

Chapter 2

Emergence and Development of the Psychology of Women

Alexandra Rutherford and Leeat Granek

The emergence and development of the psychology of women has been closely tied to the social and professional status and concerns of women over the course of the late 19th, 20th, and early 21st centuries. Although treatises on female subjectivity have existed throughout history, we begin our account with work on the psychology of women produced soon after the advent of scientific psychology in western Europe and North America in the late 1800s and provide a broad overview of developments through the early 21st century. Although in its earliest forms the psychology of women focused largely on sex differences presumed to underlie women's predetermined social roles, the purview of the field, its institutional presence, and its philosophical bases changed and grew dramatically throughout the latter one-third of the 20th century. Propelled by political, epistemological, and methodological developments, the psychology of women and gender has moved far from its late 19th century roots to encompass the diverse interests of its increasingly diverse practitioners and constituents.

Outlining the emergence and development of the psychology of women appears to be a straightforward task until one tries to define the historical object. Treated strictly as a body of research or an institutional sub-field within psychology, the psychology of women becomes artificially divorced from its gendered context and political origins. Given that the psychology of women, both as subject matter and professional discipline, was created almost entirely by women, often in response to personal experiences of sexism or an acute awareness of widespread sexist assumptions about women, it is impossible to disentangle the emergence and development of the psychology of women from the women who developed it and the gendered contexts in which they worked. Furthermore, the growth of the field is closely tied to the historical trajectory of women's status and to the increasing awareness of gendered practices and their effects within the discipline of psychology.

Given the impossibility, and even undesirability, of attempting to separate out agents, context, and objects of study, we have chosen to embrace this reflexivity and use it to shape the contours of our account. Morawski and Agronick (1991), in their discussion of feminist work in experimental psychology, referred to this complex state of affairs as a "double consciousness": "Given that psychology is a reflexive science – one involving the production of truth statements about a class of objects (humans) of which the observer is a member – then women's double consciousness as women and as scientists can take even more complicated forms" (p. 569). Here, our historical account of the psychology of women engages us in a reflection on how women scientists have utilized and

A. Rutherford (✉)
York University, Toronto, ON, Canada

navigated this double consciousness as gender politics and the very definition of science have shifted over the past 100 years.

Work that could be referred to, retrospectively, as “psychology of women” began quite early in the discipline’s history (see Milar, 2000). In part, this was due to the fact that, compared to other sciences, the new psychology admitted a higher proportion of women to its professional ranks from its beginning and the proportion of women increased more rapidly than in other sciences throughout the 1920s and 1930s (Furumoto, 1987; Hogan & Sexton, 1991; Rossiter, 1982). This did not necessarily mean that psychology was less misogynistic, but rather that, as a young field, it could ill afford to turn away promising members. Women rarely rose to positions of leadership or prestige in proportion to their numbers overall, either within professional societies or in academe (see Bryan & Boring, 1946; Mitchell, 1951).

Psychology was also professionalizing at a time when first wave feminism, whose origins in the United States are traced to the historic Seneca Falls Convention in 1848, was gaining considerable momentum and social and political visibility. Suffrage activities and the increasing numbers of women entering both the industrialized work force and postsecondary education brought gender role stereotypes and social expectations about men’s and women’s behavior into sharp relief. Another cultural product of this period – the New Woman – seriously destabilized the cult of true womanhood that had cemented women’s social status for decades. Highly educated and economically independent, the New Woman of the Progressive Era “challenged existing gender relations and the distribution of power” (Smith-Rosenberg, 1985; p. 245).

First-generation women psychologists perfectly embodied the New Woman and often found themselves, by virtue of their sex and their expertise, in the position of using science to challenge persistent gender role stereotypes. Given that their male colleagues applied these stereotypes as equally to them as to women in general, this work unavoidably, although often not explicitly, served personal, political, *and* professional aims. As historian Rosalind Rosenberg (1982) has noted of the writings of late 19th and early 20th century women social scientists, “Their writings revealed. . .how the very basis of women’s understanding of themselves was changing” (p. xiv).

In the first part of this chapter, we show how many first-generation American women psychologists used the tools of their science to engage in forms of feminist activism. Based on a periodization suggested by Scarborough (1994), we first focus on the period from psychology’s inception as a scientific discipline to just after World War I. We then discuss developments from the early 1920s until the early 1970s, a period characterized more by the absence of the psychology of women than by its development, although there were some exceptions. For example, it should be noted that both Karen Horney and Clara Thompson made important critiques of psychoanalytic theory in this period that stressed the importance of social, cultural, and environmental factors on women’s psychic development (for a review of their contributions to psychology of women, see Denmark & Fernandez, 1993). We then turn to developments from the early 1970s to today. By necessity, our coverage is selective, and we emphasize definitional, epistemological, and methodological issues rather than content areas (for other recent historical overviews of the psychology of women, see Rutherford & Pickren, 2008; Marecek, Kimmel, Crawford, & Hare-Mustin, 2003). It was in this period, with the rise of the women’s liberation movement, that the psychology of women as a distinct field of inquiry began to be fully articulated and the explicit use of the term “feminist psychology” gained common currency. In fact, Stewart and Dottolo (2006) have recently suggested that “The invention of feminist psychology began in the 1970s” (p. 493). Although the institutional trappings of feminist psychology, such as textbooks, journals, organizations, courses, and conferences, certainly began and proliferated at this time, we argue (as have others; see O’Connell & Russo, 1991) that a feminist consciousness clearly informed early research on the psychology of women, even if “feminist psychology” had not yet been invented. It is also clear that, over the past

two decades, the close identification of “psychology of women” with “feminist psychology” has changed, a point to which we return later in the chapter. We conclude by presenting some thoughts about the future of the field, including some persistent dilemmas and future directions.

Psychology and/of Women: The First Wave

As we noted above, the lives and work of first-generation American women psychologists were embedded in a social context of changing gender ideals (see also Minton, 2000) and a disciplinary context of rapid professionalization (see Camfield, 1973). The increasing numbers of women in higher education and the birth of the “new psychology” were coincident with the formalization of graduate education in the United States. Although, as Scarborough and Furumoto (1987) have shown, several first-generation women psychologists were barred from graduate programs on the basis of their sex, many sought out and received training in male-only institutions despite this barrier. Mary Whiton Calkins, for example, took courses at Harvard as a guest of the university and completed all of the requirements for the degree. Christine Ladd-Franklin studied at Johns Hopkins, even though the university did not formally admit women. In 1894, after a failed attempt to work at Columbia (which did not open its doors to women until 1900), Margaret Floy Washburn was the first woman to be officially awarded a Ph.D. in psychology at Cornell University.

These first-generation American women psychologists were distinctive in a number of respects. All were White, middle-class, Protestant, and from the Northeast or Midwest (Scarborough & Furumoto, 1987). However, they were also distinctive among women scientists because, compared to more mature sciences like physics and chemistry, psychology had not yet developed rigidly separate spheres of work for male and female scientists. For a number of reasons ably discussed by Rossiter (1982), between about 1880 and 1910 there arose a separate, gender-typed labor market for highly educated women in the natural sciences. Instead of competing with men for university positions or government employment, women often took jobs as research assistants, were funneled into service professions, or were forced to take teaching-heavy jobs at women’s colleges. Although many first-generation American women psychologists were also limited to employment at women’s colleges, “women’s work” was not to become as rigidly defined in psychology until somewhat later (see Furumoto, 1987).

After World War I, with the rise and proliferation of applied psychology, many women psychologists were guided toward positions in hospitals, clinics, courts, and schools. Often these positions required only Master’s level training. In the 1920s, funds from philanthropic organizations began to be directed toward psychology, and research centers were established. One example of this philanthropy was the Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial Fund, which provided funding for work on child development and parent education in the 1920s (see Lomax, 1977). Many women, especially at institutes where anti-nepotism rules prevailed, began to take jobs as research assistants and associates at the centers established by these funds. By mid-century, many female psychologists were also implicitly and explicitly encouraged to study and pursue jobs in child/developmental psychology, a field seen as consistent with gender stereotypes about women’s nurturance and interest in children (see Cameron & Hagen, 2005).

Our point is that very early in psychology’s history, before the emergence of a separate sphere of women’s work, many of the women who were able to overcome obstacles to full participation in the discipline made important *scientific* contributions. In many cases, these contributions involved their efforts to use science to challenge or refute the sexist assumptions about women’s natures and abilities that prevailed in society at large and were largely imported wholesale into the scientific canon

of psychology. One of these prevalent assumptions, heavily influenced by Darwinian evolutionary theory, was the variability hypothesis: the belief that men exhibit greater range and variability in the distribution of psychological traits than do women, which accounts for the greater numbers of men of both superior and inferior talent and for the greater mediocrity of women. Men's greater variability – both physically and mentally – was assumed to drive evolutionary progress (see Shields, 1975a, 1982). This greater variability among men, along with beliefs about men's and women's *different* strengths, was also assumed to equip men and women for different roles in society, a view known as the complementarity hypothesis (see Shields, 2007).

To test the variability hypothesis, Joseph Jastrow, a professor at the University of Wisconsin, conducted a study in which he asked 25 female and 25 male students to write down 100 words as quickly as possible. He concluded from an examination of these lists that women produced fewer unique words, had more repetition, and included more words that refer to apparel, furniture, and food than men did (Jastrow, 1891). As he summed up: "In general we may conclude that the feminine traits revealed by this study are an attention to the immediate surroundings, to the finished product, to the ornamental, the individual, and the concrete; while the masculine preference is for the more remote, the constructive, the useful, the general, and the abstract" (pp. 565–566). He concluded that women's and men's intellects are fundamentally different and interpreted these differences to support the variability hypothesis.

Mary Whiton Calkins and Cordelia Nevers, at Wellesley College, countered Jastrow's conclusions by conducting a similar study with the "young women of the experimental psychology class of Wellesley College" (Nevers & Calkins, 1895, p. 363). Their research failed to replicate Jastrow's results and, in fact, told quite a different story about women's variability. They concluded that, although theirs was not a completely comparable study, their "uncompromising contradiction" of Jastrow's data was warning enough that conclusions about the difference between men's and women's intellects were circumspect and often based on "purely personal observation" (p. 367). Further exchange between Jastrow and Calkins followed. Jastrow claimed that methodological differences between his study and Calkins' invalidated her results. She claimed that they did not and further argued that the enterprise of making distinctions between the intellects of men and women were "futile and impossible, because of our entire inability to eliminate the effect of environment" (p. 430). This dialogue became known as the "community of ideas" debate, and it was one of the first efforts by women psychologists to challenge prevailing scientific and cultural beliefs about gender differences (see also Tanner, 1896).

Helen Thompson-Woolley, who earned her Ph.D. at the University of Chicago in 1900, produced the first dissertation in psychology on sex differences, *The Mental Traits of Sex* (Thompson, 1903). Supported in her work by a particularly progressive academic and professional environment at Chicago, she conducted a review of the scientific literature on the status of sex differences and concluded that there was more confusion and contradiction than scientific substance. She then undertook an empirical investigation of the motor and sensory abilities of a group of 50 University of Chicago undergraduates: 25 women and 25 men (for a detailed discussion of this work and its context, see Rosenberg, 1982). Instead of reporting results for each test in terms of averages, Thompson-Woolley graphed the distributions of both men and women and noted that, in every case, the curves almost completely overlapped. In addition, although there were a small number of reliable average differences between the two groups (e.g., on motor ability and puzzle solving), women and men were actually more similar than different on most tasks including her admittedly crude tests of emotionality, a trait believed to be highly sex-typed. On tasks that did show reliable differences, Thompson-Woolley cautioned strongly against hereditarian interpretations and argued forcefully for a consideration of the ways girls and boys, women and men, were socialized differently and consistently encountered radically different environments and social expectations. In many ways,

Thompson-Woolley's arguments remain as relevant – and necessary – today as they were over 100 years ago.

One of the students most influenced by Thompson-Woolley's work was Leta Stetter Hollingworth. Hollingworth published numerous studies to debunk stereotypes about women, including another critique of the variability hypothesis (Hollingworth, 1914b; also see Shields, 1975b). She also conducted an empirical study to challenge the widespread belief that the mental and motor abilities of women became impaired during menstruation (Hollingworth, 1914a). Like Calkins and Woolley before her, throughout her work Hollingworth emphasized the differential effects of environment, culture, and social expectations in any explanation of presumed or demonstrated sex differences. The emphasis on these differential effects as an explanatory mechanism is a notable and relatively consistent feature in the sex differences work of first-generation women. One might conclude that, for this group of early women scientists, the first-hand experience of these differential effects rendered a psychology based heavily on hereditarian explanations irrelevant to, and unrepresentative of, their lived experience.

Although highly respected among their male peers, Calkins, Thompson-Woolley, and Hollingworth practiced insurgent science, and their numbers were relatively small. Their work did not give rise to a field called psychology of women. Although American women gained national suffrage in 1920, this victory signaled the beginning of a period of quiescence in terms of feminist activism. The rise of a distinct realm of women's work in psychology, as mentioned earlier, combined with the economic pressures of the Great Depression, diverted attention from the scientific debates on sex differences within psychology. However, with the advent of World War II (WWII), a group of women psychologists were impelled to collective action and formed the first organization explicitly designed to advance women's interests in psychology and to address the underrepresentation of women on committees and in professional organizations. By drawing attention to the "woman problem," these feminist activists challenged the myth of a meritocratic ideal of professional advancement that so many of their male peers unquestioningly accepted. Once again, their own experiences, as women and as scientists, revealed a different story.

Psychology and/of Women at Mid-century

It is no understatement to say that professional psychology benefitted from World War I (WWI). It was during the Great War that psychologists developed and used the intelligence test on a massive scale and appeared to prove their usefulness to society at large. As Samelson (1977) has stated, WWI helped put psychology "on the map" (p. 280). Thus, when WWII began, psychologists were ready to lend their expertise and take advantage of wartime opportunities. In 1940, an Emergency Committee in Psychology (ECP) was formed to assume responsibility for the mobilization of psychologists in the war effort. Initially, there were no women included on the committee, moreover, it quickly became clear that committee members were not disposed to including their female colleagues in their plans for professional mobilization. This "oversight" provoked a group of about 30 women to confront one of the ECP members with their concerns. The group was admonished to be patient and to wait quietly until plans could be made that would include them (Schwesinger, 1943). Although women psychologists had much to offer the war effort, their potential contributions appeared to have been completely overlooked.

Almost 2 years later, the ECP's promised plans had still not appeared. It was clear that collective action was called for. A group of about 50 New York women psychologists, many of them involved in applied work, began meeting to discuss how they could use their professional skills in

the national emergency. In November, a subgroup of these women met in the Manhattan apartment of research and consulting psychologist Alice Bryan to draw up a charter for a national organization of women psychologists. On December 8, 1941, 1 day after news of the bombing of Pearl Harbor, the National Council of Women Psychologists (NCWP) was formed. Florence Goodenough, a respected psychological scientist at the University of Minnesota, was selected as president. Although not particularly sympathetic to the “woman problem,” Goodenough was willing to lend her name to a group that would apply their considerable expertise to needed areas. By the middle of 1942, almost 250 doctoral-level women psychologists had joined the NCWP (Capshaw & Laszlo, 1986).

From the beginning, there was some disagreement over the group’s objectives. Although fully aware that they were being edged out of military positions because of their gender and were not being invited to fill vacant academic positions, women were reluctant to make the NCWP simply a clearinghouse for charges of sex discrimination. As Bryan remarked, in the devastating aftermath of Pearl Harbor “Winning the war had to be given first priority” (Bryan, 1986, p. 184). However, as Capshaw and Laszlo (1986) have argued, male psychologists and leaders in the ECP used subtle strategies to undermine the group’s feminist resolve. Many vehemently denied that sex discrimination existed in psychology and suggested that, in drawing attention to perceived discrimination at a time of national emergency, women were being self-centered. Another prominently held view was that, by drawing attention to sex-based inequities, women were undermining their status as scientists for whom pure merit would determine professional success (a position certainly held by many women in this period as well; see Johnston & Johnson, 2008). Nonetheless, the formation of the NCWP marked the first time women had come together with the explicit aim of professional advancement. They offered their services to help select women for the military, prepared recommendations on how to remain calm during war, and gave child-rearing advice to working mothers, among other initiatives (for summaries of the group’s contributions to the war effort, see Capshaw & Laszlo, 1986; Napoli, 1981; for a comparison of the NCWP with later groups for women, see Walsh, 1985).

In 1942, Alice Bryan was invited to serve on the ECP Subcommittee on Survey and Planning, which was charged with reorganizing the American Psychological Association (APA). She was the only woman in the group. Here she met Edwin Boring, a Harvard experimental psychologist. Her acquaintance with Boring resulted in an interesting collaboration that demonstrates the double consciousness of being a woman scientist in this period. Like other male psychologists, Boring was becoming increasingly provoked by Bryan’s repeated assertions that women did not hold proportionate representation in APA offices. Always the empiricist, Boring suggested that he and Bryan, as fellow-scientists, collaborate on an empirical study of the problem.

Their collaboration resulted in three articles published in the *Psychological Bulletin* and the *American Psychologist* between 1944 and 1947 (Bryan & Boring, 1944, 1946, 1947). The reports are notable for their detachment, neutrality, and absence of interpretation. As a scientist, Bryan was obliged to play the role of detached data gatherer, and, even though the data clearly vindicated her original claim, the reports are strangely quiet about what might have caused these disparities. In his autobiography, Boring characterized their collaboration as one in which Bryan, with her feminist convictions, and he, with his conviction that women, for both biological and cultural reasons, “determined most of the conditions about which she complained” (Boring, 1961, p. 72), could potentially moderate each other’s positions and reveal the truth. However, in an effort to work together amicably, the pair sidestepped their ideological differences and presented their results – which clearly vindicated Bryan’s suspicions that women were underrepresented – in largely descriptive format (for more information on the collaboration and its results, see Capshaw, 1999).

Boring (1951), however, clearly revealed his interpretive biases in a sole-authored article entitled “The Woman Problem.” What was the “woman problem”? As Boring wrote, in terms of their

positions in APA, “professional women acquire less prestige than professional men ‘in proportion to their numbers’” (Boring, 1951, p. 679). In this short, expository essay, he ventured that two of the primary reasons for women’s proportionate lack of prestige were (1) a natural predisposition on the part of women to prefer “particularistic” tasks (i.e., understanding single cases, as in clinical work) over the work of generalization that was the true calling of the scientist and (2) that women suffered from “job concentration” difficulties. Because, he reasoned, the culture tends to reward scientific work (large theories and broad policies) and fanaticism, it is no wonder that women would experience conflict between professional success and family orientation. He tackled the question of whether a woman could become such a fanatic (a “168-hour” person) and still remain marriageable. He concluded that indeed she could, but that she must be “abnormally bright to combine charm with concentration” and noted that some women “make the synthesis by being charmingly enthusiastic” (p. 681).

Ultimately, as Boring’s comments intimate, the immediate pre- and postwar periods did not provide a particularly hospitable environment for feminist activism or for the proliferation of research on the psychology of women. Neither did women psychologists necessarily benefit from the postwar economic boom (Walsh, 1985). Men quickly filled both the academic positions they had previously dominated *and* the newly prestigious clinical positions that had previously been at least partly relegated to the “women’s sphere.” Whereas rules prohibiting the employment of married women had restricted first-generation women psychologists, anti-nepotism rules in turn affected the career placement and advancement of many second-generation women. Many resorted to lower-paid research assistant positions in order to follow their husbands (for a discussion of dual-career couples in psychology, see Russo & O’Connell, 1980).

As Johnston and Johnson (2008) have recently shown, women in psychology’s second generation were also more racially and religiously diverse than their first-generation counterparts. Thus, many experienced the double jeopardy of racism and sexism (e.g., Mamie Phipps Clark) or anti-Semitism and sexism (e.g., Mary Henle). It was not until the 1930s that the first African American women were awarded Ph.D.s in psychology (see Guthrie, 1998). Inez Prosser received her Ph.D. in educational psychology in 1933 but tragically died a year later (Benjamin, Henry, & McMahon, 2005). Ruth Howard received her Ph.D. in psychology in 1934 at the University of Minnesota (Guthrie, 1998; Howard, 1983). One of the most well-known African American women psychologists Mamie Phipps Clark was awarded her Ph.D. in 1944. Clark quickly perceived the paucity of opportunities available to her as a Black woman in psychology, and she set about creating her own opportunities. She established the Northside Center for Child Development in 1946 and served as its director until her retirement in 1979 (Clark, 1983; Lal, 2002).

Despite these obstacles, a small number of psychologists in this period continued to carry out work on the psychology of women. A notable example is Georgene Seward, a Columbia-trained social and clinical psychologist. In 1944, Seward turned her attention to the still-entrenched belief that women’s performance and productivity became impaired during menstruation (Seward, 1944a). She noted, “Today when women are playing an increasingly important part in winning the war, the question of their reputed biological handicaps becomes especially pertinent” (p. 90). First she reviewed experimental evidence on “menstrual handicaps” and found no reliable differences between menstruating women and controls on either basic or complex laboratory tasks. She reiterated that whatever differences were found on *subjective reports* of impairment had to be interpreted in the light of the overwhelming negative value placed on menstruation by social tradition. She then reviewed studies that examined how menstruation affected women at work. In terms of productivity and absenteeism, she found highly variable results, including cross-cultural differences. In discussing these results, she remarked, “Although for centuries women have been exploited as cheap labor, society has continued to assume a paternalistic attitude toward them, emphasizing their ‘need’ for special

protection. These protective devices actually have ‘protected’ only economic inequalities between the sexes, justified on the assumption of biological inequalities” (p. 93). She concluded that, as social mores regarding the handicap of menstruation shifted, women would be liberated from a “code of menstrual invalidism” that would “enable them confidently to assume their places beside men in the work of the world” (p. 99).

Seward was also intensely interested in the topic of gender roles and postwar planning (see Seward, 1944b). She was involved in a joint NCWP and Society for the Psychological Study of Social Issues Committee on Roles of Men and Women in Postwar Society and published a book in 1946 called *Sex and the Social Order*. The majority of the book presented a survey of psychological studies of sex from rats and chicks to human beings, from which she concluded that, as one moved further up the evolutionary scale, sex differences had increasingly social rather than biological origins. Despite this, social roles were almost always assigned in humans on the basis of biological sex, which creates psychological distress and emotional conflict in women. In the last chapter of her book, Seward noted that WWII had afforded many women the opportunity to participate fully in the work force, often in traditionally masculine occupations. She argued that the successful pursuit of democracy in postwar society depended on supporting women’s roles as *both* workers and mothers, or, as she put it, “Victory for the democratic way of living means a democratic reformulation of sex roles” (Seward, 1946, p. 249). In order to bring about this reformulation, Seward recommended (1) the elevation of the traditionally feminine values of giving and loving and their expression in the socialization of every child; (2) economic reform that would enable, and indeed require, the equal participation of both women and men in the system of production; (3) cooperative housing and day-care to relieve the worker-mother of the sole burden of domestic responsibilities; and (4) increased training in mathematics and mechanics for girls and more parent training for boys in the context of a co-educational system that would prepare women and men to share equally in the world’s work.

Seward’s recommendations seem utopian even today. In fact, the 1950s brought almost a complete reversion to traditional gender roles for men and women, despite Seward’s proposals for reform, and despite the fact that many married women and mothers *did* work outside the home (Helson, 1972). As Morawski (1994) has noted, “The decades following Seward’s systematic appraisal, however, produced a quite different understanding of sex and gender, realizing not hers, but another’s postwar agenda” (p. 41). This was a period, as we have noted above, in which research on the psychology of women did not proliferate, and women’s leadership in professional organizations and institutions actually declined in comparison to psychology’s first 30 years (Scarborough, 1994). Social unrest was fomenting, however. This foment came in the form of the beginnings of the civil rights movement in the 1950s. This movement would provide a model for other liberation struggles during the 1960s, one of which was the women’s liberation movement. It was not until the upsurge of second-wave feminism in the late 1960s that organized psychology would again be called upon to re-examine its professional treatment of women and confront issues of sex discrimination. Debates about sex differences and the importance of social context in understanding the psychology of women, along with feminist psychologists’ demands that psychology acknowledge and reform its sexist and androcentric practices, would prove catalytic in the formation of a new sub-discipline.

The Feminist Revolution in Psychology

Emergence of a Psychology for Women

In 1968, feminist neuroscientist Naomi Weisstein delivered a critique of psychology that would become a feminist classic. In her paper, entitled “Psychology Constructs the Female,” Weisstein

used recently published studies in social psychology to illustrate the importance of situational variables and experimenter demands in determining behavior and to demonstrate that trait and biological theories were inadequate to explain women's lives because they ignored the social conditions under which women lived and social expectations about women. The paper was published by the New England Free Press that year, then revised and published again in 1971 with the expanded title: "Psychology Constructs the Female; or, The Fantasy Life of the Male Psychologist (With Some Attention to the Fantasies of his Friends, the Male Biologist and the Male Anthropologist)" (Weisstein, 1971). The article was subsequently reprinted about two dozen times.

Although Weisstein followed in the pattern of earlier psychologists in using psychological science to critique hypotheses or beliefs that supported sexist or essentialist assumptions about women, she did so with a twist. Whereas Calkins, Woolley, and Hollingworth had performed empirical studies to test the validity of the theories themselves and consistently urged an environmental versus hereditarian interpretation of their results, Weisstein used the scientific literature in social psychology that showed the incredible power of social expectations in shaping behavior to critique any scientific theory about women's (or indeed anyone's) behavior that did not take this level of explanation into account. Whereas earlier generations of women psychologists drew on their personal experiences with the power of social expectations to urge the re-evaluation of scientific theories and popular beliefs about women, Weisstein had at her disposal a body of experimental findings and empirical evidence to prove the negative effects of social expectations on women's lives.

Weisstein's critique of psychology was timely. By the late 1960s, many women psychologists began to be supported in their belief in the power of context to shape behavior, not only by Weisstein's critique, but by the rising crest of the second wave of the women's movement. Structural inequities between men and women and rampant sex discrimination were exposed and protested. Betty Friedan's *The Feminine Mystique* (1963) resonated with, yet de-centered, many women, including female psychologists. The consistent pathologization of femininity was also a call to activism. In 1972, psychologist Phyllis Chesler published *Women and Madness*, which exposed the double bind that psychiatry and psychology imposed on women: Stepping outside the norms of femininity was expressly discouraged as a sign of maladjustment to the feminine gender role, yet overadherence to gender norms (e.g., emotionally expressive, relationally dependent) was a sign of psychiatric pathology (Chesler, 1972). Research and theorizing on women, previously marginalized or practiced by a few women (as we have discussed), was legitimized and invigorated. It was in this period that the psychology of women coalesced as a distinct field. Textbooks appeared (e.g., Bardwick, 1971; Sherman, 1971; Unger & Denmark, 1975), courses were developed, societies and organizations were formed (e.g., Association for Women in Psychology, see Tiefer, 1991; APA Division 35 – The Psychology of Women, see Mednick & Urbanski, 1991; Russo & Dumont, 1997), and eventually journals were established (e.g., *Sex Roles* in 1975; *Psychology of Women Quarterly* in 1976; *Women & Therapy* in 1982; *Feminism & Psychology* in 1991).

Not all were happy with the term "psychology of women." In the first review of the area for the women's studies journal *Signs*, Mary Parlee (1975) referred to the notion of a "psychology of women" as a "conceptual monstrosity" (p. 120). She argued that it would confirm and perpetuate the notion that psychology proper (the rest of psychology) was by, for, and of men. She expressed concern that psychology of women might simply become a catch-all category for any research on women, even if that work perpetuated sexist assumptions. She then organized her review of the literature using a framework suggested by Nancy Henley. She placed bodies of research into three categories: psychology *of* women (empirical work on sex differences, sex roles, and other topics); psychology *against* women (studies that explore why traditional psychology has failed to produce relevant understandings of women and suggestions for new research, including Weisstein's article mentioned above); and psychology *for* women. In this last category Parlee placed the work of

feminist psychologists and defined a *feminist psychologist* as someone who “is both a feminist (as the dictionary defines this term) and a psychologist and whose research is in an area where a psychologist’s perspective on feminism affects the way she or he formulates problems and questions” (p. 131).

After reviewing important studies in the first two categories, including Eleanor Maccoby and Carol Jacklin’s landmark review of sex differences research (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974) and Matina Horner’s fear of success studies (Horner, 1972; for a critique see Tresemer, 1977), Parlee then explored three research areas to which *feminist* psychologists had begun to contribute. The first was the study of phenomena that, according to Parlee, would be obvious from a feminist point of view but which had remained invisible to the rest of psychology. For example, Broverman, Broverman, Clarkson, Rosenkrantz, and Vogel (1970) had shown that experts’ descriptions of mentally healthy men and women paralleled stereotypic conceptions of masculinity and femininity, that is, mentally healthy men were described as having stereotypically masculine traits and mentally healthy women were described as having stereotypically feminine traits. When asked to describe a healthy adult (sex unspecified), experts’ descriptions were closer to their descriptions of a healthy man than a healthy woman. Much of the work Parlee surveyed in this category involved investigations of femininity and masculinity and the way these concepts organize reactions, evaluations, decisions, and behaviors.

In her second category of feminist research, Parlee described studies in which a feminist approach to women’s experiences forced a reinterpretation of traditional theories or bodies of data. She offered Sandra Bem’s work on androgyny as an example (Bem, 1974). Bem suggested that masculinity and femininity, instead of residing at opposite ends of a continuum, were actually independent dimensions. She developed a sex role inventory to measure endorsement of masculine and feminine characteristics and proposed the concept of androgyny to capture the phenomenon of equal endorsement of typically masculine and feminine traits. With the concept of androgyny, researchers could move beyond masculinity and femininity to explore more complex interactions and develop new theory.

Finally, Parlee outlined a third category of studies by feminist psychologists. In this research, women’s behavior and experience were explored within the context of an already well-developed theoretical frame that had hitherto paid little attention to women as a group or gender as a variable. Here she included some examples of unpublished work using operant conditioning theory to explain how sex-typed behaviors were learned and maintained, as well as the use of attribution theory to understand women’s experience and the operation of sex role stereotypes. For example, social psychologists Deaux and Emswiller published a study in 1974 that showed that college students attributed the success of a female stimulus person on an experimental task to luck. Success by a male stimulus person on the same task was attributed to ability or skill (Deaux & Emswiller, 1974). Here Parlee also discussed Nancy Henley’s emerging work on the politics of touch. Henley (1973) used sociolinguistic theories on relative status in dyads to explore why women were touched by men more than they touched men. She then expanded this work to include how the effects of status, sex, and power are often conflated and are expressed through nonverbal behavior (Henley, 1977).

Four years later, Parlee (1979) wrote another review essay for *Signs*. Here she stated that her use of the phrase “psychology of women” explicitly referred to research and theory that was *for* women and noted that feminist psychologists had prevailed in owning their discipline so that people doing sexist research on women no longer used the label for their work. She discussed the increasing vigor of the field in terms of numbers of researchers and their visibility in professional associations. She also noted that feminist psychologists were beginning to investigate previously unexamined topics that lent themselves to interdisciplinary analysis, such as rape, domestic violence, conversational interactions, and women’s health.

In that article, Parlee (1979) also highlighted the growing unease with positivist philosophies of science, not only in psychology of women but, to some extent, in psychology generally. The limitations of positivism's preferred method – the laboratory experiment – were being acknowledged across many subfields of psychology (see Elms, 1975). The context-stripping required of this method seemed dramatically to limit ecological validity, generalizability, and, consequently, the social usefulness of laboratory results. Moreover, despite claims of almost 100 years of value-free science, it was finally becoming clear to many psychologists that social values often masqueraded as scientific fact. As Carolyn Sherif wrote in her now-classic paper "Bias in Psychology" published in 1979, "If the possibility and existence of sexist bias was recognized by the turn of this century, why and how could academic and non-academic psychology continue to perpetuate its myths up to the present?" (Sherif, 1979/1998, p. 61). Sherif then reviewed the dominant beliefs conducive to bias in psychology and conducted what amounted to as an exposé of the pitfalls of the experimental laboratory method as applied to psychology. She introduced the important and powerful feminist idea that beliefs about the proper way to pursue knowledge – the ways we *formulate* questions, *execute* their investigation, and *interpret* the results – are all potential sources of bias that influence the kinds of knowledge we generate.

Also in 1979, Rhoda Unger published "Toward a Redefinition of Sex and Gender in Psychology," which formally introduced psychologists to the distinction between biological sex and gender as a social construction (although Vaughter, 1976 had earlier discussed the distinction in the women's studies journal *Signs* and Bem's work acknowledged this distinction). Her article also built upon Sherif's work in an important way. Unger (1979) suggested that questions about sex differences, which had captured both the popular and scientific imaginations throughout psychology's history, were questions that arose predominantly from a framework that privileges the biological basis of women's presumed inferiority. These were, she argued, *someone else's* questions, often pursued for the purpose of maintaining or supporting the status quo, rather than changing it. Unger elaborated on the relationship between methodology and epistemology in her classic paper "Through the Looking Glass: No Wonderland Yet! The Reciprocal Relationship between Methodology and Models of Reality" (Unger, 1983; see also Rutherford, 2007). Just as Weisstein's 1968 article had been a "feminist shot that ricocheted down the halls between psychology's laboratories and clinics, hitting its target dead-center" (Sherif, 1979/1998, p. 58), so were Sherif's and Unger's calls for an examination of feminist epistemology to ricochet down the halls of feminist psychology in the 1980s.

Emergence of Feminist Practice

One other important area of development should be noted before we turn to a closer look at some of these epistemological debates: feminist critiques of clinical psychology and the emergence and development of feminist therapy and counseling (see Brodsky, 1980; Gilbert & Osipow, 1991; Marecek & Hare-Mustin, 1991). During the 1970s, feminist psychologists were among other groups who protested the inclusion of homosexuality as an official diagnosis in the *Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders*. They also protested the inclusion of categories that pathologized women's behavior and experiences, such as self-defeating personality disorder and late luteal phase dysphoric disorder (Caplan, 1992; Parlee, 1994). It also became clear that the sexual abuse of female clients by male therapists was occurring with alarming regularity, but, more disturbing, it was considered a beneficial and acceptable therapeutic practice by many perpetrators. The ethics of sexual contact in therapy had been neither adequately debated nor developed

(Hare-Mustin, 1974). In 1977 feminist psychologists were successful in having the Ethics Code of the American Psychological Association changed to prohibit sexual contact between therapist and client (Marecek & Hare-Mustin, 1991).

Feminists did more than critique existing practices. They also developed new ones (see Brodsky & Hare-Mustin, 1980). Early in the 1970s, freestanding feminist therapy collectives sprang up across the United States. With little or no theory upon which to develop precise therapeutic practices other than the feminist maxim “the personal is political,” feminist therapists drew upon the consciousness-raising movement for a model of how to empower and work with women (Kravetz, 1980; for a history of consciousness raising and its relationship to therapeutic culture, see Rosenthal, 1984). Gradually, therapeutic models were refined and some common principles emerged: greater power sharing and collaboration in the therapist–client relationship; an emphasis on structural rather than intrapsychic explanations for women’s problems; and respect for all forms of diversity. The incorporation of the Feminist Therapy Institute in 1983 provided a professional home for feminist therapists and continues to serve as a center for training in feminist principles. It has developed and disseminated an important code of Feminist Therapy Ethics to guide feminist practice.

Over the next two decades, feminist therapists addressed problems that affected women, such as body image and eating problems, relational issues, domestic violence, sexual abuse, homophobia, and racism. Today, feminist therapists continue to develop models for working with clients from diverse backgrounds that address the complex intersections of gender, ethnicity, sexual orientation, socioeconomic status, and other important variables in their clients’ lives (Brown, 1995). Much of this work has been conducted by feminist psychologists who themselves experience these intersections. Their work is informed and enriched by this reflexivity (see Chin, 2000; Comas-Díaz, 1987).

Epistemological Debates and Methodological Developments of the 1980s and 1990s

The feminist critique of psychological science that began in the late 1960s with Weisstein’s insistence on the importance of social context was developed further in the late 1970s and coalesced in the 1980s and 1990s. Feminist psychologists began to challenge not only the deficiencies of the scientific method as practiced within their discipline, but the very philosophy on which it was based (for a review of this critique, see Teo, 2005). This positivist philosophy claimed that good science proceeds progressively and cumulatively, using rationality, objectivity, and a detached neutrality toward its subject matter. The goal of positivist science is to uncover universal truths. Feminist philosophers and scientists objected to this characterization of “rational” science and argued that “truths” discovered in positivist science were andocentric and biased at every level, including the underlying theories, methods, goals, and interpretations guiding the research (Harding, 1986, 1991). Feminist physicist Evelyn Fox-Keller (1985) argued that positivist science focused too heavily on objectivity and that the rigid separation of the researcher from the researched was a distinctly masculine trait that was more about power and control than about value neutrality in research.

This feminist critique of science was itself influenced by the major social and political upheavals of the 1970s. Second-wave feminism was characterized by protests to challenge discrimination against women in all domains of private and public life. The political activities of organizations such as the National Organization for Women (NOW), the explosion of consciousness-raising groups around the country, and the cresting of the civil rights movement in the United States, de-centered and re-organized not only traditional social roles and systems, but academic and intellectual systems

as well. Furthermore, de-colonial and liberation struggles throughout the world led to the overthrow of traditional power structures and centers of authority. As critical theorist Chela Sandoval (2000) has written, “the period from the last half of the nineteenth century through the 1970s can be seen as a cultural breach replete with myriad forms of de-colonial events. . . . [T]he rationality of Western thought can be said to have found its limits in the twentieth century. . . . permitting a release of new knowledges in the sciences, arts, and humanities” (p. 8).

Feminist psychologists who worked in academic institutions in the 1960s and 1970s were heavily influenced by the political and cultural activities of the women’s movement, as we have already discussed. Some were also influenced by the feminist critique of science, and began acting on these critiques, both by introducing them into psychology and by incorporating them into their research (Marecek, 2001). Perhaps most significant was that the notion of deconstructing one’s epistemology and methods in order to understand the underlying assumptions guiding one’s research became a staple of the feminist critique of positivist psychology.

Feminist psychologists drew on writings from the broader feminist critique of science to articulate several important shortcomings of mainstream psychology. They pointed out the historical absence of women as participants in psychological research (Carlson & Carlson, 1961; Langton, 2000; Riger, 1992), the lack of attention to power and its relationship to gender in psychological theorizing (Yoder & Kahn, 1992), and the continued lack of attention to social context, including the ways in which variables such as social status, personal and cultural history, and the beliefs and values of both the researcher and the researched affect outcomes (see Fox & Prilleltensky, 1997). Feminist critics have also argued that western psychological epistemology is based on individualism and on the Cartesian mind/body split, a masculine ontology that discriminates against women’s ways of knowing and reasoning (Sampson, 1985; Shildrick, 1997). Carol Gilligan’s critique of Kohlberg’s moral theory is a prominent example of one outcome of this critique within psychology (Gilligan, 1982). Three feminist responses to the criticisms of science, originally proposed by Harding (1986), have been incorporated into psychology. They include feminist empiricism, feminist standpoint theory, and feminist postmodernism (see Riger, 1992).

Feminist Empiricism

Feminist empiricism is the most common epistemological approach used in psychology to counter gender biases in experiments (Morawski, 1990). This approach is based on the assumption that positivistic science is a sound way to generate truth and that, once methodological “errors” are removed, the findings that emerge from this kind of science will represent a close approximation of reality that is applicable universally. The major criticism of this approach is that, even when positivistic research is designated as “feminist,” it is often still saturated with technical flaws including experimental biases, poorly represented samples, faulty measurement techniques, and misrepresentation of data. Researchers have thus countered feminist empiricism with the charge that methods can never reveal “reality,” as no science, including a feminist empiricist one, can be separated from the social and political practices of which it is a part (Wilkinson, 1997). Furthermore, feminists have noted that “empiricist science takes the male gaze as the natural perspective and continues to place women as the problematized Other. The antimonies of empiricism lend validity to certain descriptions of reality and disadvantage other accounts” (Hare-Mustin & Marecek, 1990, p. 170). Some theorists have thus concluded that the potential of feminist empiricism is overshadowed by its entanglement in cultural gender binaries and should be abandoned for feminist standpoint epistemologies.

Feminist Standpoint Epistemologies

Feminist standpoint epistemologies claim that we should “center our science on women because what we know and how we know depend on who we are, that is, on the knower’s historical locus and his or her position in the social hierarchy” (Riger, 1992, p. 733). In other words, feminist standpoint epistemologies argue that women’s material experiences privilege their understanding of their world and thus put them in the best position to think, reflect, and report on their own lives. In addition to asserting that knowledge claims are best made from women’s lived situations, this theory also advocates understanding these accounts through the predominant social structures in which they are situated.

Whereas feminist empiricism claims that research is validated through methodological rigor, feminist standpoint theory argues that validity of research findings can be determined through the lens of subjectivity and self-reflexivity. Feminist standpoint theory posits that we can only arrive at objectivity through self-situating within our social, cultural, and political landscape. It challenges an empirical epistemology that emphasizes objectivity and neutrality by emphasizing the importance of subjectivity in producing knowledge (see Code, 1991; Harding, 1991; Lloyd, 1993).

Feminist standpoint theory became increasingly popular in the 1980s and 1990s. Marecek (2001) has noted that, although empiricist methods were valuable for “the feminist research program of the 1960s and 1970s,” a program that was “intended to challenge claims that women were deficient in cognitive abilities and other qualities needed for success in work and public life” (p. 256), 1980s feminists moved from gaining equal rights in the workplace to focusing on distinctly feminine strengths that they claimed were particular to women. In line with political changes in the United States, namely, a shift away from the radical 1960s progressivism to the far more conservative Reagan era of the early 1980s, American feminist discourse also changed. It moved from emphasizing equal rights and the similarities between the sexes to delineating and glorifying “feminine traits” such as maternal thinking (Ruddick, 1989) and a relationship-oriented morality (Bohan, 1993). As mentioned above, perhaps the best-known example of this approach is Carol Gilligan’s theory that women have a unique feminine sensibility and an ethic of care that prizes compassion, nurture, and relationships over impartial justice and individual achievement (Gilligan, 1982; for other examples, see Belenky, Clinchey, Goldberger, & Tarule, 1986; Chodorow, 1978).

Theory generated from this perspective has revealed a plethora of alternative epistemologies that have enriched notions of both who and what can be known (see, for example, Collins, 2000; Corker, 2001; Langton, 2000; Moya, 2001). Some, however, have pointed out that this approach can potentially essentialize and universalize the notion of woman (Morawski, 1990). Assuming a “woman’s voice” or a “woman’s way of knowing” can lead to the obfuscation of the profound, often incommensurable, differences among women of various classes, races, sexual identities, and geographies.

Feminist Postmodernism

Feminist postmodernism is a theoretical frame that was built around the central tenets of the poststructuralist or postmodern movement. Postmodern thinkers challenge the positivist empirical scientific tradition and claim that human beings cannot be understood outside of their culture or history. One of the most prominent and influential thinkers in this genre was Michel Foucault (1977, 1980), a psychologist and philosopher who began with the assumption of historical and cultural interconnection and proposed that knowledge cannot be separated from power. Foucault argued

that all “truths” are constructed and inexorably linked to the knowledge/power binary. This binary “emphasizes the way that knowledge is not dispassionate but rather an integral part of struggles over power. . . it also draws attention to the way that, in producing knowledge, one is also making a claim for power” (Mills, 2003, p. 69). In other words, all knowledge claims are infused with power and thus are always political.

Whereas feminist standpoint theory posits individuals to be active in constructing their realities, feminist postmodernism argues that women’s knowledge and behavior are mediated through the discursive power structures that are patriarchal and androcentric and thus discriminate against women. Feminist postmodernists state that, although positivistic science appears to be value-free, it is actually shrouded in neutrality that promotes the masculine conception of reality that functions to maintain men’s power interests, and they examine the development of particular forms of knowledge to ask questions about why certain knowledge claims are deemed “truer” than others. These psychologists begin with the Foucauldian assumption that knowledge is deeply entangled with power and that language and power are also inextricably bound together (Hare-Mustin & Marecek, 1990; Hepburn, 1999). They use these assumptions to deconstruct accepted “truths” to reveal their political repercussions (Nightingale & Neilands, 1997).

The major criticism of feminist postmodernism is that it argues for the equivalence of multiple truths, thereby leading to a rejection of all evaluative criteria. If all truths are determined by the power/knowledge binary, then all knowledge claims can hold potentially equal value at the right cultural or historical moment. For example, at this point in time, positivist empirical research in psychology is considered to be the “truth” because of the power structures that uphold this epistemology as the appropriate way of knowing. This is upheld regardless of the validity of the theory. According to this reasoning, all truths or all methods can potentially hold the same power of claiming truth if the “knower” has enough power to assert it (for a discussion of the perceived incompatibility between relativism and feminism, see Hepburn, 2000).

Feminist Methods

The infiltration of feminist epistemologies in psychology has led many psychologists to think about the possibility of a feminist method. One of the first social scientists to write about feminist methodology was Shulamit Reinharz (1979/1992) who argued that, although there is no single feminist method, there is a common feminist epistemological approach. In other words, regardless of what methodological tools are used, it is the underlying assumptions guiding the research that make it feminist. She argued that a researcher committed to taking gender, class, race, and other social, historical, and cultural facts into account when conducting research is conducting feminist research. Moreover, a person who is aware of the patriarchal influences that shape and constrain the lives of one’s participants is also using a feminist method regardless of the specific research tools employed.

Common to all feminist psychological approaches is the belief that no method is neutral and that the very act of choosing a certain way to study something or someone will constrain what can be found (see Crawford & Kimmel, 1999; Unger, 1983). The second point that is common to all feminist approaches is that, in addition to taking gender into consideration as an explanatory variable, social class, race, ethnicity, religious background, and sexual orientation are also central to understanding any given phenomenon (Crawford & Unger, 2004).

Within psychology, several feminist methods have been proposed. Gergen (1988) has suggested that a feminist method should include these principles: (1) recognizing the interdependence of experimenter and participant; (2) avoiding the decontextualizing of participants or experimenters from

their social and historical contexts; (3) recognizing and revealing the nature of one's values within the research context; (4) accepting that facts do not exist independent of their producers' linguistic codes; (5) demystifying the role of the scientist to establish an egalitarian relationship between researcher and participant; and finally (6) acknowledging the interdependent relationship between science and its consumers.

There have also been debates about the actual methodological tools to be used in feminist psychological studies. Some feminists have suggested that, instead of experiments and questionnaires, feminist researchers should turn to qualitative methods and/or personal documents to be used as primary sources (Teo, 2005). The conclusion of these debates often harkens back to Reinharz's original proposal that one's epistemological stance (the assumptions and goals in the research process), rather than the tools themselves, make any research project a feminist endeavor.

Building a Multicultural Psychology of Women

There will not be valid theories of the psychology of women as long. . . as these theories are based on a very limited sector of the population. . . the whole issue of inclusion is not about "affirmative action" but rather about the nature of knowledge, both in the psychology of women and in the discipline of psychology as a whole. The theories and the research we now have are, for the most part, incomplete and faulty pieces of knowledge, no matter how elegant they seem. (Espin, 1995, p. 73)

The multicultural movement in psychology advocates and enforces respect and appreciation for diversity and works to achieve greater inclusiveness in the discipline as a whole (Pope, Reynolds, & Mueller, 2004). Just as women have historically been studied from a man's perspective, the study of psychology has typically been conducted from the viewpoint of White, middle-class researchers, and participants. This has unreflectively generated a body of theory and praxis that is unrepresentative of an increasing majority of the American population, and which is often exported unsuccessfully to other cultures and contexts around the world (see Enriquez, 1987).

One of the main concerns of the multicultural movement is the ethnocentrism of mainstream psychology and the negative effects of universalizing this knowledge. The United States' dominance in matters of economy and media has led to what is termed the globalization movement. Globalization has led not only to the wholesale importation of American products and goods but also the spread of American values and ideologies around the world. Rather than diversifying psychology, the globalization of the discipline has led "third world countries" to be importers of American psychological knowledge instead of exporters of their own knowledge (Moghaddam, 1996). Teo (2005) noted that, although the multicultural critique, or what he termed the "postcolonial critique," has called for indigenous psychologies, what has happened instead is that many "third world" psychologists "start out with a Western perspective, and imitate and perpetuate Western ideals of mental life" (p. 177).

Although multicultural psychologists have expressed concern over the globalization of Euro-American psychology, within the field of psychology of women there have also been critiques. Those who have the power to speak out and take a stand on women's issues within the academy and other social institutions have typically been White, heterosexual, middle-class women (Lips, 2006). The result is that some psychologists, even those who are feminist, have analyzed and understood gender relations within a limited scope that leaves out the experiences of all others from different ethnicities, social classes, sexual orientations, and cultures (Lips, 2006; Reynolds, & Constantine, 2004). Even more problematic has been the tendency to derive "truths" from these overrepresented and privileged groups of women and apply them to everyone.

Feminist and multicultural psychologists have thus begun to examine the ways in which researchers in the discipline have overlooked the perspectives of women of color (Comas-Díaz, 1991; Espin, 1995; Reid, 1988), the perspectives of poor women (Reid, 1993; Saris & Johnston-Robledo, 2000), and the perspectives of women with disabilities (Roets, Reinaart, & Van Hove, 2008). The conclusion of these critiques is that, although all women share some kind of oppression as a result of their gender, they experience this oppression differently depending on their historical, social, political, economical, and psychological situations. There is no single, universal woman's experience and thus no single, universal experience of oppression.

Multicultural Psychology, Feminist Psychology, and Social Activism

There have been many parallels between feminist psychology and multicultural psychology. Both feminist and multicultural psychologies emphasize the role of social oppression in the etiology of mental health problems (see Brown, 1994; Comas-Díaz & Greene, 1994). In addition, research in both disciplines underscores the finding that what is defined as pathology is often a reaction to oppressive forces (Brown, 1994; Worell & Remer, 1992). Moreover, both multicultural and feminist psychologists argue that addressing oppressive conditions (e.g., poverty, racism, barriers to education and institutional support) often alleviates symptoms of mental disorders (Brabeck, 2000; Brown, 2000).

The idea of using psychological knowledge to further political activism and change the social conditions that oppress people has also been advocated by political psychologists (Jost, Banaji, & Nosek, 2004), community psychologists (Fox & Prilleltensky, 1997), liberation psychologists (Martin-Baro, 1994), and feminist psychologists (Fine & Roberts, 1999; Grant, Finkelstein, & Lyons, 2003; Moane, 1999). More recently, feminist liberation psychologists have explicitly advocated for "bringing about change at the macro levels of culture and society, as well as the personal and community levels" (Moane, 2006, p. 74).

Persistent Dilemmas and Future Directions

We began this chapter with a description of some early work on the psychology of women that would, retrospectively, be termed "feminist empiricism." Without the conceptual distinction between sex and gender, and in the absence of epistemological reflection or debate, early feminist psychologists had only the master's tools with which to dismantle the master's house (Lorde, 1984/2007). Often, their job consisted of using science to prove that sex differences, presumed to be based in biology, either did not exist or were socially and culturally determined. Feminist psychologists are still debating the pros and cons of feminist empiricism, and sex differences continue to preoccupy the scientific and popular imaginations. Janet Hyde (2005) has argued that decades of sex differences research paradoxically reveal that we are more the same than different. Alice Eagly (1987) has argued that there are only a small number of true psychological differences between men and women, and these can be explained socioculturally. How to interpret gender differences and the virtue of studying them at all remain persistent dilemmas for feminist psychologists (see Kitlinger, 1994).

The recent upsurge of interest in and attention to evolutionary psychology and sociobiological explanations of gender differences have also been a cause of concern for many feminist psychologists. Eagly (e.g., Eagly, 1987; Eagly & Wood, 1999) has consistently argued against sociobiological

interpretations and has used social role theory as an effective counterexplanation that could lead to social change rather than support for essentialist and biologized acceptance of the status quo. This is not a new dilemma, as our discussions of the variability hypothesis have shown. More recently, after E. O. Wilson (1975) published *Sociobiology: The New Synthesis*, a multi-disciplinary group of feminist scientists, led by feminist activist and comparative psychologist Ethel Tobach, came together to combat the use of genetic determinism to justify sexism. The group, called the Genes and Gender Collective, held multiple conferences and published at least seven volumes on issues such as evolutionary explanations of rape and women and work (see, for example, Hunter, 1991; Sunday & Tobach, 1985; Tobach & Rosoff, 1977, 1994). Sociobiology in the service of sexism is a persistent dilemma for feminist psychologists.

We have shown that social, political, intellectual, and disciplinary factors all contributed to the emergence of a distinct field called psychology of women, or feminist psychology, in the 1970s. The field was born in the wake of intense feminist activism and critique of the status quo. Keeping psychology of women true to its feminist roots is a continuing challenge. Additional historical reconstructions that pay careful attention to the political contexts in which both psychology and the psychology of women have been forged are needed. How have generations of feminist psychologists related to and influenced the epistemic assumptions, research practices, and knowledge products of a field strongly identified with the “androcentric ideology of contemporary science” (Harding, 1986, p. 136)? How have feminist psychologists negotiated relationships with a discipline that has been, perhaps more than any other social science, oblivious to or antagonistic toward their aims?

Systematic preservation of the historical record of feminist psychology, including first-person accounts and memoirs, oral histories, photographs, and collections of individual and organizational papers, is necessary to construct these accounts and to keep our collective memory alive as the feminist founders and pioneers of the field pass away. The establishment of a historical record that includes the stories and experiences of a diverse range of feminist scholars can help us to redress the past neglect of their stories and to avoid the one-sided histories that result. In sum, we need to collect and analyze the material that will allow us to construct a history of psychology *for* women.

To ensure a vibrant future, feminist psychology also needs to continue to attract junior scholars who bring a range of experiences, backgrounds, and concerns to the discipline. This remains a distinct challenge, but also suggests exciting future directions. In their recent review article on feminist psychology in *Signs*, Stewart and Dottolo (2006) highlighted the work of both established and emerging feminist scholars. In characterizing the “new hands building feminist psychology” (p. 501) they noted, “Many of these young feminist psychologists aim explicitly to address race, class, gender, and sexuality as social identities and constructions” (p. 503). Stewart and Dottolo remarked that these scholars use interdisciplinary women’s studies perspectives to guide their investigations and are seriously engaged in the theorization of intersectionality. Further, these researchers draw on a wide range of methods to confirm, challenge, or develop feminist theories in new ways. Stewart and Dottolo concluded, albeit tentatively, that this generation of feminist scholars may be less pre-occupied than previous generations with “staking out claims” about the nature of their enterprise. Feminist psychologists have built a solid house. It is time to invite everyone in.

References

- Bardwick, J. M. (1971). *Psychology of women: A study of bio-cultural conflict*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Belenky, M. F., Clinchey, B. M., Goldberger, N. R., & Tarule, J. M. (1986). *Women’s ways of knowing: Development of self, voice, and mind*. New York: Basic Books.
- Bem, S. L. (1974). The measurement of psychological androgyny. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 42, 155–162.

- Benjamin, L. T., Henry, K. D., & McMahon, L. R. (2005). Inez Beverly Prosser and the education of African Americans. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 41, 43–62.
- Bohan, J. S. (1993). Regarding gender: Essentialism, constructionism, and feminist psychology. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 17, 5–21.
- Boring, E. G. (1951). The woman problem. *American Psychologist*, 6, 679–682.
- Boring, E. G. (1961). *Psychologist at large*. New York: Basic Books.
- Brabeck, M. M. (Ed.) (2000). *Practicing feminist ethics in psychology*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Brodsky, A. M. (1980). A decade of feminist influence on psychotherapy. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 4, 331–344.
- Brodsky, A. M., & Hare-Mustin, R. T. (1980). *Women and psychotherapy*. New York: Guilford.
- Broverman, I. K., Broverman, D. M., Clarkson, F. E., Rosenkrantz, P. S., & Vogel, S. R. (1970). Sex role stereotypes and clinical judgments of mental health. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 34, 1–7.
- Brown, L. S. (1994). *Subversive dialogues: Theory in feminist therapy*. New York: Basic Books.
- Brown, L. S. (1995). Cultural diversity in feminist therapy: Theory and practice. In H. Landrine (Ed.), *Bringing cultural diversity to feminist psychology: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 143–161). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Brown, L. S. (2000). Feminist therapy. In C. R. Synder & R. E. Ingram (Eds.), *Handbook of psychological change: Psychotherapy processes and practices for the 21st century* (pp. 358–380). New York: Wiley.
- Bryan, A. I. (1986). A participant's view of the National Council of Women Psychologists: Comment on Capshew and Laszlo. *Journal of Social Issues*, 42, 181–184.
- Bryan, A. I., & Boring, E. G. (1944). Women in American psychology: Prolegomenon. *Psychological Bulletin*, 41, 447–454.
- Bryan, A. I., & Boring, E. G. (1946). Women in American psychology: Statistics from the OPP questionnaire. *American Psychologist*, 1, 71–79.
- Bryan, A. I., & Boring, E. G. (1947). Women in American psychology: Factors affecting their professional careers. *American Psychologist*, 2, 3–20.
- Cameron, C. E., & Hagen, J. W. (2005). Women in child development: Themes from the SRCD oral history project. *History of Psychology*, 8, 289–316.
- Camfield, T. M. (1973). The professionalization of American psychology, 1870–1917. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 9, 66–75.
- Caplan, P. J. (1992). Gender issues in the diagnosis of mental disorder. *Women & Therapy*, 12(4), 71–82.
- Capshew, J. H. (1999). *Psychologists on the march: Science, practice, and professional identity in America, 1929–1969*. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Capshew, J. H., & Laszlo, A. C. (1986). “We would not take no for an answer”: Women psychologists and gender politics during World War II. *Journal of Social Issues*, 42, 157–180.
- Carlson, E. R., & Carlson, R. (1961). Male and female subjects in personality research. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 61, 482–483.
- Chesler, P. (1972). *Women and madness*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Chin, J. (Ed.) (2000). *Relationships among Asian-American women*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Chodorow, N. (1978). *The reproduction of mothering*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Clark, M. P. (1983). Mamie Phipps Clark. In A. N. O’Connell & N. F. Russo (Eds.), *Models of achievement: Reflections of eminent women in psychology* (pp. 267–277). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Code, L. (1991). *What can she know? Feminist theory and the construction of knowledge*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Collins, P. H. (2000). *Black feminist thought: Knowledge, consciousness, and the politics of empowerment*. New York: Routledge.
- Comas-Díaz, L. (1987). Feminist therapy with mainland Puerto Rican women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 11, 461–474.
- Comas-Díaz, L. (1991). Feminism and diversity in psychology: The case of women of color. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 15, 597–609.
- Comas-Díaz, L., & Greene, B. (Eds.). (1994). *Women of color: Integrating ethnic and gender identities in psychotherapy*. New York: Guilford.
- Corker, M. (2001). Sensing disability. *Hypatia*, 16(4), 34–52.
- Crawford, M., & Kimmel, E. (Eds.). (1999). Innovative methods [Special Issue]. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 23(1/2).
- Crawford, M., & Unger, R. (2004). *Women and gender: A feminist psychology* (3rd ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.

- Deaux, K., & Emswiller, T. (1974). Explanation of successful performance on sex-linked tasks: What is skill for the male is luck for the female. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 29, 80–85.
- Denmark, F. L., & Fernandez, L. C. (1993). Historical development of the psychology of women. In F. L. Denmark & M. A. Paludi (Eds.), *Psychology of women: A handbook of issues and theories* (pp. 4–22). Westport, CT: Greenwood.
- Eagly, A. H. (1987). *Sex differences in social behavior: A social-role interpretation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Eagly, A. H., & Wood, W. (1999). The origins of sex differences in human behavior: Evolved dispositions versus social roles. *American Psychologist*, 54, 408–423.
- Elms, A. C. (1975). The crisis of confidence in social psychology. *American Psychologist*, 30, 967–976.
- Enriquez, V. G. (1987). Decolonizing the Filipino psyche: Impetus for the development of psychology in the Philippines. In G. H. Blowers & A. M. Turtle (Eds.), *Psychology moving east: The status of Western psychology in Asia and Oceania* (pp. 265–288). Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Espin, O. M. (1995). On knowing you are the unknown: Women of color constructing psychology. In J. Adelman & G. Enguidanos (Eds.), *Racism in the lives of women* (pp. 127–136). New York: Haworth.
- Fine, M., & Roberts, R. A. (1999). Erika Apfelbaum 1979 revisited. *Feminism & Psychology*, 9, 261–265.
- Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison*. New York: Pantheon.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: selected interviews and writings, 1972–1977*. New York: Pantheon.
- Fox, D., & Prilleltensky, I. (Eds.). (1997). *Critical psychology: An introduction* (pp. 68–84). London: Sage.
- Fox-Keller, E. (1985). *Reflections on gender and science*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Friedan, B. (1963). *The feminine mystique*. New York: Dell.
- Furumoto, L. (1987). On the margins: Women and the professionalization of psychology in the United States, 1890–1940. In M. G. Ash & W. R. Woodward (Eds.), *Psychology in twentieth century thought and society* (pp. 93–113). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Gergen, M. M. (1988). Building a feminist methodology. *Contemporary Social Psychology*, 13(2), 47–53.
- Gilbert, L. A., & Osipow, S. H. (1991). Feminist contributions to counseling psychology. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 15, 537–547.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). *In a different voice*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Grant, K., Finkelstein, J. S., & Lyons, A. (2003). Integrating psychological research on girls with feminist activism: A model for building a liberation psychology in the United States. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 31, 143–55.
- Guthrie, R. V. (1998). *Even the rat was white: A historical view of psychology* (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.
- Harding, S. (1986). *The science question in feminism*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Harding, S. (1991). *Whose science? Whose knowledge? Thinking from women's lives*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Hare-Mustin, R. T. (1974). Ethical considerations in the use of sexual contact in psychotherapy. *Psychotherapy*, 11, 308–310.
- Hare-Mustin, R. T., & Marecek, J. (1990). Gender and the meaning of difference: Postmodernism and psychology. In R. T. Hare-Mustin & J. Marecek (Eds.), *Making a difference: Psychology and the construction of gender* (pp. 22–64). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Helson, R. (1972). The changing image of the career woman. *Journal of Social Issues*, 28, 33–46.
- Henley, N. (1973). Status and sex: Some touching observations. *Bulletin of the Psychonomic Society*, 2, 91–93.
- Henley, N. (1977). *Body politics: Power, sex, and nonverbal communication*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Hepburn, A. (1999). Postmodernity and the politics of feminist psychology. *Radical Psychology*, 1, 1–15.
- Hepburn, A. (2000). On the alleged incompatibility between relativism and feminist psychology. *Feminism & Psychology*, 10, 91–106.
- Hogan, J. D., & Sexton, V. S. (1991). Women and the American Psychological Association. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 15, 623–634.
- Hollingworth, L. S. (1914a). *Functional periodicity: An experimental study of the mental and motor abilities of women during menstruation*. Teachers College, Columbia University, Contributions to Education, No. 69.
- Hollingworth, L. S. (1914b). Variability as related to sex differences in achievement: A critique. *American Journal of Sociology*, 19, 510–530.
- Horner, M. S. (1972). Toward an understanding of achievement-related conflicts in women. *Journal of Social Issues*, 28, 157–175.
- Howard, R. W. (1983). Ruth W. Howard. In A. N. O'Connell & N. F. Russo (Eds.), *Models of achievement: Reflections of eminent women in psychology* (pp. 55–67). New York: Columbia University Press.
- Hunter, A. E. (1991). *On peace, war, and gender: A challenge to genetic explanations*. New York: Feminist Press.
- Hyde, J. S. (2005). The gender similarities hypothesis. *American Psychologist*, 60, 581–592.

- Jastrow, J. (1891). A study in mental statistics. *New Review*, 5, 559–568.
- Johnston, E., & Johnson, A. (2008). Searching for the second generation of American women psychologists. *History of Psychology*, 11, 40–69.
- Jost, J. T., Banaji, M. R., & Nosek, B. A. (2004). A decade of system justification theory: Accumulated evidence of conscious and unconscious bolstering of the status quo. *Political Psychology*, 25, 881–920.
- Kitzinger, C. (1994). Should we study sex differences? *Feminism & Psychology*, 4, 501–506.
- Kravetz, D. (1980). Consciousness-raising and self-help. In A. M. Brodsky & R. T. Hare-Mustin (Eds.), *Women and psychotherapy* (pp. 267–284). New York: Guilford.
- Lal, S. (2002). Giving children security: Mamie Phipps Clark and the racialization of child psychology. *American Psychologist*, 57, 20–28.
- Langton, R. (2000). Feminism in epistemology: Exclusion and objectification. In M. Fricker & J. Hornsby (Eds.), *The Cambridge companion to feminism in philosophy* (pp. 127–145). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Lips, H. (2006). *A new psychology of women* (3rd ed.). Boston: McGraw-Hill.
- Lloyd, G. (1993). *The man of reason: "Male" and "Female" in Western philosophy*. London: Routledge.
- Lomax, E. (1977). The Laura Spelman Rockefeller Memorial: Some of its contributions to early research in child development. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 13, 283–293.
- Lorde, A. (1984/2007). *Sister outsider: Essays and speeches by Audre Lorde*. Berkeley, CA: Crossing Press.
- Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. (1974). *The psychology of sex differences*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.
- Marecek, J. (2001). After the facts: Psychology and the study of gender. *Canadian Psychology*, 42, 254–267.
- Marecek, J., & Hare-Mustin, R. T. (1991). A short history of the future: Feminism and clinical psychology. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 15, 521–536.
- Marecek, J., Kimmel, E. B., Crawford, M., & Hare-Mustin, R. T. (2003). Psychology of women and gender. In D. K. Freedheim (Ed.), *Handbook of psychology, Volume 1: History of psychology* (pp. 249–268). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Martin-Baro, I. (1994). *Writings for a liberation psychology*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Mednick, M. T. S., & Urbanski, L. (1991). The origins and activities of APA's division of the psychology of women. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 15, 651–663.
- Milar, K. S. (2000). The first generation of women psychologists and the psychology of women. *American Psychologist*, 55, 616–619.
- Mills, S. (2003). *Michel Foucault*. London: Routledge.
- Minton, H. L. (2000). Psychology and gender at the turn of the century. *American Psychologist*, 55, 613–615.
- Mitchell, M. B. (1951). Status of women in the American Psychological Association. *American Psychologist*, 6, 193–201.
- Moane, G. (1999). *Gender and colonialism: A psychological analysis of oppression and liberation*. London: Macmillan.
- Moane, G. (2006). Exploring activism and change: Feminist psychology, liberation psychology, political psychology. *Feminism & Psychology*, 16, 73–78.
- Moghaddam, F. M. (1996). Training for developing-world psychologists: Can it be better than the psychology? In S. C. Carr & J. F. Schumaker (Eds.), *Psychology and the developing world* (pp. 49–59). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Morawski, J. G. (1990). Toward the unimagined: Feminism and epistemology in psychology. In R. T. Hare-Mustin & J. Marecek (Eds.), *Making a difference: Psychology and the construction of gender*, (pp. 150–183). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Morawski, J. G. (1994). *Practicing feminisms, reconstructing psychology: Notes on a liminal science*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.
- Morawski, J. G., & Agronick, G. (1991). A restive legacy: The history of feminist work in experimental and cognitive psychology. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 15, 567–579.
- Moya, P. M. L. (2001). Chicana feminism and postmodernist theory. *Signs*, 2, 441–483.
- Napoli, D. S. (1981). *Architects of adjustment: The history of the psychological profession in the United States*. Port Washington, NY: Kennikat.
- Nevers, C. C., & Calkins, M. W. (1895). Dr. Jastrow on community of ideas of men and women. *Psychological Review*, 2, 363–367.
- Nightingale, D., & Neilands, T. (1997). Understanding and practicing critical psychology. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 15, 495–504.
- O'Connell, A. N., & Russo, N. F. (1991). Women's heritage in psychology: Past and present. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 15, 495–504.
- Parlee, M. B. (1975). Psychology. *Signs*, 1, 119–138.
- Parlee, M. B. (1979). Psychology and women. *Signs*, 5, 121–133.

- Parlee, M. B. (1994). The social construction of premenstrual syndrome: A case study in scientific discourse as cultural contestation. In M. G. Winkler & L. B. Cole (Eds.), *The good body: Asceticism in contemporary culture* (pp. 91–107). New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Pope, R. L., Reynolds, A. L., & Mueller, J. M. (2004). *Multicultural competence in student affairs*. San Francisco: Jossey Bass.
- Reid, P. T. (1988). Racism and sexism: Comparisons and conflicts. In P. A. Katz & D. A. Taylor (Eds.), *Eliminating racism* (pp. 203–221). New York: Plenum.
- Reid, P. T. (1993). Poor women in psychological research: “Shut up and shut out.” *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 17, 133–150.
- Reinharz, S. (1979/1992). *Feminist methods in social research*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Reynolds, A. L., & Constantine, M. G. (2004). Feminism and multiculturalism: Parallels and intersections. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 32, 346–448.
- Riger, S. (1992). Epistemological debates, feminist voices: Science, social values, and the study of women. *American Psychologist*, 47, 730–740.
- Roets, G., Reinaart, R., & Van Hove, G. (2008). Living between borderlands: Discovering a sense of nomadic subjectivity throughout Rosa’s life story. *Journal of Gender Studies*, 17, 99–115.
- Rosenberg, R. (1982). *Beyond separate spheres: The intellectual roots of modern feminism*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Rosenthal, N. B. (1984). Consciousness-raising: From revolution to re-evaluation. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 8, 309–326.
- Rossiter, M. W. (1982). *Women scientists in America: Struggles and strategies to 1940*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Ruddick, S. (1989). *Maternal thinking: Towards a politics of peace*. New York: Ballentine.
- Russo, N. F., & Dumont, A. (1997). A history of division 35 (psychology of women): Origins, issues, activities, future. In D. A. Dewsbury (Ed.), *Unification through division: Histories of the divisions of the American Psychological Association* (Vol. 2, pp. 211–238). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Russo, N. F., & O’Connell, A. N. (1980). Models from our past: Psychology’s foremothers. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 5, 11–53.
- Rutherford, A. (2007). Feminist questions, feminist answers: Toward a redefinition. *Feminism & Psychology*, 17, 459–464.
- Rutherford, A., & Pickren, W. E. (2008). Women and minorities in psychology. In S. Davis & B. Buskist (Eds.), *The handbook of 21st century psychology* (pp. 25–36). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Samelson, F. (1977). World War I intelligence testing and the development of psychology. *Journal of the History of the Behavioral Sciences*, 13, 274–282.
- Sampson, E. E. (1985). The decentralization of identity: Toward a revised concept of personal and social order. *American Psychologist*, 40, 1203–1211.
- Sandoval, C. (2000). *Methodology of the oppressed*. Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.
- Saris, R. N., & Johnston-Robledo, I. (2000). Poor women are still shut out of mainstream psychology. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 24, 233–235.
- Scarborough, E. (1994). Recognition for women: The problem of linkage. In H. E. Adler & R.W. Rieber (Eds.), *Aspects of the history of psychology in America: 1892/1992* (pp. 101–112). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Scarborough, E., & Furumoto, L. (1987). *Untold lives: The first generation of American women psychologists*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Schwesinger, G. C. (1943). Wartime organizational activities of women psychologists: II. The National Council of Women Psychologists. *Journal of Consulting Psychology*, 7, 298–299.
- Seward, G. H. (1944a). Psychological effects of the menstrual cycle in women workers. *Psychological Bulletin*, 41, 90–102.
- Seward, G. H. (1944b). Sex roles in postwar planning. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 19, 163–185.
- Seward, G. H. (1946). *Sex and the social order*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Sherif, C. W. (1979/1998). Bias in psychology. Reprinted in *Feminism & Psychology*, 8, 58–75.
- Sherman, J.A. (1971). *On the psychology of women: A survey of empirical studies*. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.
- Shields, S. A. (1975a). Functionalism, Darwinism, and the psychology of women. *American Psychologist*, 30, 739–754.
- Shields, S. A. (1975b). Ms. Pilgrim’s progress: The contributions of Leta Stetter Hollingworth to the psychology of women. *American Psychologist*, 30, 852–857.

- Shields, S. A. (1982). The variability hypothesis: The history of a biological model of sex differences in intelligence. *Signs*, 7, 769–797.
- Shields, S. A. (2007). Passionate men, emotional women: Psychology constructs gender difference in the late 19th century. *History of Psychology*, 10, 92–110.
- Schildrick, M. (1997). *Leaky bodies and boundaries: Feminism, postmodernism, and (bio)ethics*. London: Routledge.
- Smith-Rosenberg, C. (1985). *Visions of gender in Victorian America*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Stewart, A. J., & Dottolo, A. L. (2006). Feminist psychology. *Signs*, 31, 493–509.
- Sunday, S., & Tobach, E. (1985). *Violence against women: A critique of the sociobiology of rape*. New York: Gordian Press.
- Tanner, A. (1896). The community of ideas of men and women. *Psychological Review*, 3, 548–550.
- Teo, T. (2005). *The critique of psychology: From Kant to postcolonial theory*. New York: Springer.
- Thompson, H. B. (1903). *The mental traits of sex: An empirical investigation of the normal mind in men and women*. Available at: <http://psychclassics.yorku.ca/Thompson/>
- Tiefer, L. (1991). A brief history of the Association for Women in Psychology: 1969–1991. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 15, 635–649.
- Tobach, E., & Rosoff, B. (1977). *Genes and gender* (Vol. 1). New York: Gordian Press.
- Tobach, E., & Rosoff, B. (1994). *Challenging racism and sexism: Alternatives to genetic explanations*. New York: Feminist Press.
- Tresemmer, D. W. (1977). *Fear of success*. New York: Plenum.
- Unger, R. K. (1979). Toward a redefinition of sex and gender. *American Psychologist*, 34, 1085–1094.
- Unger, R. K. (1983). Through the looking glass: No wonderland yet! (The reciprocal relationship between methodology and models of reality). *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 8, 9–32.
- Unger, R. K., & Denmark, F. L. (1975). *Women: Dependent or independent variable?* New York: Psychological Dimensions.
- Vaughter, R. M. (1976). Psychology. *Signs*, 2, 120–146.
- Walsh, M. R. (1985). Academic professional women organizing for change: The struggle in psychology. *Journal of Social Issues*, 41, 17–28.
- Weisstein, N. (1971). Psychology constructs the female; or, The fantasy life of the male psychologist (with some attention to the fantasies of his friends, the male biologist and the male anthropologist). *Journal of Social Education*, 35, 362–373.
- Wilkinson, S. (1997). Feminist psychology. In D. Fox & I. Prilleltensky (Eds.), *Critical psychology: An introduction* (pp. 247–264). London: Sage.
- Wilson, E. O. (1975). *Sociobiology: The new synthesis*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.
- Worell, J., & Remer, P. (1992). *Feminist perspectives in therapy*. New York: Wiley.
- Yoder, J. D. & Kahn, A. S. (1992). Toward a feminist understanding of women and power. *Psychology of Women Quarterly*, 16, 381–388.

Handbook of Gender Research in Psychology
Volume 1: Gender Research in General and
Experimental Psychology

Chrisler, J.C.; McCreary, D.R. (Eds.)

2010, XXVI, 712 p., Hardcover

ISBN: 978-1-4419-1464-4