and J. Vromen (Eds.), *The economics of economists: Institutional setting, individual incentives, and future prospects* (pp. 285–315). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press. Doi:10.1017/CBO9781139059145.015
- Golbeck, A. L. (2017). *Equivalence: Elizabeth L. Scott at Berkeley*. CRC Press, Taylor & Francis Group.
- Golbeck, A. L., & Weinstein, R. S. (2021, May 10). *Elizabeth Scott and Sue Ervin-Tripp: The Fight for Gender Equity at UC Berkeley*. University of California, Berkeley [Video]. YouTube. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tIVHOKukRbg&t=645s>
- Gough, H. (1990). Ravenna Helson. In A. N. O’Connell & N. F. Russo (Eds.), *Women in psychology: A bio-bibliographic sourcebook* (pp 151-160). Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood Publishers.
- Grold, J.G. (1961). *A history of the University of California Psychology Department at Berkeley*. University of California, Berkeley. [https://digitalassets.lib.berkeley.edu/edp/history\\_of\\_ca\\_psych\\_department.pdf](https://digitalassets.lib.berkeley.edu/edp/history_of_ca_psych_department.pdf)
- Gruber, J., Mendle, J., Lindquist, K. A., Schmader, T., Clark, L. A., Bliss-Moreau, E., Akinola, M., Atlas, L., Barch, D. M., Barrett, L. F., Borelli, J. L., Brannon,

- T. N., Bunge, S. A., Campos, B., Cantlon, J., Carter, R., Carter-Sowell, A. R., Chen, S., Craske, M. G., ... Williams, L. A. (2021). The future of women in psychological science. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 16(3), 483–516. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691620952789>
- Guthrie, R. V. (2004). *Even the rat was white: A historical view of psychology* (Allyn & Bacon Classics Edition), 2<sup>nd</sup> Edition.
- Hagen, J. W. (2019). Dorothy Hansen Eichorn (1924–2018). *American Psychologist*, 74(4), 511. <https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0000386>
- Helmuth, K. & Madison, S. (2021a, April 13). *Women in Psychology: Change Makers in the Front Lines*. University of California, Berkeley [Video]. YouTube. [https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n7e\\_aY34\\_g&ab\\_channel=SocialSciencesatUCBerkeley](https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=n7e_aY34_g&ab_channel=SocialSciencesatUCBerkeley)
- Hinshaw, S. P., Keltner, D., & Main, M. (2000). *In-Memoriam Lisa Margarit Capps, Psychology: Berkeley (1964-2000)*. Online Archive of California. <https://oac.cdlib.org/view?docId=hb1r29n709;NAAN=13030&doc.view=frames&chunk.id=div00008&toc.depth=1&toc.id=&brand=oac4>
- Institute for Personality and Social Research (2020). *Ravenna M. Helson*, <https://ipsr.berkeley.edu/helson-memorial-page>
- Landreth, C. (1983). *Catherine Landreth: The Nursery School of the Institute of Child Welfare of UC Berkeley* [Interview]. Oral History Center, The Bancroft Library, University of California, Berkeley. <https://californiarevealed.org/islandora/object/cavpp%3A21818>
- Lipsitt, L. W., & Eichorn, D. H. (1990). Nancy Bayley. In A. N. O'Connell & N. F. Russo (Eds.), *Women in psychology: A bio-bibliographic sourcebook* (pp 23-29). Santa Barbara, CA: Greenwood Publishers.
- Kyratzis, A. (2020). Social context and language: A tribute to the lifework of Susan Ervin-Tripp. *Journal of Sociolinguistics*, 24(1). doi:10.1111/josl.12382.
- Macfarlane, J. W. (1952). *Preliminary Notes on the History of the Psychology Department, University of California, 1896-1951*. Available in the Olga Bridgman archive in the Wellcome Collection, London. [https://psychology.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/macfarlane\\_p1-4.pdf](https://psychology.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/macfarlane_p1-4.pdf)
- Macfarlane, J. W. (1968). *Psychology*. University of California, Digital Archives. [https://www.lib.berkeley.edu/uchistory/general\\_history/campuses/ucb/departments\\_p.html#psychology](https://www.lib.berkeley.edu/uchistory/general_history/campuses/ucb/departments_p.html#psychology)
- Mary Cover Jones. (2017, June 8). In Wikipedia. [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Mary\\_Cover\\_Jones&oldid=1020256176](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Mary_Cover_Jones&oldid=1020256176)
- Marjorie Pyles Honzik (2021, May 9). In Wikipedia. [https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Marjorie\\_Pyles\\_Honzik&oldid=1025698451](https://en.wikipedia.org/w/index.php?title=Marjorie_Pyles_Honzik&oldid=1025698451)
- Mayer, R. W. (1972). *Psychology, psychologists, and the University of California: The First Twenty Years, 1880-1900*. Reprinted from the Proceedings, 80th Annual Convention, APA. Available in the Olga Bridgman archive in the Wellcome Collection, London. [https://psychology.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/mayer\\_p1-2.pdf](https://psychology.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/mayer_p1-2.pdf)
- Milkman, K. L., Akinola, M., Chugh, D. (2012). Temporal distance and

- discrimination: An audit study in academia. *Psychological Science*, 23, 710–717. [doi:10.1177/0956797611434539](https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797611434539)
- Milkman, K. L., Akinola, M., Chugh, D. (2015). What happens before? A field experiment exploring how pay and representation differentially shape bias on the pathway into organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 100, 1678–1712. [doi:10.1037/apl0000022](https://doi.org/10.1037/apl0000022)
- Mussen, P., Eichorn, D., & Hardyck, C. (1985). *In Memoriam: Jeanne Humphrey Block*. UC History Digital Archives. <http://texts.cdlib.org/view?docId=hb4d5nb20m;NAAN=13030&doc.view=frames&chunk.id=div00015&toc.depth=1&toc.id=&brand=calisphere>
- Mussen, P. H., Honzik, M., & Tuddenham, R. (1991). Jean Walker Macfarlane (1894–1989): Obituary. *American Psychologist*, 46(8), 874. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.46.8.874>
- National Science Foundation, National Center for Science and Engineering Statistics. (2018). Doctorate recipients from U.S. universities: 2017 (Special Report NSF 19-301). Retrieved from <https://nces.nsf.gov/pubs/nsf19301>
- O'Connell, A. N., & Russo, N. F. (Eds.). (1990). *Women in psychology: A bio-bibliographic sourcebook*. Greenwood Press.
- Office of the Vice Provost for Faculty (2015, January). *Report on the UC Berkeley faculty equity study*. UC Berkeley. <https://vpf.berkeley.edu/sites/default/files/Equity%20Study%20Report%20final%201-26-15%20--revised.pdf>
- Rutherford, A. (2006). Mother of behavior therapy and beyond: Mary Cover Jones and the study of the "whole child" In D. A. Dewsbury, L. T. Benjamin, & M. Wertheimer (Eds.), *Portraits of pioneers in psychology* (pp. 189–204). American Psychological Association; Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.
- Scarborough, E. & Furumoto, L. (1987). *Untold lives: The first generation of American women psychologists*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Slobin, D., Maslach, C., & Weinstein, R. S. (2019). *In Memoriam: Susan Ervin-Tripp*. University of California. <https://senate.universityofcalifornia.edu/in-memoriam/files/susan-ervin-tripp.html>
- Society for Research in Child Development. (2018, Feb 22). *In Memoriam: Dorothy H. Eichorn (1924 – 2018)*. *Society for Research in Child Development*. <https://www.srkd.org/news/memoriam-dorothy-h-eichorn-1924-2018>
- Society of Personality and Social Psychology (2019). SPSP Sexual harassment survey results. *Society for Personality and Social Psychology*. <https://spsp.org/announcements/sexual-harassment-survey>
- Tuddenham, R. D., Macfarlane, J. W., & Simon, A. (1977). *In Memoriam: Olga Bridgman*. UC History Digital Archives. <http://texts.cdlib.org/view?docId=hb1199n68c&doc.view=frames&chunk.id=div00008&toc.depth=1&toc.id=>
- Vande Kemp, H. (2010). *Diane Blumberg Baumrind (1927-)*. American Psychological Association, Society for the Psychology of Women. <https://www.apadivisions.org/division-35/about/heritage/diana-baumrind-biography>
- Varela, F. J., Thompson, E., & Rosch, E. (2017). *The embodied mind: Cognitive*

- science and human experience* (revised edition). Boston, MA: MIT Press.
- Weinstein, R. S. (2020). *Psychology Part I: 10 Trailblazing Women at Berkeley*. University of California, Berkeley. Department of Psychology. <https://psychology.berkeley.edu/psychology-part-i-10-trailblazing-women-berkeley>
- Weinstein, R. S. (2002). *Reaching higher: The power of expectations in schooling*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, MA.
- Weinstein, R. S., Ayduk, O., & Johnson, S. L. (2021). *Psychology part II: Our female Ph.D. graduates at Berkeley*. University of California Berkeley Department of Psychology. <https://psychology.berkeley.edu/psychology-part-ii-our-female-phd-graduates-berkeley>
- Weinstein, R. S. & Worrell, F. (Eds.). (2016). *Achieving college dreams: How a university-charter district partnership created an early college high school*. Oxford University Press.
- Wolfinger, N. H., Mason, M. A., Goulden, M. (2008). Problems in the pipeline: Gender, marriage, and fertility in the Ivory Tower. *Journal of Higher Education*, 79, 388–405.
- World Health Organization. (2018). *International classification of diseases for mortality and morbidity statistics* (11th Revision). Retrieved from <https://icd.who.int/browse11/l-m/en>

## Appendix: Brief Essays on Breaking the Glass Ceiling

### Some memories of the sixties Dan Slobin

I came to the Berkeley Psych Department in January 1964, at age 24, with a fresh PhD from Harvard. The Department had recruited me to establish a new discipline, psycholinguistics. I came from a Russian Jewish immigrant world of strong women. My mother had an M.A. in English literature. The women of her parents' generation were all literate in Yiddish, Russian, English, and often Modern Hebrew. They and their daughters were professionals of one sort or another, and/or active in social and political organizations. I remember, as a small child, musing that although half of the population were women there were hardly any women in government or science that I knew of.

I inherited an office in Tolman Hall from Catherine Landreth, who had just retired. I came to know important women researchers in the Institute of Human Development: Jeanne Block, Marjorie Honzik, Diana Baumrind, Dorothy Eichorn. It soon became evident to me that none of these women—of the same generation as my teachers—had a ladder faculty position. There was, in fact, already a psycholinguist on the Berkeley faculty: Susan Ervin-Tripp, with whom I had published an invited paper on psycholinguistics in the *Annual Review of*

*Psychology*. She was in the Department of Speech (later Rhetoric). We taught seminars together, did research together, shared graduate students—but I always had to be the dissertation chair, though she was a generation older than I and well-known internationally. My first doctoral student was a woman, Jacqueline Strunk Sachs, who went on to a faculty position at the University of Connecticut. And in my first decade I had a number of women doctoral students who became productive faculty members at leading universities.

The lack of women faculty in our department disturbed me. I remember a lunch discussion at the Institute of Human Learning in which I asked my senior colleagues something like: “About half of our grad students are women, what are we training them for when we don’t have any women faculty?” I was cut off by comments that I’ve never forgotten. To paraphrase: Oh yes, they’re very talented. But, you know, they’ll want to have children and then they’ll drop out of the profession. What they learn from us will make them good mothers. As for our own faculty, we have to invest in junior faculty who will achieve tenure and remain. Maybe some of our women grads can go to state colleges or community colleges, where they won’t have our sort of research demands.

Finally the glass ceiling cracked. In the search for a social psychologist, there was no doubt that Eleanor Rosch and Christina Maslach were the superior candidates and the department argued for two positions within the same academic year. But Sue Ervin-Tripp was still in Rhetoric, without grad students or courses in psychology. So, along with a few other junior faculty members (Jonas Langer, Ed Samson, maybe a few others), we went to the Dean of the College (there was a single dean then) and presented a case for moving Sue to the Dept of Psychology, where she obviously belonged. The Dean agreed and negotiated with Rhetoric. They agreed to “lend” Sue’s FTE to Psych for the duration of her career (but, decades later, no one remember to move that slot back to its place of origin). By the way, Sue had three children and continued to do research and publish until her death.

## **Early Career**

### **Christina Maslach**

In 1970, I was a graduate student at Stanford University, writing my dissertation and looking for a job. A local news article caught my attention, about the low number of women professors (only about 3%) at the University of California, Berkeley. The article had two tables: one listed departments that had never hired women to be faculty (the zero club), and the other listed departments that had hired women, but arranged in order of how long it had been since the last hire. The department at the top of the latter list was Psychology – it had been 47 years since their last hire of a female professor, Jean Macfarlane, in 1923. I did not know it then, but someone who had prepared that report was Susan Ervin-Tripp, a subsequent colleague.

The report had a major disconnect – many women from Berkeley had published research articles (which I had studied as a student), so why had they not been faculty? Then I became more interested in Berkeley because they wanted to hire someone in social psychology (my area of specialization) and they were “flexible with regard to sex.” Awkward phrasing, but it meant that they would consider female applicants. But would they really? The uncertainty led one person to call me “Chris” throughout the recommendation letter, avoiding pronouns, presumably to get my application taken seriously.

I gave a job talk, and eventually the Department hired two women, both Eleanor Heider Rosch and me. But when I entered Tolman Hall through the back entrance into IHD, and saw the names listed there – where the famous women I had studied were all “research associates” – then I realized they had never been faculty but had had this lesser position instead.

When I started my job, most faculty colleagues were welcoming (but a few would make remarks like, “Why are you gossiping in the hall?”). More interesting reactions came from students. Some would come to my office, and when they did not see a male professor there, they would ask the female “secretary” to let him know that they had shown up to see him. Others (usually women) would stop by to shake my hand, and say, “I’m so glad you are here!” My first large lecture course had three TAs who were all male and older than me, and who did not take kindly to my being “the professor.” At the end of the course, one male student told me that he would not give me a positive teaching evaluation, and when I asked why, he had no answer until he finally spluttered, “I could be dating you!” (an interesting comment on gender and power dynamics!).

Susan Ervin-Tripp transferred from Rhetoric to Psychology a few years later, when there was a lot of interest in issues of sex and gender. We co-taught a seminar on this topic several times and became part of a group that developed Women’s Studies. Later, I developed a lower-division lecture course, “Psychology of Gender,” and taught that for many years.

After I received tenure, I began to do more university service, and a lot of this involved gender issues. I chaired the Academic Senate committee on the Status of Women and Ethnic Minorities (SWEM) and worked with a colleague to review the patterns of faculty membership on the most powerful Senate committee (that oversees academic personnel decisions but is called the “Budget Committee”). Not only did we find that female and minority faculty were rarely appointed to serve on this committee, but that some departments always had a committee seat, while other departments had none. Our report led to changing the process of Budget Committee membership. Then I became the Faculty Assistant on the Status of Women, which was a half-time position that reported to the Executive Vice Chancellor and Provost (EVCP), who was Carol Christ at that time. My job was twofold -- to review every personnel case involving a female faculty member, to ensure that the process was being done fairly, and to meet confidentially with any women faculty who were concerned about how they were being treated. If I

discovered any problems, I would bring them to EVCP Christ's attention, and she would follow up with some appropriate action.

I served twice as Chair of the Academic Senate, and then retired. But I have returned virtually to the 1970s, to start a new project. That report about the dwindling presence of women faculty had compelled the university to open up its hiring practices -- and so a "new wave" of women were hired as professors during the 1970s. I have been conducting interviews with many of these women -- their stories are fascinating, and it is wonderful to see how far we have come in the past half century!

## **Early Career**

### **Eleanor Rosch**

I came to UC Berkeley in 1971, the same year that Christina Maslach was hired. We were the first two women to join the psychology department with regular faculty positions. At that time, I was largely oblivious to the gender aspects of the situation. That the faculty members were all men seemed natural to me. During my job interview, when I was told that the luncheon for me would be in the Women's Faculty Club because women were not allowed in the regular Faculty Club, I found it quaint and rather charming. I didn't think to worry when, at the party after my job talk, a frowning person pointed out to me that faculty wives were talking to me more than was usual.

What I did worry about was an error in the materials I had brought for the talk. Ironically that turned out to be, perhaps, one of the factors leading to my being hired. The work I was presenting began with a series of experiments on color categorization in the Dani people of the highlands of Indonesian New Guinea where I had traveled with my anthropologist husband Karl Heider. The problem was that I had accidentally left behind my slides of the colors I had used, and the very properties that made colors ideal for the research made them impervious to communication without people actually seeing them. I was horrified when I discovered this until I realized that the two people who had initiated the study of cultural color categories (Brent Berlin and Paul Kay) were at Berkeley. Surely, they would have a display of Munsell color chips that I could borrow. They did, and not only did they come to my talk with the needed display, but they turned up with a cohort of interested faculty and students from anthropology, linguistics, philosophy, computer science and biology.

The upshot was that Chris Maslach was rightly hired for the social psychology position for which we were both interviewing, and the department asked for a second position for me as a Target of Opportunity. The University granted that, and I came. This narrative exemplifies the kind of support (and at times serendipity) I've received from colleagues and staff throughout my career here without which whatever I've accomplished would not have been possible.

The UC Berkeley psychology department was an odd place to be in the 1970s. It was divided into three groups, formed some years previously to give partial autonomy to warring hard and soft science factions in the department, but it no longer seemed a good map of faculty interests. Cognitive psychology didn't fit into any of the groups, and this was creating strain for me. When I spoke to the chair about it, he said that was wonderful because no one felt well placed in the group system, so the more stress that was built up, the sooner it would change. Never had I felt so privileged to be feeling vexed. So it came to pass, smaller groups that fit people's actual interests, at least for a while.

Then there was teaching. The early 70s was a time just emerging from the Free Speech Movement. My first undergraduate lecture class, in which I was trying to teach the wondrous new cognitive psychology, was not going well. The students were not shy about challenging me to show them how any of it would make a difference in their lives, and I've tried to take this as a guiding light for teaching ever since. In the early 1980s students again began demanding changes in course offerings, giving the psychology department a list of classes they wanted instituted, one of which was on meditation and Eastern thought. Knowing that I had become interested in Eastern psychologies, the chair asked me to teach such a class. That class, along with a class on sleep and dreams that I instituted years later, had the advantage that students came to it pre-interested in the subject matter. With the added ability to use PowerPoint to mix pictures, sounds, and text with a lecture, I began to think of lectures as an art form, and teaching such classes became a new delight.

Throughout my career here, I have felt supported in my endeavors. If there was ever an issue about my being a woman, I was not privy to it. Whatever biases may have existed toward females, my papers were eventually published in suitable journals, and I was promoted appropriately. All of this does not mean, however, that gender was not an issue in my work and life. Where being a woman mattered significantly was in my private life. My husband and I split up my second year at Berkeley, a common crisis time for academic marriages. Subsequent dating was largely a disaster. In the early days I felt that if only I were a man, I could have a wife who would appreciate that I worked so much, and would provide companionship and do wifely things to make it easier for me. That is long since past, but occasionally I do remember thinking that—and smile.

## **Early Career Mary Main**

Buoyed by what I can best describe as a substantial optimism, I applied for an assistant professorship at UC Berkeley's Department of Psychology to begin July 1973. I was a new PhD and—my thesis advisor at Johns Hopkins, Mary Ainsworth, having herself “made” it in a masculine setting—I was fully expectant of a positive

outcome.

My first meeting with Berkeley's then-chair, Geoff Keppel, was positive, but also somewhat daunting. He told me that although I had obtained a prospectively positive vote as a new faculty hire, there were, however, two important male faculty members who did not like the idea of adding women to Berkeley's faculty. And, they were being substantially vocal about it.

My actual try-out talk at Berkeley was, unfortunately, more "exciting" than I could have imagined. A distressed young man who quite evidently was not a student at Berkeley entered and continually waved a knife at me as I began to speak. This aroused a general alarm, and the police were about to be called in for my protection when I intervened, having suddenly had the thought that he was suffering from schizophrenia and was not, in fact, a danger.

He was let go, and some months later, in far better condition, he came to my office to thank me. And, although I don't remember the grades he obtained, he also came to my classes.

-----

Happily, and not long following my "job" talk, I learned that that I was indeed being offered an assistant professor position at Berkeley. This offer took place (and was accepted) despite the protests of Professors X and Y, who were—unfortunately for me—members of my own sub-area of (developmental psychology). I don't remember their exact wording, but I heard that in general they considered that I would be found uncreative and unproductive.

This could have made my first years at Berkeley less than fully enjoyable, but—fortunately—help was directly ahead. This was in the person of Professor Steve Glickman, my forthcoming chair and who, I was told, was widely known for his studies in animal behavior. Steve was perhaps especially well-known for his focus on the hyena, a fairly large animal with notable teeth, and not widely known for its friendly attitude to humans. On my first visit to Steve's hyena colony, I decided the way to favorably impress Steve would certainly be to quickly climb over the fence and walk among the hyenas (!!!). I carried out this thought to its fullest in that I climbed the fence and walked a bit among the quiet but toothy herd, albeit recognizing, as I looked back at Steve, that the impression I was making at that moment was not, perhaps, entirely positive.

Nonetheless, I passed to tenure, and did so largely because Steve actively supported me during my tenure meeting (even though his doing so was illegal for a Chair, he cheerfully informed me later).

As time went on, both Steve and his wife Krista became good friends, and we came to share a graduate student, who is now herself a professor at a major university. And Steve is widely missed and widely mourned following his still fairly recent death

from pancreatic cancer.

- - - - -

Although some predicted, upon my hire, that I would be uncreative and unproductive, my work on attachment at Berkeley continues to be well-cited. The entirety of my papers is to be forwarded to London's Wellcome Trust, which has already collected the work of the founder of my field, John Bowlby, as well as only one or two women, including Madame Curie. I am told it is to be studied by scholars of my field in England and has been described by a young historian of science, Robbie Duschinsky, at Cambridge University (England). The 2020 book, entitled "*Cornerstones of Attachment Research*", illustrates the work of John Bowlby, Mary Ainsworth, myself with Erik Hesse, and Alan Sroufe.

## **Early Career**

### **Rhona S. Weinstein**

Growing up, I always wanted to be a professor—a dream fueled by the nightly game my father played with me. I could choose the volume and entry of the *Encyclopedia Britannica* and he would read it aloud. This game instilled a tremendous respect for scholarship and I, too, wanted to contribute to that knowledge base. As a female, the path forward seemed filled with obstacles. At one university, upon announcing my plans to marry, I was asked to give up a graduate fellowship and leave the Ph.D. program in psychology. At another university, as a married woman, my search for a faculty position was not taken seriously.

Thus, my Berkeley appointment in 1973 as an assistant professor, during the first year of affirmative action, was hard won. As we had taken turns at choice points in our dual careers, I followed my husband to the Bay Area. But when I responded to the posted job announcement, I listed my Yale address, knowing full well that a local woman would be perceived as less desirable. Pre-offer communication traveled back and forth across the country—Berkeley to Yale and Yale back to me in San Francisco. My husband, huddled with the wives at the required evening dinner, was asked about *his* job prospects.

When I arrived, I took over the Tolman Hall office of a faculty member who didn't receive tenure and as he was packing up, he wished me better luck. I remember my shock at how few female faculty there were in the university, 47 of us gathered in one small room. I also remember the discomfort I felt as the only woman in a meeting, on a committee, and in more informal gatherings.

Among the indignities, I was denied a summer salary because I had a husband to support me, asked to bring coffee to meetings, expected to take notes, chastised for gossiping in the hall when speaking to female colleagues, and un-invited (as an assistant professor) to faculty tenure meetings because "women become too

emotional.” My voice was often stifled as men listened best to men—even taking as their own, points previously made by women. Early on, my authority was challenged in the classroom: I was called by my first name, comments were made about my wardrobe (dressed in formal suits in Berkeley of all places), and grades were contested.

As the sole community psychologist in a clinical program, I faced special challenges in building a partnered-research program in schools and the community, outside of laboratory settings. Early in my second year, I made the unpopular decision to start a family, the first pregnancy in the Psychology Department. This yielded twins and it was publicly said in a faculty meeting that “the department was saved another pregnancy.” Five faculty members visited my office and suggested I resign because motherhood would stand in the way of an academic career. Working until delivery, with no maternity leave, I returned to teaching five courses—the extra lecture class added to test my commitment. After an unfavorable mid-career review, made within that slim window of time in which my future trajectory was predicted, the chair suggested that I might consider leaving immediately.

I did not heed the advice. My consciousness had been raised and with the support of many, importantly, my husband and colleagues (both male and female), I came to see this as an institutional problem, not one of personal failure. A pivotal mentor, Jeanne Block, begged me to hold on to my faculty title with its vote, if not for me, then “for her and all the women at IHD.” Sue Ervin Tripp peppered me with edits on the letters I wrote, as I fought for systemic changes. Arlie Hochschild’s brilliant paper “Inside the Clockwork of Male Careers” articulated the mismatch between academic norms, women’s biological clocks, and societal gender roles, providing perspective. The “stop the clock” policy mechanism for childbearing proved vital to my survival. As I was to learn, the wish to have it all—a career, marriage, and parenthood—provoked anger and even sadness, for men and women alike, those who had made great sacrifices to earn their place in the academy. As time passed, as the representation of women grew, many softened and even apologized for attitudes born of earlier eras.

I am ever so grateful for the opportunity to have served as a professor in a public university like Berkeley, which has responded with policy changes to recognize and develop the talent of half the population—women who earlier had been left behind. Without a doubt, these experiences of fighting against low expectations for women has played a role in my research interests in how expectations about ability can become self-fulfilling prophecies.

## **Early Career**

### **Charlan Jeanne Nemeth**

As a graduate student, I distinctly remember having a dream. That was to be a full professor at Berkeley. It was partly the caliber of the university, partly the San

Francisco area, partly the liberal orientation that I believed favored justice and equality. Perhaps most of all, I liked the idea of a public university as it provided a vehicle for social mobility. Some 15 years later, that became a reality. In 1977, I came to Berkeley as a full professor in Social Psychology and headed up the area.

That dream and the road to Berkeley was not a straight line. It came via a lifetime of bucking expectations and knowing that the playing field was not even for females and that prowess was not necessarily valued. These experiences, along with an interest in social influence, fueled my research interest in how minority views persuade but it eventually led to a focus on the larger value of dissent.

Arriving in Berkeley in 1977 as a full professor with tenure at age 35 was a dream come true. Here I believed I could speak “truth” to power and be protected from repercussions for that speech. That belief was only partially true.

Berkeley had few women in Psychology those days; some, while remarkably talented, had the misfortune of being married to a faculty member and were denied positions.

One might think that, as a full professor, discrimination would be less or even nonexistent. However, I soon learned the old lessons. In some ways, it was more difficult because it was couched in nice rhetoric from well-meaning people. Much as elsewhere, being a female meant I was expected to “go along and get along”, to phrase opinions in vague ways, to be careful not to offend or too direct. However, my research told me that minority views require consistency; they also stimulate thinking and benefit the quality of decision making. I wanted to do both.

At Berkeley, much “business” was conducted in informal settings and alliances were formed that way. I had married in 1979 and living in San Francisco meant that I was unable to partake in many social gatherings. Further, many such settings were “all boys”, playing basketball or poker. Did I dare challenge them to a game of “horse” when I had played Varsity basketball for 4 years? I also had 2 children by 1983.

In those days, there was no university help. I worked up to one week before delivery each time and was relieved of 1 or 2 months of end of semester teaching by colleagues who offered to cover for me. I was back full time the following semester.

The culture was also changing towards a kinder, gentler department. But that sometimes made it harder to see discrimination directly. Sometimes, it took the form of condescension. Sometimes, it was pressure –unmistakably a message they would not be pleased should you question or challenge them. Sometimes it was more overt. Repeatedly, my pay trailed that of people I hired who were 10-15 years younger. As with many organizations, merit increases benefited from “sympathies” or alliances.

Part of the pay inequity was due to my reluctance—I think shared by many women—to play the “one foot out the door” strategy. I had committed to Berkeley for the long haul and had set down roots. I didn’t pursue outside offers and declined invitations to be considered. I was intent on building the best area, the best department, the best university. It seemed disingenuous to pursue other offers when I had no intention of leaving. Yet, I watched male faculty members do this regularly. And they were rewarded with stepped up promotions, more perks and income—sometimes without having an actual offer. This resulted in my moving only 8 steps after 36 years. A career assessment at retirement was not granted.

During the past 40 years, there have been many attempts to create equity and to support and encourage those in minority categories, not only by many female faculty-and staff-but also by many of our white male faculty who enjoyed privilege but were stalwart defenders of the rights of others.

Today, we have many more female faculty but, only recently, have they served as Chair. There has been progress on pay equity but it remains under discussion. Perhaps more subtle but disturbing is that many female faculty members still feel a pressure to “go along and get along” and remain silent even when a faculty or staff member has been disparaged or bullied. The department has come far but it is still “in progress” towards full equity and inclusion.